

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, July 12, 1967.

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

### QUESTIONS

#### BETTING ODDS.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yesterday an article that appeared in the *News* dealt with fractional betting odds as opposed to decimal odds. The article stated that two race clubs, most punters and some bookmakers approved the idea of returning to fractional odds in South Australia. I think it can be said that most people associated with racing would prefer a return to fractional odds for many reasons, which I do not intend to go into today. Can the Chief Secretary say whether any approach has been made to the Government to return to fractional odds in this State and, if it has, whether the Government intends to take appropriate action?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I think I could get over it by saying "No" to the first question. If and when approaches are made they will be given due consideration.

#### PORT WAKEFIELD ROAD.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Can the Minister of Roads say what plans are in hand to duplicate or widen the very heavily used road from Cavan to Port Wakefield?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I thought I made this clear the other day. Plans are in hand for widening what is known as the Port Wakefield Road. However, what is to be done will depend a great deal on the report of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study, which I expect to have by September this year. Much of the planning for the future of this road will take place in conjunction with that report when it comes to hand.

#### PLANNING APPEAL BOARD.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: In view of the statement made by the Hon. Mr. Hill regarding the appointment of Mr. Roder as Chairman of the Planning Appeal Board as constituted under the Planning and Development Act, and in view of the fact that the Minister of Local Government has stated that he was

responsible for that appointment, can the Minister tell me his reasons for making the appointment?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: As honourable members are aware, when the administration of this Act was placed within my jurisdiction as Minister of Local Government, it fell to my lot to recommend the appointments not only of the Chairman of the board but also of the members of that board and members of the authority. The question then arose of determining who was the most fitting person to appoint as Chairman of the board, as conditions are laid down under the Act of various qualifications that the Chairman must have: for instance, he must be a barrister or magistrate with at least 10 years of practising in this State. That is one qualification stipulated. As I have said, it became my responsibility to make these appointments.

I shall be quite frank about this, that I made inquiries and was influenced by information passed on to me. I was influenced by a conference of the Municipal Association, about which we have heard so much from time to time on the floor of this Chamber in respect of its opinions deserving consideration. The conference was held on November 3, 1965. I should like to quote the following views of the association, as they are quite short. It stated:

We consider that there should be an independent Chairman, possessing some planning qualifications. We have considered the type of person who would best fill the position of Chairman. We have discussed with Mr. K. H. Gifford, Q.C., such an appointment and, having regard to the practice in many parts of the United States of America and Europe, we suggest that a person possessing experience and qualifications in law and planning would have suitable attributes to act as Chairman of the proposed State Planning Appeal Board. It occurs to us that the most suitable person available in the State to be invited to undertake this position is Mr. John Herbert Roder, M.A., LL.B., a practitioner of the Supreme Court of some 17 years' standing, whose practice is largely concerned with land and property matters and who, in 1964, completed his final examination leading to the degree of Master of Town Planning, and is at present submitting a thesis relating to planning appeals to the University of Adelaide to obtain this degree. To the best of the Municipal Association's knowledge, there is only one other similarly qualified person elsewhere in Australia.

That was made available to me, and I checked it. I admit that it had an influence on me in regard to the appointment of the Chairman of the board. I have checked the last sentence of that statement and, to the best of my knowledge, there is only one other

person in Australia with the same qualifications as Mr. Roder has. I am not concerned with where the individual came from, what office he is in or anything else. What I was concerned with was to appoint the most fitting person as the Chairman of the board, because it is an important position to hold, as I am sure every member will agree.

I went further before making any recommendation: I told the Premier what I intended to do. The Premier resisted this very strongly, because he said this could create a considerable amount of criticism and an accusation of its being a political appointment. To be quite frank about it, I told the Premier that the appointment was mine and not his, and, as I was responsible for these appointments—

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: When did you say this to the Premier?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Before ever the appointment was made or the recommendation was taken to Cabinet; after I had investigated it myself and informed myself who I thought was the best appointee. I stated this to the Premier, and he resisted this. He also resisted it when I took the recommendation to Cabinet for approval of the appointment. However, Cabinet was agreeable, on the information I gave it about the qualifications of this person, and it accepted my recommendation for the appointment. Accusations were made on the floor of this Chamber, and I hope I can clear up this position, because the Address in Reply debate has not finished.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I do not think they were accusations.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: What do you mean? Be your age!

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The debate has not finished and, if honourable members wish to address themselves to this matter, they may do so. If so, I sincerely hope that they will have in mind that any criticism they may make on this matter should be levelled at me and not at somebody who, by any stretch of the imagination, was definitely not responsible. I repeat that the Premier resisted the appointment of Mr. Roder. I hope that that answers the honourable member's question and that I have now made it quite plain what the circumstances were.

#### GAS.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary in his capacity as Leader of the Government in this Council.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The Premier has stated that the Electricity Trust of South Australia should not pay more for natural gas than it is now paying for fuel oil. The general opinion is that the delay in announcing the commencement of the gas pipeline is due to the lengthy negotiations taking place for a suitable price for gas for power generation. I ask the Chief Secretary: (1) Is it not a fact that the producers have made an offer to supply gas at a price below that paid for fuel oil for power generation? (2) If so, what is the reason for the delay in accepting this price? (3) Will not the State receive a 10 per cent royalty on all natural gas sold? (4) What price does E.T.S.A. now pay for fuel oil for each 1,000,000 British thermal units? (5) Is it a fact that fuel represents a relatively small proportion of the cost of electricity generation? (6) Is it not reasonable to assume that the price of oil from overseas could rise because of the unsettled conditions in the oil-producing countries near to Australia? (7) Is it not a fact that, by using natural gas, considerable capital expenditure could be avoided in providing facilities to handle alternative fuel at the Torrens Island power station?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I appreciate that the Leader of the Opposition mentioned this series of questions to me, but obviously I cannot give the answers now. However, these questions will be followed up and a report will be made available as soon as practicable.

#### COMPANIES ACT OFFENCES.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Some time ago the Attorney-General announced that he intended to prosecute about 30 companies or persons for offences they had committed under the Companies Act. Will the Chief Secretary obtain from the Attorney-General the following details: (1) the number of companies that have already been prosecuted and the result of the prosecutions; and (2) what progress is being made regarding the prosecution of the remainder?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I am prepared to refer the questions to the Attorney-General.

#### JOINT COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I ask leave to move a motion without notice.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN moved:

That the Hon. C. R. Story be given permission to give evidence before the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation in respect of

a proclamation under the Vine Fruit and Vegetable Protection Act.

Motion carried.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 11. Page 464.)

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE (Northern): I rise to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. In doing so I wish to join with the mover, the seconder, and previous speakers in their expressions of regret that His Excellency the Governor was so indisposed as to be unable to perform the opening ceremony himself. Sir Edric and Lady Bastyan have endeared themselves to everyone in this State. Honourable members were very regretful to learn of his indisposition, and I sincerely hope that his recovery will be a speedy one. I congratulate the Governor's Deputy, who deputized so well. I wish also to add my tribute to those of previous speakers regarding the late Robert Stanley Richards and the late Rufus Goldney, who were not known to me but whose history speaks for itself. I make special mention of the late Dudley Octoman, who was well known to me and whose efforts on behalf of primary producers throughout the State were not only well known but they perhaps contributed to his early demise.

It is regrettable in my opinion to learn that so many politicians have indicated that they intend to retire at the end of this session. It is never wise to eliminate all the elders of the tribe at one time, and I am sure that honourable members will miss these men in the governing of our State. One is Sir Thomas Playford, whom we can rate not only as a politician but as a statesman and, as such, was responsible to a large degree for the economic and industrial stability that South Australia now enjoys. I think perhaps foremost among his achievements were the development of the Leigh Creek coalfield and the establishment of the Curlew Point power station, which have enabled industry to function properly and reach the high degree of efficiency it has today.

The Hon. Mr. Densley has retired from the position that you, Sir, now occupy. He was well known in this Chamber for the manner in which he conducted the business of the Council. It is a tribute to Mr. Densley and to you, Sir, that since I have been in this Chamber there has been no blasphemy, very little shouting and a great deal of decorum. Messrs. Jim Heaslip, Bill Quirke, George Bockelberg, and Huntley Shannon have also

indicated that they intend to retire and I contend that their loss will be noticeable for a long time. Then there is the Hon. Frank Walsh, who led the Labor Party so well and was instrumental in that Party becoming the Government in this State. I wish each of them well in retirement. The Hon. Mr. Springett, who has succeeded Mr. Densley, has already shown that we not only have a doctor in the House but we also have the makings of an excellent legislator. I congratulate him on his election and wish him well in his career as a politician.

Paragraph 4 of His Excellency's Speech indicates that the Government has been successful in the establishment of industry and that it is actively engaged in promoting further expansion in this field. This is heartening news; I wish the Government well in its endeavours and I will co-operate in any way possible. The recent appointment of Mr. Currie as Director of Industrial Development should be a move in the right direction.

Paragraph 5 of the Speech gave details of the excellent wheat yields in all grain areas of the State except the Murray Mallee, which suffered a severe drought and which has had little relief since. Eyre Peninsula was given special mention, having produced 24,000,000 bushels of the 54,250,000 bushels of wheat harvested in this State. It is not the first time that Eyre Peninsula has produced a grand harvest, nor will it be the last, and the increased figures substantiate the predictions of Eyre Peninsula people over many years.

This area has great potential; because of the figures I have quoted and other figures that I intend to quote it will be difficult in future for politicians or people in authority to overlook this area. It is a most colourful area: it has experienced hardships and successes, but a great deal more must be done to bring it to full productivity. In that area, as in many other areas in the country, more all-weather or bitumen roads are needed. The railway system in the area has fulfilled its purpose and I would be the last to point a finger at its activities. As a grain and fertilizer haulier the railway system is appreciated, although the railway service there is insufficient to cope even in a small way with the traffic offering on Eyre Peninsula. For that reason, I maintain that more bituminizing should be undertaken on these roads.

This applies also to the areas of the North. The main Alice Springs to Port Augusta road, which carries a big volume of traffic now and which is most essential to our economy, is often in a very poor state of repair. I believe

that attention should be paid to this road, and that the bituminizing of the Eyre Highway should be completed through to the border to link up with the road being bituminized on the Western Australian side.

I realize that these projects are big ones and that they cannot be fulfilled immediately. However, I point out that they need every consideration. Perhaps in the meantime one thing that could be done to make living conditions more pleasant in some of these far-flung areas would be to bituminize the main streets of the towns. Two classic examples are Coober Pedy and Penong. These two small towns, which are subjected to a good deal of hot, dry and dusty weather, carry a big volume of traffic through their main streets. It is almost asking too much in some years to expect housewives to raise families and attempt to keep a home in a livable state in towns that carry such an amount of traffic on such poor roads. Also, it is asking a great deal of businesses to keep functioning in these conditions. I recommend to the Minister of Roads and to the Government that some steps be taken to alleviate the position in towns such as these.

Water requirements in these areas will take many years to be fulfilled. However, in some cases it is most urgent that steps be taken to provide a service. It is quite admirable that we have 11,000 miles of mains in this State and many more hundreds of miles awaiting completion. However, as I say, the demand for a service is most urgent in some areas.

I am sure that members of this Council and also the people that I represent would be disappointed if I did not at this stage mention the promised Kimba-Polda pipeline. As early as 1839 one of our prominent citizens said that the area between Decree Bay and Darke Peak held a great deal of potential provided it was supplied with water. I think this has been repeated ever since 1839, but a large area of this country is still awaiting water. Kimba is still under the promise of a pipeline from Polda, the difference now being that the Polda Basin has been tested and has come up to the necessary requirements and specifications of the authorities. Also, it has been approved by the Public Works Committee. A pipeline, estimated to cost \$2,240,000, was approved by Cabinet some time ago. All that is necessary now is for the Government to honour the promises it made prior to the election and again shortly afterwards.

I have at various times stressed the urgency of water to reach Kimba soon. The town of Kimba has been supplied for some years through water being carted there, but there has not been nearly enough water to establish or to support a town that has proved itself over the years to be one of the biggest grain receipt points outside of terminals in the southern hemisphere. Apart from its grain productivity, Kimba carries 250,000 sheep and many beef cattle, and I am sure that everyone will agree that it deserves better treatment. A water supply for this area was first advocated as early as 1839. An article written in 1923 in the *Eyre Peninsula Tribune* stated:

Kimba: Water carting is still the order of the day here. We read long letters in the papers of how things will be better for us in about three years or so when the Polda schemes are reticulated. This is something to look forward to, but let us hope that it rains in the meantime.

That was 44 years ago and, of course, the story is very much the same today. As an indication of the productivity of Eyre Peninsula, I should like to point out that the area is carrying 14,900 beef cattle, 6,900 dairy cattle, 2,552,690 sheep, and 25,700 pigs. The total wool production of the area is 30,820,700 lb. In addition to that, the area produced 24,000,000 bushels of wheat for the last harvest.

I think we can safely say that this big increase in wheat production is partly due to the innovation of bulk handling. In this respect, I should like to mention the splendid job being done by the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited. Since its inception it has provided 143 silos throughout the State at a cost of \$25,000,000. Additional bulk grain stores are being constructed at 16 further locations, providing another 6,250,000 bushels of bulk storage at a cost of about \$3,500,000. The new silos and new additions are: at Port Lincoln, 500,000 bushels; Port Pirie, 1,000,000 bushels; and Ardrossan, 1,200,000 bushels. The extensions to country silos are at Poochera, Tintinara, Peake, Coomandook, Roseworthy, Arno Bay, Cowell, Rudall, Darke Peak, Wirrulla, Wudinna, Cummins and Yaninee. It will be noted that 10 of these silos are being constructed on Eyre Peninsula, where last season the greatest crop ever was harvested. The total storage capacity of these 10 silos will be 3,000,000 bushels. It is not possible, as the bulk handling people have pointed out, to construct silos capable of coping with extreme or bumper seasons, but it is considered

that this additional storage will help to alleviate a bottleneck such as occurred last year.

There have also been discussions (I believe evidence has been taken) about creating a seaboard terminal on the eastern coast of Eyre Peninsula. The sites being investigated are at Port Neil, Arno Bay and Point Gibbon, each of which has, I understand, a sufficient depth of water to handle bigger ships than are at present loading at the various terminals. As the sale of our wheat must, to a large extent, depend on the type of ship that can be loaded and the speed of its turn-round, it is important that a further terminal be created in eastern Eyre Peninsula.

I think that most of the paragraphs of His Excellency's Speech have been dealt with by speakers more eloquent than I, but I should like to refer to paragraph 10, dealing with Aborigines. Much progress has been made with the promise to assimilate Aborigines, but much more is necessary. I do not mean by way of hand-outs, nor do I think it can be achieved by do-gooders, who are more interested in having their names published in the newspapers than in the welfare of the Aborigines. Nor can it be achieved by politicians who make loose promises to overcome difficulties overnight in return for perhaps some voting compensation. Rather do I believe it must come by the concerted effort of those people who wish to help, of the Government and more especially of the missions.

Much can be attained by more support, perhaps financial, for people dedicated to this type of work. It is all very well for people to jump on the band waggon and establish some name for themselves by trying to achieve something about which they know very little. Most of the mission workers know something of the problem and are prepared to spend many years learning. They have done much good for the Aborigines, who themselves must be educated to take part in this assimilation. When this programme is speeded up (and there are many ways in which it can be) we shall see some results, rather than by lavish hand-outs and big write-ups. I support the motion.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE (Southern): I endorse the remarks of the earlier speakers, particularly with reference to His Excellency the Governor and Lady Bastyan. I can only express regret that the return to health of His Excellency has not been as rapid as we would have wished. I have referred previously in this Chamber to my ex-colleague, the Hon. L. H.

Densley, and other honourable members have paid what is only a just tribute to him. I now hasten, at the first opportunity, to congratulate my new colleague in Southern, the Hon. Mr. Springett, on his selection and particularly on his maiden speech in this Chamber.

I intend to confine myself this afternoon to only one or two subjects. For some time I have been greatly concerned about some aspects of the Government's administration of the finances of the Highways Department. First, I wish to take honourable members back a few years to the time when the first Minister of Roads was appointed. In 1953-54 the Government, finding itself with an assured surplus (not unusual in those years of sound planning) at the end of the financial year and in order to assist the rapidly developing Highways Department to obtain matching grants just initiated by the Commonwealth, paid into the Highways Fund *via* the Loan Fund the sum of \$1,240,000.

Some years later, between 1960 and 1964, the Government, realizing that the construction of the Blanchetown bridge and the new Highways Department building almost simultaneously would seriously deplete the funds available for road construction, provided a further sum (perchance of the same amount) of \$1,240,000 by way of loan from the Treasury Loan Account.

The Walsh Government had no sooner assumed office (with only three months of the financial year remaining) than it requested the Highways Commissioner to repay \$600,000 to the Treasury, under section 31 (a) of the Highways Act. This may be quite in order, but unprecedented.

In 1965 the Commissioner was asked to repay \$640,000 to the Treasury Loan Account, and this amount had to be deducted from the money available for the road programme. During the financial year just ended, the Government made a further demand on the Highways Commissioner to repay \$1,000,000 to the Revenue Account in the Treasury. It will be claimed, of course, that this is a repayment of the money transferred from revenue to the Highways Fund back in 1953-54. I do not want to go into the pros and cons of which account was repaid, because the figures work out just the same in the end. The totals come to the same amount, and the same amount was deducted from the money available for road and other purposes within the department.

The present Minister has stated emphatically that the Government intends to make no further money available from Loan funds for highways purposes and that he considers there are much

more important avenues requiring those funds. This is his own personal statement.

Referring again to loan repayments, I suggest that it would be an interesting exercise to see the public reaction if the department were to inform the larger councils that their loan repayments, which are mostly due 20 to 30 years hence, would be repayable on demand. I hope the Minister will ask Cabinet to contemplate the logic of such a statement. Furthermore, the Highways Department will have to consider telling councils, presumably through the Minister, that in view of the Treasury's attitude it can no longer be a loan agency for machinery, etc., and at the same time continue with a progressive road programme. The Minister may well claim that all funds granted from Loan Account are repayable on demand, if available.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: That is right.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: If so, it would seem that the Minister is supporting the rest of his Government at the expense of his own department, and that department only—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: What is wrong with that?

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: It is quite all right for you, but it is not so good for him.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: What is wrong with it, if it is right?

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Obviously, to be consistent, loans to departments concerned with works and buildings could be repaid when they were unable to expend them. However, following this line of thought and action, no other department has been asked to repay its Loan funds and, if loans to the Highways Department are to be repayable after only a few years, the whole basis of highways finance will collapse, and the provision of 50-year amenities, such as bridges, overpasses, etc., will become impossible except at the expense of the whole road system throughout the State.

What this Government is doing is not only refusing Loan funds for bridges or buildings but also asking the Highways Department to repay its Loan funds (the term of which should be 53 years) for the benefit of improved social services. Both metropolitan and country road users, not to mention the very important transport industry, which is paying practically the whole of the road maintenance tax, will require an explanation. It may well be said in the strongest terms that this Government is ratting the Highways Department to satisfy its social security vote and, rather naturally, other departments are quite happy with the position.

Incidentally, I read in this morning's *Advertiser* that the Highways Department was to be asked to find the whole of the funds for the Morphett Street bridge. Doubtless we shall hear much more about this later.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: It won't be long, either.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I shall now mention another dangerous inconsistency that has arisen; I refer to matters that the Statutes state should be referred to the Public Works Committee. The Public Works Standing Committee Act states: "No Treasurer . . . shall introduce a Bill for a project costing in excess of \$200,000 until it is first referred to the Public Works Committee." The Playford Government, despite the Highways Commissioner's Act, referred the Highways building, the Blanchetown bridge, the Keswick bridge, the Morphett Street bridge, and others to the committee. Why?

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Because it was not game to do anything else.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Because some of them required Loan funds, but the basic reason was that it was in the interests of the community that an opportunity should be given for all branches of the public to give evidence, if they so desired. Today, no new highways project will be granted Loan funds (according to the Minister) and therefore no project will need to be referred to the committee, because of the Highways Act. Of course, legal doubts still exist on these points, but surely any prudent Government would do well to refer all large projects to the committee. But what has happened? The Kingston bridge and the Port Augusta bridge have actually been referred to the committee. I heard the Minister interject a few moments ago; he suggested that by referring the projects to the committee the Playford Government had run away from it. The present Government actually referred the Kingston bridge and the Port Augusta bridge to the Public Works Committee, and it also requested a second report on a drainage scheme, but the new Highways Department building, costing about \$1,500,000, is to be proceeded with three years ahead of the period suggested in the first report of the committee, without any inquiry whatever. Is an inquiry necessary? Of course it is!

The Highways Department 12 months ago budgeted for annual expenditure under its very

numerous headings, and since then a request has been made by the Treasury for \$1,000,000 to be repaid to Revenue Account. This means that the road programme for the year has been reduced by \$1,000,000. Can anyone, including the Minister, deny that? Regardless of financial juggling, although receipts from road maintenance tax have increased tremendously (they are about \$2,000,000) I point out that every cent of this tax, and therefore every additional cent collected, must be added to road maintenance expenditure, in accordance with the Statute.

This apparent buoyancy of funds, plus the repayment of council loans of over \$1,000,000 to the Highways Department in 1965-66, together with the proclaimed staff shortages that affect the planning of complex projects, have made the department think it should push on with the new building, regardless. I remind honourable members that the building does not qualify for the Commonwealth Government matching grants. Of course, I am aware that it is quite easy to make short-falls on the building to make sure that the income comes up to the matching grants offered by the Commonwealth Government. I have always advocated the building up of the essential technical staff and I have received full Cabinet support and approval for this. Honourable members must be somewhat concerned that with an approximate increase of 5 per cent per annum in funds available the actual cost of administration of the Highways Department, which is defrayed from revenue from motor vehicle sources, increased by about 33 per cent in 1965-66. The figures for the year just concluded are not yet available. In the 1962 report of the Public Works Committee, both Mr. Jackman, the then Commissioner, and Mr. Yeates, the present Commissioner, emphasized that the building was based on the period 1961-71 and that the staff, of necessity, would probably increase from 262 in 1961 to 487 in 1971.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: The department is up to that now!

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: It envisaged that there would be 500 in the head office in 1971. This does not appear unreasonable, but on Tuesday the Minister said that 430 people were now working in the building. I believe that figure included some attached to the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study. The argument in favour of the original building was based on a staff of over 500 in

1971. There are now over 400, but they are housed in a first-class building on a very generous square-footage basis. Let us consider a possible figure of even 550 in 1972, and possibly 650 by 1975. Yet, in a time of record financial stringency—of depleting the available Loan funds to balance Revenue expenditure: excesses by millions, not thousands, of dollars—the Government proposes to duplicate the present building some years before it is really needed.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: I challenge the honourable member to come out with me, inspect the building and see the conditions under which some of the employees are working.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I am probably more familiar with the building than is the Minister. The point I am making is that there has been no reference to or inquiry by the Public Works Committee, and I ask "Why?" Is there any consistency anywhere, or any sound basis on which these financial tyros seek to prop up their own catafalque? I do not blame the department which, like other departments, wants the best, whether or not the State can afford it. The responsibility is the Government's alone. Even as I collated my notes, I read a statement by the Minister regarding the problem of Murray Bridge. He said that Cabinet considered the need was a pressing one. I shall not go into the further remarks I read in today's *Advertiser*. The Minister stated further that the Public Works Committee would consider the relevant facts and report upon whether the bridge should be constructed and where it should be. Why does it concern the Public Works Committee for highways funds, not Loan funds? Because the Government, for obvious political reasons, does not want to accept the responsibility in that district.

I consider that my remarks should contain some references to the preliminary construction of the Crafers-Verdun freeway. I use the term "preliminary," despite the fact that some months ago the Minister announced the opening of the first portion. If any part of any freeway has been opened, the public would like to know where. At present, from the traveller's point of view, all that exists is about one-half mile of restricted good surface, with bottlenecks and flagmen at either end. Off-track, there is a series of chasms and spills that make our Hills quarries pale into insignificance. Some weeks ago it was stated that, as wet weather approached, work would be diverted to the higher and drier areas, but why has

advantage not been taken of the driest season on record to push on with the lower areas at Stirling and beyond? Has the land not been acquired yet? I can only conceive that the plans are being varied from month to month, and at ever-increasing cost. I suggest that the work on the up-run at Measdays, which involves vast expenditure, is being done much sooner than is necessary. If the Minister could provide honourable members with an up-to-date plan, it might tend to allay their fears. While one likes to plan ahead, I suggest that statements about a freeway from Littlehampton or Nairne to Callington are pure window dressing. What of the city's urgent demand for approach freeways? Let us be practicable and get some priority arranged in these matters. Ring routes must come before freeways, and clearways before ring routes. What of the new bridge over the Torrens River between Walkerville and the O.G. bridge—an integral part of the north-eastern ring route? This Government not only talks of refusing any Loan moneys to the Highways Department but insists on continued repayments of old loans, but it would be better not to talk of such things as I now wish to list, because they cannot be done in reasonable time with only the anticipated revenue. Of course, the Treasurer may blame the Commonwealth Government, as usual.

To remind honourable members of some of the vast capital tasks immediately ahead, I mention nine major bridges that come to my mind. They are as follows: the Morphett Street bridge, at an estimated cost of \$3,400,000; the Keswick bridge, for which the figure is not available, but I imagine it is probably about \$1,000,000, allowing for the approaches; the Jervois bridge, at a cost of over \$1,500,000; the Port Augusta bridge, at a cost of \$1,600,000; the Kingston bridge, at a cost of \$2,400,000; the railway bridge at Pooraka; the Cavan Arms over-pass, or its alternative of a new route; the bridge over the Noarlunga river; and now, according to this morning's *Advertiser*, a new bridge across the Murray River by 1970, on which various estimates have been given, which must, of course, be very hazy and nebulous at this stage, but I shall take an average and say another \$1,000,000 by 1970.

This does not even mention the clover leaves at Crafers, Stirling, and Verdun. Consider these, when added to the increased costs of constructing deeper foundations and wider and better roads, which we know have to be built throughout the whole of the State, not in one

small portion of it. It gives one plenty of room to think and ponder where this very important department is going.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It is going along all right since you left it!

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: What has been left out? One minor matter which would go a lot better if the other Minister did not require so many funds in his department.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It goes all right.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Odd things occur to me that have been missed out. I noticed in a financial statement a month or two ago that it was impossible to make any provision for the awful piece of road between Aldgate and Strathalbyn. During the next five years funds will not be available, and that comment was made before any mention was made of Murray Bridge.

Turning now to another minor but important subject, I was delighted to hear the Hon. Mr. Geddes refer to safety precautions, with particular regard to railway crossings. I am certain it is partly due to the wrong approach that the Railways Department has no regard to these matters. The Highways Department, unfortunately, has to bear the whole of the cost of those crossings despite the fact that the Railways Commissioner some years ago offered to contribute either one-third or one-half towards the cost of improving the crossings on a planned yearly programme of 12 or 13 crossings. What the Hon. Mr. Geddes did not mention, as I understand it, is the major factor which multiplies the damage done in railway accidents at those crossings: it is the steel or iron rails and posts placed so near to the railway track that in many cases (I cannot give the exact figures, but they would be available from the accident investigation department) when a car hits a train it is parallelepiped in between the iron stanchion and the train itself instead of being thrust to one side into the water table.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: The honourable member, as Minister, was requested on a number of occasions to have this altered and the iron rails removed, but he did nothing about it.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: The Minister is incorrect in saying that, and he should apologize. I suggest that he examine a crossing in the Midland District where I took action to have it altered. However, it was not done because of the obstinacy of the Railways Commissioner. In saying that, I am not hiding behind Parliament, but the Commissioner



refused to move those posts and rails back because he contended that such action would endanger more people—those in his trains.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: But the honourable member was his boss!

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I point out that I was not his boss. The present Government altered the Commissioner of Railways Act as soon as it came to power and it made the Hon. Mr. Kneebone boss over the railways.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Why didn't your Government do something about it?

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: It is no good the Minister trying to run away from facts.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: The honourable member ran away from his obligation.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: No, and I expect the Minister to stand up to his. In addition, I am convinced that one grave mistake was made (and I am not nailing that on anybody in particular) and that is the lack of intelligence somewhere in realizing that in order to succeed in preventing people from running into a train they must be informed soon enough that the crossing is there. The Highways Department does not indicate a dangerous corner right at that corner but in a position some 200 or 300 yards before the corner, depending on the approach and the potential danger. Only recently a determined attempt was made (I take it that it was made by the two departments combined) to warn the public of the presence of a railway crossing by erecting black and white zebra boards right at the crossing. However, by the time the driver saw them—the road usually crosses at right angles on a railway crossing—he would be on the crossing itself. Take the instance of a driver at night feeling a bit sleepy.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: A driver should not drive if he is sleepy.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: We cannot all be the perfect driver as is the Chief Secretary.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I guarantee that I have never run into a train.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I suggest to members that the position be examined with the idea of impressing on the correct authority that we must—

*Members interjecting:*

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I am suggesting that advance notice be given that a railway crossing is ahead, and I leave the matter at that point. It has been neither easy nor pleasant for me to direct most of my criticism at a department which I proudly assisted to build up and which I will always justify and continue to support. However, the real tenor of my accusations is against the Treasurer, who has subrogated his Minister to pursue his own petty strategies whilst slowing down progressive works of inestimable value to the State. We have not a tiger in the tank; it is so full of holes it would not hold one. We have a succubus in the Treasury drawing out the very life blood of our one-time progressive State. To paraphrase someone else's remarks, we have a lot of gas underground in this State; we have this Government above it. I cannot help thinking that if the positions were reversed we should all be a lot better off. I support the motion.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER (Central No. 2): I rise to support the motion. All honourable members were appreciative of the dignified opening of Parliament by His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, but all were deeply regretful for the reason—the illness of His Excellency the Governor—and we all earnestly pray for his complete restoration to health. Neither His Excellency nor Lady Bastyan spare themselves in the performance of their duties. The South Australian people are mindful of that, but it is with pride that we hear, not only from Canberra but also from Sydney, that His Excellency and Lady Bastyan won all hearts during His Excellency's term as Administrator of the Commonwealth.

I join other honourable members in expressions of sympathy for the relatives of so many men associated with this Parliament who have died during the past year. I mention in particular our grief in the loss of the Hon. Dudley Octoman whose calm wisdom, upright character, and friendly personality, gave us all inspiration. There have been so many changes in the membership of this honourable Council that I find it hard to believe that in my period of service there have been three Presidents, all delightful men with what I suppose must be a prerequisite of the office—a well-developed sense of humour. We saw the Hon. L. H. Densley's departure from the Chair with great regret and we miss his presence in this Chamber, both as member and as President.

We are fortunate, however, in having the Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin to take over this high and difficult office and we wish him many years of happy responsibility in that.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The honourable member never needs any latitude.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: We are fortunate, too, in having the Hon. V. G. Springett to fill the vacancy left by the Hon. L. H. Densley's resignation. His delightfully worded, but cunningly devised, maiden speech, brought joy to both sides of the Chamber.

The Speech of the Governor's Deputy, to which I now turn, I found to be a most ingenious document. It rivals Roget's *Thesaurus* in all the combinations and permutations of words meaning "to plan". We have a series of items, connected with the development of this State, which are to be considered or to be continued to be considered, to be proceeded with, to be commenced, and so on, and one cannot help comparing them with items similarly referred to from time to time where it is known that practically nothing has been done, or will be done.

These phrases are apparently used to mean that the matters are to be thought about, publicized and, in other ways, treated in a manner that will not require the expenditure of real money. Here are some of the items in the Speech which on the above comment are going to be more notable for talk than for solid construction. Paragraph 8 states:

Amendments to the Crown Lands Act designed to cover the changing needs of settlers and landholders, mostly rural producers, continue to be considered.

Later on it says:

Progress continues in the preparation of plans for the opening to settlement of the very considerable area of scrub land extending from the Victorian border . . . and it is to be hoped that the first blocks will be open for application at the end of the present year. . . .

That is a real message of hope.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You are wrong there; that one is showing results.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: I am talking about the phraseology of the Speech. It is a real message of hope. The same paragraph goes on to say:

It is intended to prepare plans for the management of each national park.

I am dealing only with the things I consider developmental; there are others, of course. The next one is paragraph 15, which states:

During the next financial year work will proceed on the Royal Adelaide Hospital—

That is good—

and preparatory work for the southern district and Modbury hospitals.

The same paragraph says:

Provision for new schools and additions to existing schools will be made and work will commence on the planning of a new Government Printing Office.

Paragraph 16 says:

General improvements in the State road system have included progress towards the preparation of a comprehensive plan . . .

Members will see that Roget's *Thesaurus* has been extremely helpful in the preparation of the Speech. This planning, of course, is not anything new: since the present Government has been in power we have had a series of things either commenced by the Playford Government or promised by this Government in its election policy which have been slowed down, which have been stopped, or which have never been commenced. For example, the people at Keith, as the Hon. Mr. Kemp so clearly told this Council yesterday, are extremely upset because their water supply project seems to have ground to a halt. From being likely to be available in the sweet bye-and-bye it is now fast becoming a project in the land of the never-never.

This Government, with its public avowals of interest in matters of education, has nevertheless reduced the original plan for the rate of construction of the Flinders University to the point where it is years behind what was anticipated. This was, after all, a State project, with Commonwealth assistance. The Commonwealth assistance has been greater than was expected when this university was first planned, but I cannot say the same for the State's contribution.

Now what about the things promised but never even started? The Hon. Mr. Springett spoke forthrightly of the need to get started immediately on the Southern Districts Hospital, which will be essential as a teaching hospital if the medical school is ever established at Flinders University. But honourable members will also recall how badly the people at Modbury and the surrounding districts needed a hospital and the urgency in particular for a maternity section there and then in March, 1965. Well, Mr. President, the babies got themselves born somehow and are now looking for kindergartens, but they are not having much luck in that field either, subsidies for the Kindergarten Union remaining depressingly low, despite the enormous growth in our pre-school population. However, who knows—they may yet manage to

get tertiary education when a third university is planned or considered or hoped to be considered in that area! Why have these projects all lapsed or never been started? Where has all the money gone? Perhaps the reason is that the same type of money was used by the Playford Government for State promotion and public welfare, whereas it is now being used, by the present Government, for self-promotion and public relations.

The next item I have to deal with is a most unpleasant matter and comes under paragraph 14. I commend the Government for what it has done in the various ancillary services for the mentally ill. This is stated very clearly in that paragraph, and I do commend the Minister and his department for what has been done. However, the matter I am going to deal with applies to a scandalous situation which has arisen in South Australia in connection with the treatment of people who are the State's responsibility under the Mental Health Act. Honourable members may possibly not be aware that it has become the practice for the Director of Mental Health to farm out patients under the Department of Mental Health to what are called rehabilitation or psychiatric hostels. These patients are those who have reached a state in their treatment which enables them to leave the main institutions but who still require custody, care and attention.

Over the past few months I have received, from medical practitioners and other people intimately associated with the health and hygiene of the community, a series of complaints. I am informed (and I have taken pains to check the facts presented to me) that the following is the general situation: that there are around the metropolitan area something of the order of 30 of these hostels; that they are usually in private homes which are being run on the lines of something between a boarding-house and a rest home, mostly by women who are not required to have any noteworthy qualifications; and that apparently the circumstances of existence in these homes are, in many cases, appalling. They are in many cases over-crowded. There is supposed to be a limit of 22 patients in any one hostel, but this rule is not always adhered to. For example, there is one such hostel, housing 49 patients, which was previously run as a private hospital with 19 beds but which was de-licensed because of non-co-operation and refusal to carry out the requirements of the law, now being run—I repeat—as a hostel for 49 patients.

I am further informed that these hostels are consistently understaffed and commonly have only one or two people to look after many patients. Again, I can give an example of such a hostel which had 22 patients and in which there was one person to do the cooking and one person to care for those patients, and that latter person was a 17-year-old, pregnant, untrained girl. The general complaint I have received is that in these hostels, where many inmates cannot look after themselves, there is gross over-crowding, the hygiene is indescribable, the food is almost invariably limited and poor and not in conformity with any nutritive standards, the bedding is inadequate, indeed sparse, and warmth is entirely lacking, as heating is not normally provided. The staffing of these hostels is so inadequate, I am told, that frequently there is no working staff on duty overnight, so the patients are locked in their rooms. This in itself would be terrifying to the patients, apart from the insanitary and over-crowded conditions.

I have also had it reported to me that toilet and washing facilities in these hostels do not have to satisfy any of today's standards and that there is, in most of these places, no special fire-prevention provisions and certainly nothing in the nature of any fire drill practised. This latter fact, in combination with the practice of locking up at night, and coupled with a minimum of staff, must be a matter of concern to us all, and particularly to the Government, which may well find a shocking tragedy on its hands at any time.

I hope I have not given the impression that there may be a number of charitable people running these hostels for the advantage of the mentally ill. I am informed that, on the contrary, this is a popular type of activity as a money-making concern. There is, in fact, evidence of one woman running four of these hostels, and of another who, the mother of a large family and in employment elsewhere as a part-time nurse, is also running one of these establishments.

I am well aware that honourable members will find these things hard to believe, as I did, but I can assure them that, although I have no right to enter these places, I have checked the matter fully with people closely associated with boards of health and I am giving this information in the confidence that it is perfectly true. Honourable members may rightly ask how this situation can arise. As far as I can interpret it, it arises for the reason that the Directorate of Mental Health has been separated to such an extent by the

Mental Health Act Amendment Act of 1966 from the general supervision of the Health Department that there are now bad loopholes in the statutory arrangements for the—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Don't take that too far, because you are completely off beam.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: I can assure the Chief Secretary that I have looked it up and I am telling honourable members what has been reported to me—in the statutory arrangements for the supervision of the health of the people of South Australia. I understand that, whereas provision was made under the Health Act for the supervision of private hospitals and rest homes by the boards of health, under the new arrangements the boards of health have no rights to inspect or interfere in these hostels, which have become established under the patronage of the Department of Mental Health.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Are they licensed?

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: They are not; there is no statutory power to license them. The private hospitals are licensed, and the rest homes are licensed, because they come under the Public Health Act. However, these other places come under the Department of Mental Health, which has no power to license. The Director of Mental Health, I feel sure, cannot be aware of the basic circumstances existing in these hostels.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I can assure the honourable member that she is wrong.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: The people I have spoken to have said that these things take place. I understand that the reason why the boards of health and the Health Department cannot act in the matter is that there is a certain resistance by the Department of Mental Health to any intrusion into the spheres of its activities.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We have inspectors to look into these matters.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: The inspectors of the various boards of health know these conditions and are horrified by them but are powerless to act. I bring the whole matter before honourable members because it is perfectly clear that, when we amended the Mental Health Act, we introduced a set of conditions which are without the rights of inspection and control necessary for the well-being of mental health cases in South Australia.

As a result, a set of circumstances has been produced wherein patients can be kept in conditions of near-torture and degradation that should never have eventuated. The situation is so bad that it calls for a full-scale

Government inquiry. Knowing the Chief Secretary, as all honourable members in this Council do, to be a man of great humanity and sympathy for all who suffer hardship in any field, I am confident in asking him to start such an inquiry—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We do not need to; we are trying to find a solution to it.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: So you admit it! I cannot believe the Chief Secretary would allow these conditions to continue, so I feel confident in asking honourable members to support him if he finds that a **Royal Commission** into this matter of mental health is the solution. I support the motion.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Midland): I rise to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. In doing so, I first extend my congratulations to you, Mr. President, on your appointment as the President of this Council and say that you are fulfilling that office in accordance with the high expectations we had of you at the time of your appointment. I also associate myself with the expressions about the Hon. Mr. Densley, your predecessor, Sir, in this office. We all liked him and sincerely hope he enjoys good health in his retirement. I congratulate the Hon. Mr. Springett on his election to this Council. Already he has demonstrated his ability and his interest in political topics. I look forward to a long association with him in this Chamber. I also associate myself with the expressions of regret at the continued illness of His Excellency the Governor. I fervently hope he will be fully restored soon so that he can undertake his duties again.

I want to deal with four or five different subjects this afternoon: first, with the present situation of the primary producer. Secondly, I want to say something about industrial development in this State; thirdly, I shall make one or two comments about town planning and certain matters that have occurred with regard to that Act. I should like also to say something about the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association conference that I attended in Ottawa last year and, if time permits, about the proposed Government Insurance Office. Finally, I may have one or two comments to make about the Electoral Act.

First, let me deal with the position of the primary producer. Everybody knows that at this moment he is suffering considerable anxiety because of the doubtful nature of the season, but I do not wish to speak at length on that aspect of the matter, because the primary producer is a person who has learnt to live with

this kind of problem. Rather, I want to look at his situation from the point of view of his position in the community and his ability to withstand the economic pressures brought to bear upon him as a result of the increasing cost structure of this State. I have taken out some figures that show that his returns from wheat have remained almost stable for the last 10 years. In the 1960 season the net return to the grower for bulk wheat at shipping ports was 134.467c a bushel; in 1961 it was 143.395c; in 1962 it was 144.397c; in 1963 it was 139.438c; in 1964 it was 137.255c; and in 1965 it was 134.928c. So the farmer finds himself in the position that over the whole of that period the net returns from his sales of wheat through the Australian Wheat Board have, for all practical purposes, remained stable.

The same position obtains with his sales of barley. The net returns to the grower from the various barley pools over the last few years (and these figures refer to pools that have been licensed) are as follows: in 1961 it was 9s.3.917d.; in 1962 it was 11s.3.723d.; in 1963 it was 11s.3.702d.; in 1964 it was 11s.2.624d.; and in 1965 it was 11s.7.488d. So, over all those years, farmers received nothing more for their wheat and barley crops, and it must be remembered that the income of wheat and barley farmers constitutes a large proportion of the income of all primary producers in this State. It is interesting, although it does not relate to my present argument, to note that 33 per cent of the wheat exported from Australia in 1965-66 was sold to the People's Republic of China, which was our best customer for wheat in that year. China has come into the market only in the last few years.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I hope we have some grain to sell to China this season.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I sincerely hope so, too. The United Kingdom and Eire took 14.5 per cent, and the Middle East took 10 per cent; this shows that over the last few years the markets for our export wheat have completely changed. Whilst our markets at present seem quite good, they must be developed further if we are to maintain the present standard of living of our farmers.

These facts show that the farmer has had a stable income but also that it has not increased to an extent comparable with the increase in his costs, which has been remarkable. Water rates, land tax, district council rates, the cost of plant and machinery and the new items of plant now required which were not needed some years ago, particularly bulk

handling plant—these have all increased tremendously and the farmer has therefore had to try to balance his budget in a situation of stable income and ever-increasing costs.

Consequently, his net income has become lower and lower over the years, and the tragedy now is that very few farmers can establish their sons on properties to succeed them. This nearly always means that, if there are three sons in a family, the best that can happen is that two sons can be established on farms and the other son must leave the land and seek employment elsewhere. This is not conducive to the development of this State's natural resources. I frequently find this problem as I meet people, both professionally and personally, whose sons are being married and are wishing to set up a home. The problem that arises is this: how can sufficient income be provided from the land owned by the family?

Associated with this problem is that of the financial arrangements that must be made if additional land is to be purchased. Because of the scarcity of good land in South Australia, notwithstanding the decrease that has occurred in the net income of farmers, in almost every part of the State the capital cost of farming land has increased considerably. Indeed, the increase over the last 10 years has been at least 30 or 40 per cent and this has made it almost impossible for farmers to purchase additional land.

The big difficulty that must be faced is the tremendous burden imposed on primary producers by succession duties. Some people think that, because a farmer has a property worth \$60,000 or \$100,000, he is wealthy, but nothing is further from the truth. The farmer requires capital investment of that magnitude to enable him to carry on his activities and, in addition, he requires plant, machinery and stock, and this is all valued for probate.

I can say from my own experience that this is a burden that we should not ask our primary producers to carry, because it has two adverse effects. First, it prevents lads who have been brought up and trained on the land and who would make excellent primary producers from following a farming occupation. We must remember that it takes almost a lifetime to learn the skills involved. Secondly, preserving the land and getting the best out of it can be learned not from a textbook but only by experience.

Today, because many lads brought up on farms must take up other occupations, the State is losing a valuable asset, and the most

important cause is the burden of succession duties. I become appalled when I hear people saying glibly that an increase in succession duties will have no serious results. Succession duties already represent the biggest obstacle to keeping people on the land, and I for one favour reducing them considerably.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: This must be done, or agriculture is doomed.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: When the Playford Government was in office it provided a concession of up to 30 per cent in the amount of duty payable in respect of farming land. It was proposed that this concession be taken away under the Succession Duties Act Amendment Bill introduced by the Walsh Government.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Other exemptions were to be granted by that Bill.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Yes, but not to an extent approaching the situation that existed under the old Act.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: As far as the primary producer was concerned.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: The Bill did not fit in with the promise made in the Labor Party's policy speech, which was that primary producers would be exempt from all succession duty in respect of a living area.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: What about the concessions that your Party refused the other 70 per cent?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I do not favour making promises and not carrying them out, and the people of South Australia do not favour this either—this is the cause of the honourable member's anxiety now. Of course, this is the last session of this Parliament and, as we proceed through it, it will become increasingly obvious that an election is approaching. I would have no personal objection if an election were held next week. The truth is that under the pressure and anxiety of the coming election tempers will become frayed and members will become nervous.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You had us nervous when you said that we would be out in 30 days!

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I am becoming increasingly conscious of this nervousness in members opposite. Some people think that the primary producer lives pretty well and that he has fairly extensive assets, but the position is not nearly as rosy as the average person believes. It is tremendously important for the economic development of this State that every potentially useful acre of land be used

and that as many farmers as possible be kept on the land, because it is the basis of our export income.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Does the honourable member agree that land not in production should be brought into production?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Yes, and if the Government proposes to enable this to be done I shall heartily support it. One suggestion I can make is this: there are areas of Crown lands in this State which are out of production and which are held on a Crown lease basis, and many farmers have the know-how, plant and capital to develop them. However, the present policy is that these lands should not be freeholded. If a return were made to the previous policy of freeholding this land, we would see an immediate extension of the area of land in production. I would agree with the Government if it said, "We will freehold this land on the condition that it is developed and used." I am not in favour of people holding land and keeping it out of production, but I do not think anybody should be prevented from owning land as long as it is used to its maximum benefit. If the Minister wants to help in this matter, all he needs to do is revoke the provision relating to the non-freeholding of land. If he does, he will be making a worthwhile contribution towards the development of the State.

I wish to deal now with industrial development in the State, which is the most urgent problem on our plate at present. That fact is recognized in statements that have been made by the Premier and correspondence that has appeared in the press, and it is certainly recognized by people in industry. There is much nervousness and anxiety; I think the Government admits this. A Director of Industrial Development has been appointed, and I congratulate the Government on the appointment. It is always a pleasure to me that, when a Government that has socialistic principles finds itself in trouble, it runs to private enterprise to get someone to help it overcome its difficulties.

The Government has said that members of the Opposition are knocking the State as a result of their criticism of it, but whether or not that is true is not for me to say now. I believe the statement that has knocked the State more severely than any other in recent days was the one made by the Premier after he assumed office. He announced on the radio, in the press and in an appearance on television that the trouble with the State was that it

possessed a milk bar economy. A statement like that cannot do anything but harm the reputation of the State. It was a foolish thing to say, and it has done more harm to South Australia than has any other statement from any other source. The remarkable thing to me is that the Premier has not seen fit, in one of the numerous opportunities he has had, to correct or withdraw the statement. I do not think the time is too late for him to do that, as I think it would help the State out of its difficulties. The principal Government spokesman in the State spreading abroad as widely as possible that the State has a milk bar economy has done a great disservice to the whole of industry and to the people he ought to serve. I regret the statement that was made and the damage it has done. I regret it, because it was not true. General Motors-Holden's, the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited's extension at Whyalla, Chrysler's extension at Tonsley Park, and the Philips organization, which moved to this State from New South Wales are industries that were brought to this State by the Playford Government. Could they be called milk bar industries? Not in my book.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: You could hardly call it constructive criticism.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: It is not constructive; it is damaging. Other States of the Commonwealth have similar economies. New South Wales depends largely on its motor-body building and domestic appliance industries, but it is not in the mess that this State is in with regard to economic development. I have had figures given to me (and I am indebted to the person who gave them) that show that during the March quarter New South Wales had an increase in gross national product of 14 per cent, whereas South Australia had an increase of only 3 per cent, so I cannot say too strongly that I disagree with the Premier's statement. Members of the Government criticize members of the Opposition, but they should first put their own house in order and stop making ridiculous statements that do severe harm. It is bad enough for us to paddle our own canoe and try to develop the State without having that kind of derogatory remark made.

With all the good will in the world South Australia has a difficult road to tread as regards future industrial development, as it has less natural advantages than other States have. For instance, in New South Wales for the last 10 years from 1956 to 1965, the average production of wheat was 78,401,000 bushels. In 1964-65, the production was 151,483,000

bushels, almost twice the average for the previous 10 years. The average acreage sown for the last 10 seasons was 3,837,188, whereas in 1964-65 it was 5,760,000—an increase of 1,923,000 acres. If a State has potential to bring almost 2,000,000 more acres under wheat, one can see what that must do to its industrial development of the State and realize how much additional money has been poured into it. This State has not as great a potential; it has a certain potential as regards extending wheat-farming areas, but it is nowhere near as great as that of New South Wales. In Queensland, there are large areas of good land in excellent rainfall areas. These are coming into production, and I regard Queensland as having one of the best potentials of any State in the Commonwealth.

Western Australia has the Hamersley iron ore and the Ord River developments: I had an opportunity to inspect the latter when I attended the recent Commonwealth Parliamentary Association conference. It also has the developments by the Chase syndicates and others in the southern portion of the State. In Western Australia, one gets the impression that the State is vibrant, and pulsating with an expanding economy. Victoria, which is a compact State with good rainfall areas, is the commercial heart of the Commonwealth of Australia. It gets great benefit, as does New South Wales, from the Snowy Mountains scheme. South Australia is the Cinderella State when it comes to industrial development, and it seems, therefore, that the State will progress in the future only as it has done in the past: that is, by hard work and increased effort, and by making every post a winning post. I believe that that can be achieved only by watching two things very carefully.

First, the State must continue to pursue the development of whatever natural resources it has. I was delighted to hear the Premier's recent announcement that a copper discovery had been made near Woomera. I hope that the discovery will turn out to be the success the Premier hopes it will be, because if there is one thing that could help South Australia now it is a really worthwhile and valuable mineral discovery. I hope the copper discovery turns out to be the success we all hope for. I would like to see increasing sums of money spent by the Mines Department in exploratory work. I know tests have to be made to see whether a lead is worth chasing, and money is sometimes spent when the result is nil. If one looks at the history of South Australia and considers what the discovery of copper

at Kapunda and in the Kadina, Wallaroo and Moonta areas did for those places, what the discovery of brown coal did in the Leigh Creek area, and the contributions those findings made to the economy of the State, one can appreciate the tremendous value of such discoveries. I hope that we will keep our expenditure in exploratory work for mineral resources at the highest possible level.

It is important that we keep costs down to an absolute minimum, but I regret I cannot see much evidence of this being done by the present Government. I believe figures have been quoted in this Chamber (I have not checked them but I believe them to be correct) that have shown that the cost of running Ministerial offices has increased by 182 per cent since this Government assumed office. I do not think that is a good example to set, and I strongly and definitely say that I thought the announcement granting an additional week's annual leave to Government employees was not justified at this time. I am not averse to granting employees the best possible conditions that the economic situation can stand but, considering the nature of the work done by most people today, I think that three weeks is adequate time to enable people to recover from the strain of a year's work. I do not think that Ministers of the present Government, who are all hard-working men (I make no criticism regarding their application to their duties, because each has a full-time and hard job to do), take four weeks' leave each. I think we would be better advised to keep annual leave down to three weeks and thereby help to keep costs within reasonable limits.

Regarding costs, I was interested, when the granting of four weeks' annual leave was announced, to hear somebody ask the Chief Secretary what the cost would be. If I remember correctly, his reply was that he doubted whether there would be any increase in cost and that he had his own views on the matter. However, on the same day the cost increase was given by the Premier in another place as \$X a year—I forget the amount stated. It seems to me that the decision to grant four weeks' annual leave was made by the Government without its giving the matter great thought: that it was merely given from the point of view of political expediency. The Government's general contention is that the increase in costs has been marginal and that such increase does not affect the overall economic bargaining position of South Australia, but that is not so. Those of us associated

with industrial activities know that the constant anxiety is to examine costs. The other day I was talking to an industrialist who said that he had a considerable export market in other States but, because of the increase in costs that has occurred in this State, he was finding that, as contracts became due for renewal, he was losing them to contractors in other States.

I do not think this Government is doing the right thing by the people of this State while it continues to be so careless in relation to costs. I think this factor should be examined at the top bracket first and, if controlled there, it will be controlled right through industry. The Government is not setting a good example in this matter.

I turn now to town planning. A new Bill was passed last year that was described as a model Act, and I have no doubt that it was. However, when discussing the Bill I asked by interjection whence the money was to come to enable its provisions to be implemented, and I was told that the Government had certain ideas about that. I waited to hear what those ideas were, but the only detailed explanation I could get was the Premier's statement in a telecast about a fortnight ago that the responsibility for finding the money for inner suburban development (that was the only area of town planning he mentioned) should be the Commonwealth Government's. That is playing again a record which has been heard so often and which is getting rather worn. As far as I can see, the Government has no proposals for implementing the provisions of the Planning and Development Act. We cannot say that the passing of the Act amounts to any more than window dressing. The emphasis at present seems to be on inner suburban development, and proposals are apparently being considered to enable something to be done about it. However, in my opinion this will be achieved in a natural way and without the huge expenditure of public moneys that is sometimes contemplated. If a survey is made around the outskirts of the city, it will be seen that considerable redevelopment is going on. For instance, on South Terrace standard buildings have been demolished and new buildings, such as the Master Builders Association building, Grain House, which is owned by South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd., and some multi-storey flats, have been erected. I believe that the Government Motor Garage was also erected in an area where old buildings were demolished.



The Norwood area has an excellent example: Channel 10 bought several old derelict houses and erected new premises in a small, park-like setting. Previously that area contained some of the most derelict houses that I have seen but it is now an attractive area. In other parts of the city old slum-type dwellings have been demolished and multi-storey flats erected. I think we should look carefully before committing a large sum of Government money towards inner suburban development when in many instances private enterprise is attending to the matter fairly effectively.

There has been some controversy in the last day or two about the appointment of the Chairman of the Planning Appeal Board. I do not want to enter into that controversy, but I think one angle should be ventilated in the interests of the effective working of this legislation. I am not satisfied that the prime requirement of a chairman of the appeal board is that he should be a good town planner or that he should have good town planning qualifications. I think the first and foremost requirement is that he should be completely impartial and come to the position in the manner of a judge coming to his seat on the bench. That is the most important aspect of this appointment, in my opinion. For that reason, I was extremely surprised and disappointed to read the advertisement that appeared on page 28 of the *Advertiser* of July 5. I believe this advertisement was referred to in this Chamber, but I again refer to it. It reads:

Major builder and developer is looking for land:

1. Broad acres suitable for subdivision in parcels from 5-100 acres.
2. Subdivided land also of interest in parcels from 10-100 acre lots.

Address inquiries in writing to "Land", c/o Roder, Dunstan, Lee & Taylor, 13 Grenfell Street, Adelaide.

I believe that the Mr. Roder referred to in that advertisement is the gentleman who is Chairman of the Town Planning Appeal Board.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: That is right, and he is a partner in the firm.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Yes. I think this matter needs careful consideration. A gentleman who is Chairman of the Planning Appeal Board has advertised on behalf of a client for land for the purpose of development. He may interview the man who has the land available and introduce him to the developer and, having a careful and detailed knowledge of all these discussions, he at a later date may find himself chairman of the appeal board that

has to adjudicate whether this development can go on or not. I do not agree with the suggestion that a man can be a solicitor acting in a matter and advising people on one day what they should do and on the next day sitting on the bench adjudicating as to whether or not something should be approved. I think it is tremendously important that the Chairman of the appeal board is absolutely impartial and free from any possible taint and any possible criticism. When he advertises in the press for people to bring land to him to refer to his client and associates himself with this type of thing only to find himself later on Chairman of the board, the matter wants careful consideration.

I think the Chairman of the board must make up his mind what he wants to do. If he wants to carry on doing this kind of work, that is well and good, but if he wants to be the Chairman of the board he has to say, "I cannot handle this kind of matter." I do not take it any further than that. I am not making any accusation of any bad faith at all. I merely say that this kind of criticism is being brought forward to me.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: You are suggesting he should resign as a member of his legal firm?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: What I am suggesting is that he wants to make sure he does not put himself in a position where he can have foreknowledge of a matter that may come before him in his judicial capacity as Chairman of the board. I am not making any criticism with regard to his qualifications, and I am not making any criticism with regard to the appointment. However, I am making a criticism with regard to his being associated with introducing people to a developer to develop land for them, when a few weeks later he may find himself sitting as the Chairman of a tribunal to decide whether or not approval should be given to that developer.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Couldn't the same apply to a land agent who could have been appointed to the authority? They do all this sort of business, as the honourable member is aware.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Possibly that could be true. All I want to say is that I know of a solicitor who was appointed as Chairman of the Land Agents Board, and that solicitor, since he has held that office, has refused to have anything to do with any land transaction which may be subject to a query in his capacity as Chairman of the board. I do not

think one can run with the hare and hunt with the hounds. I think this is a decision which must be made by the parties concerned. In many respects the Chairman of the appeal board will exercise jurisdiction, will deal with amounts of money, and will affect people's private lives to a far greater extent than do many of the judges of our Supreme Court. Just as I believe in the absolute independence and integrity of our judiciary, which we have enjoyed in this State ever since its history began and which I know we will continue to enjoy because of the calibre of the present judiciary, so I want to see this appeal board get off on the same basis so that there cannot be any suggestion of any departing from complete independence. I leave the matter at that. I suggest that this kind of thing is something which needs very careful consideration.

The position of a member of the Opposition in this Council is a difficult one. I have always interpreted it as being a position in which we must not "knock" everything that comes forward: it does not mean that we must say "No" to everything to which the Government says "Yes". Also, it does not mean that we must be people who are chasing all kinds of wisps purely for the sake of political advantage. However, I do feel that there is an obligation on us, when we think there is a possibility of a miscarriage of justice, to ventilate the matter in a dignified and proper manner. I consider that in this present situation there is a possibility of such a miscarriage of justice, and that is the reason I raise the matter for the consideration of those whose responsibility it is to consider it.

I think I made it clear (and I think the Minister appreciates this) that I am not suggesting that anything improper has been done. However, the situation is one that needs to be watched carefully. This is not only in my own interests: this is a matter that has been raised with me by people in the street. Therefore, there is some cause for anxiety. I sincerely hope that the turn of events from now on will be such that it will not be necessary for me to refer to the matter in the future, but if it is necessary I shall certainly do so.

I had the privilege of attending a Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference in Ottawa last year, and I have expressed previously my indebtedness to the members of this Council and to the Government for making it possible for me to do so. I want to say that I found the experience very interesting and very educational indeed. I am taking this opportunity to make one or two comments,

because I think this Parliament might very well adopt the procedure followed by the Commonwealth Parliament, whereby when a member returns from a conference of this kind a motion is moved in the House which gives the delegate to the conference the opportunity of speaking to the motion and of recording in *Hansard* something of his impressions of the conference.

Whilst I have taken the trouble of preparing a detailed report on my visit overseas, and whilst that has been circulated to all members, I think it would be beneficial if my impressions were recorded for all time in *Hansard*. I say this not because it happens to be my report but because I consider it a matter of policy. I have only one or two things to say this afternoon. The first is that I believe the strength of the C.P.A. is greater today than it has been for many years past. I illustrate that by referring to a conversation I had with the delegates from India, to whom I addressed the question: "What is your view as far as the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association is concerned?" One of those delegates said to me, "Mr. Rowe, my view is this: I was put in prison on six separate occasions by the British people when we were having our argument with them as to whether we should remain as we were under British control or whether we should have a measure of independence, but I have forgotten that; I have been taught not to bear a grudge, and my present view is that I will remain a member of the British Commonwealth as long as I feel we are needed."

Time does not permit me to go into the attitude of the African delegates regarding the very delicate situation that exists in Rhodesia at this time. However, I can say that while there were some strong speeches made and while there was some severe criticism of the British Government regarding its attitude to Rhodesia, I believe that at the moment the British Government (although it is not of my brand politically) is doing all it possibly can to handle the situation and is trying to keep at bay the various pressures that are arising. I believe the British Government is handling the matter as well as it can be handled. While there was severe criticism from the African delegates, at no point of time did I hear any delegate say that he thought he was justified in resigning from the Commonwealth because of the situation in Rhodesia.

A new procedure was adopted at this conference, where some of the subjects were taken in committee. In committee one has the right

to interject, as one has in the sittings of this Parliament. The subjects were divided up, and as two committees were sitting contemporaneously one could go to the committee in which one had the most interest. I found that particularly instructive. I was not as interested in some subjects as I was in others. I was particularly interested in the questions of Parliamentary Government and the role of an Upper House in our modern democracies, so I went to the committee that was dealing with those questions. I found the interjections very worth while and very interesting.

Another thing that happened was that for the first time, I think, the Canadian Parliament produced a daily *Hansard* report of the proceedings of the conference. We know the value of a *Hansard* report to us in our deliberations in this Chamber but, when there are people from many different countries, many of whom are not speaking their own mother tongue, and not every speaker is clear when he is on his feet, the advantage of a verbatim report of the proceedings of a conference that a delegate can take home and study for himself afterwards is great. I must confess that when some delegates—maybe from India, Africa, or some other parts of the Commonwealth—were speaking not in their mother tongue, if amongst 150 delegates I happened to be at the other end of the hall it was difficult to understand precisely what was being said. It was a worthwhile innovation to have that *Hansard* report.

Also, the Prime Ministers of the British Commonwealth countries have established a Commonwealth Secretariat. The future working of this Secretariat and the sphere in which it operates we must watch carefully, unless we want to find ourselves in the position that it takes over from the sphere that ought to belong to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. Mr. Arnold Smith is the secretary of the organization. I think he understands perfectly well the operation of Parkinson's law. We must take care that we are not usurped. Most honourable members of this Council have not had the privilege so far of attending such a conference; other honourable members will have that privilege in the future. Whilst we do not reach any conclusions or pass any resolutions, I regard it as being one of the best educational opportunities of my life to meet those people and talk with them on their own ground to get something of their background. It has considerably broadened my knowledge. The truth is that the world is becoming smaller and people who were once remote from us economically, politically, socially and in every

other way are almost becoming our neighbours today. So money spent in this way is well worth while. I still believe firmly that the British Commonwealth of Nations is today the greatest factor for world peace and world development. If it is lost to us, something will have gone out of our lives that future generations will miss very much.

In concluding on that topic, let me say that I entirely endorse the remarks made in this Chamber about Mr. Ball's attending the C.P.A. conference in Uganda. I met the delegates from Uganda. I am sure Mr. Ball will have an enjoyable and instructive time. I wish him good health while he is away.

In another place we are to have a Bill introducing a Government Insurance Office. I shall have an opportunity, if it passes through another place, of discussing that matter in greater detail when it comes here, but I was interested (and the Government may like to consider this matter) recently to read an article in the *Telegraph*, a Sydney newspaper, of Monday, July 3, 1967. The heading was: "Immediate car injury pay move", and the article began:

The New South Wales Labor Party has called for insurance companies to pay immediate compensation to motor accident victims. I do not want to read the whole article but will take extracts from it. The first is:

The Government Insurance Office handled most of the State's third party claims, and earnings from investment of these funds exceeded \$4,600,000 a year.

Another extract is as follows:

One M.L.A. said the Terrigal meeting was told the Government Insurance Office had more than \$80,000,000 reserved for unsettled or unreported claims.

So the Government Insurance Office in New South Wales is sitting on \$80,000,000 in respect of which claims for payment are being held up. I shall say no more than that, except that it indicates that, when we get a Government Insurance Office, we shall not have solved all our problems in that field.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: There is a Liberal Government in New South Wales; the Labor Party would not do that.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: The Liberal Party may have more experience in running an insurance office than the Labor Party has.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It may have more experience of that than running a country.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Another thing is this. Supposing we had established the Government Insurance Office last year and it was just starting to stand on its own feet and we

ran into a disaster like the recent Tasmanian bushfire, I take it the claims on that office would be underwritten by the Government. If we had a disaster of that magnitude, as we could well have in this State, the Government might find itself considerably farther down the drain that it is at present. So we must look at this matter and realize that insurance is like many other businesses: we do not learn how to run it overnight. People in the insurance business have hundreds of years of experience behind them. We must be careful that we select people really competent to handle insurance.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: We still do not see them going broke.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I hope they do not. Sometimes it almost happens with Governments. That is the reason for my anxiety about this matter.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We shan't go broke.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: No; you will not go broke. While we are on that topic, I was rather interested in this transfer of \$7,000,000 from one account to another, from the Loan Account to the Revenue Account. The position there is that the Government introduces a Budget and says it will spend \$X on Loan works and a certain amount of dollars will be allocated for Revenue purposes. However, when the Labor Government went ahead on this basis and its financial affairs got into a mess and it found there was not enough money in the Revenue Account, it took some money from the Loan Account and put it into the Revenue Account.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Very good tactics!

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: But they were extreme tactics. It is exactly the same as with businessmen. Let us compare the two situations. Supposing I was a company promoter or the director of a company, I decided I needed to get some more money from the public, I issued a prospectus stating that I was going on the market to get \$7,000,000 of unsecured notes at 8 per cent per annum and I proposed to use the \$7,000,000 to build new high rise flats to help the inner suburban areas; then, having got the money from the public for that purpose in accordance with the terms of my prospectus, when I got my bank statement I suddenly found I had overspent in another quarter, so I took that \$7,000,000 and used it to pay my day-to-day debts.

If I did that as the director of a private company, the Attorney-General would be justified in adding me to his list of 30 companies, making it 31, and prosecuting me for obtaining money from the public by false pretences, by telling the public that I was going to use the money for one purpose and then using it for another. That is precisely what has happened with this \$7,000,000. We have a Budget that says that the money will be used for the purpose of providing Loan funds for building bridges and engaging in other Loan projects, but we have taken that money and used it for the ordinary running of the State.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: For how many years did the Playford Government adopt that policy?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: The Playford Government did not adopt that policy at all. If this practice is to be followed it ought to be done by way of a Budget in this Parliament, so that we can discuss it and see what is really happening, and I am delighted to know that the public is aware of the method by which this Government has balanced its Budget. If a person in private industry had done this, he would have been prosecuted for improper use of funds.

I shall now deal with one or two matters relating to the Electoral Act. We have seen money spent in order to put additional names on the electoral roll for this Council. It would not have been necessary to spend this money if the Playford Government's proposal had been supported and implemented, whereby the spouses of people already on the roll would be eligible for enrolment. If this proposal had been adopted, many names not now on the roll would be on the roll. However, that is a different issue.

Cards were prepared by a computer and sent out; ticks were placed alongside people's names indicating that they were entitled to be enrolled. Such people have come to me and said, "This card has been sent to me; if I sign it, will you witness my signature?" I have said, "What is the position? Are you entitled to be enrolled?" and I have found that many are not entitled to be enrolled and I have told them not to complete the card and not to return it.

The Attorney-General is the Minister in charge of the Electoral Act, and we find ourselves confronted with the astounding statement from him that no prosecutions will be

launched against anybody who improperly completes the claim card when he is not entitled to be enrolled. What sort of administration of the law is this? If people commit a breach of the law, why should they not be prosecuted? How far can this go? The Attorney-General said that there would be no prosecutions at all for any offences under the Act. Our electoral system becomes purely a matter of favour if it is not policed: it is an astounding statement.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The Attorney-General upsets you!

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I am not on my own in that respect. I do not appreciate the Chief Secretary's interjection, because this is a serious matter. The Government is responsible for the maintenance of law and order and for seeing that justice is done and that everybody is treated fairly.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We are trying to get them all on the roll.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I do not appreciate that remark. The Attorney-General's statement was that people will not be prosecuted when, in point of fact, they should be prosecuted. If we have reached the stage where the administration of the law becomes a matter of favour instead of seeing that everybody is treated equally, then virtue has gone out of this State and we are in a very poor situation indeed.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: You are afraid you will lose seats.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I am not concerned about losing seats. If the honourable member is worried about losing seats, as he undoubtedly is, let me say this: I do not have to depend on what I get here to keep myself going. My concern here is to see that justice and fair play are extended to every member of the community.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I will remind you of that statement one day.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Give equal voting rights to all people if you want to see justice done.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I can manage a duet but not a quartet, especially if it is not in tune.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: You should call it a trio.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Yes, in view of the hippie music that they make. Our biggest responsibility as members of Parliament is to

see that the three principal ingredients that make up our democracy are maintained inviolate.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask honourable members not to indulge in audible conversation among themselves. The speaker has the right to be heard.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: The ingredients are the executive, the legislature and the judiciary. In cases where democracies have failed, either the executive has taken over the functions of Parliament and has done away with Parliament, or something more serious has happened: the executive has assumed the functions of the judiciary. If the executive, in the person of the Attorney-General, is to determine whether a person is to be prosecuted or not—whether he is guilty or not—if the Attorney-General is to be the judge, we are in a very bad way indeed. It is important that the law should be maintained by the judiciary, and if there is evidence requiring that a matter should be referred to the judiciary, it should be so referred, and the judiciary should make the decision. So, the Attorney-General's statement cuts far more deeply into the basic roots of our democracy than he and many other people appreciate.

When I leave political life, and some members have suggested that this may be sooner than I expect, I should like to feel that I have maintained to some extent these basic principles of our democracy, and that people feel that they will receive a fair trial before the law and that the principles of justice still remain. If I can leave political life with this thought, I shall feel that all my strivings have not been in vain. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. It is an accepted fact that the opening of a Parliamentary session is always conducted in a dignified manner with an air of ceremony in the best tradition, and I feel sure that it would be a matter of deep regret if we ever departed from this tradition. I compliment His Excellency the Governor's Deputy on the dignified way in which he carries out the duties of his very high office, and in particular, the opening of Parliament. Together with other members I express regret that His Excellency the Governor, Sir Edric Bastyan, through indisposition was unable to deliver what probably would have been his last speech in opening the Parliament of this State.

I also express my sympathy to the relatives of deceased members, some of whom I knew very well. Others were only names to me, but in each case the departed member made a very valuable contribution to the development and welfare of this State. All members will agree that the Hon. Mr. Springett will be a valuable acquisition to this Council because he brings with him a wide experience in a field that has not in recent years been represented here. To the Hon. Mr. Densley, the former President of this Council, I express appreciation of the conscientious manner in which he carried out his duties. To you, Sir, I tender my congratulations on your appointment to the highest office that this Council has to offer.

I also wish to have placed on record the appreciation of the District of Midland—indeed, I feel I would be echoing the sentiments of all South Australians—of the wonderful contribution made to the advancement of this State by Sir Thomas Playford. He assumed the office of Premier at a time when South Australia was a mendicant State with a small population, lacking industries, and with very little finance. Furthermore, the trust funds held by the Treasury at that time had been depleted. With his shrewd political mind, Sir Thomas Playford by prudent planning lifted South Australia to the position of one of the most prosperous States in Australia—a State that was able to stand on its own feet. In addition not only were the trust funds replaced but considerable reserves were built up. The criticism levelled at Sir Thomas Playford by the Premier almost immediately on assuming office was, I should think, unprecedented, completely unfounded and, indeed, made for the sole purpose of distracting attention from the Labor Government's inability to handle the State's finances.

The Minister of Local Government, who moved the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, not to be outdone by his Leader also jumped on the band wagon and stated that the last Government, on leaving office, had committed the present Government to an expenditure of Loan funds of over \$41,000,000. This, of course, is true. One needs only to do an elementary exercise to know that any prudent Government that practices forward planning would be committed to future expenditure. It would be interesting to examine some of the projects that would have cost this \$41,000,000, which the Government of the day had said was for a period of three years. One was the Bolivar treatment works;

admittedly, the expenditure on this project would have to extend over several years, and it would be necessary for additional expenditure to be committed over a period of one, two, three or even more years.

The Torrens Island power station is another project that would require additional expenditure. In addition, there are the Royal Adelaide Hospital extensions, school buildings, and waterworks and sewerage, including the Taillem Bend to Keith pipeline, which the present Government has brought to a standstill. These commitments were known to the Labor Government; indeed, they had all been inquired into by the Public Works Committee, of which the Minister was a member. At the last election the Leader of the Labor Party said that a Labor Government would honour the commitments of the Playford Government and, indeed, he described them as being mostly administrative decisions. It would be interesting to know just what commitments the next Government will be faced with on assuming office, particularly when one remembers the number of references made to the Public Works Committee.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You would be surprised.

The Hon. L. R. HART: If it is the intention to go on with the projects that have been referred to and recommended by the committee, then I suggest that the incoming Government, after the next elections, will be committed to something far in excess of \$41,000,000.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We will give effect to them.

The Hon. L. R. HART: That may be so, but it will be interesting to see where you will get the money. I understand the present Government has the means of manipulating finance to make up for any shortcomings, of course. Since the new Premier has taken office, many announcements have been made, but possibly none has attracted more attention than the one that the balancing of the 1966-67 Budget was a remarkable achievement. How finances were manipulated to bring about a balanced Budget has been dealt with adequately by other honourable members, and I do not intend to deal further with this matter. The remarkable thing to me is that the former Premier, the Hon. Frank Walsh, on relinquishing office made no mention of the fact that the Budget for this year was to be balanced. He

relinquished office only about a fortnight before the present Premier made the announcement regarding the balancing of the Budget. I think it would have been a fitting conclusion to the career of Mr. Walsh on leaving office to have been able to announce that he had balanced the State's Budget, but for some good reason known to him he was not prepared to make the announcement. He knew he was not honestly able to make it.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is not right. He told us before he left.

The Hon. L. R. HART: That is rather interesting—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: He knew.

The Hon. L. R. HART: —because the people of South Australia would like to have heard such an announcement from Mr. Walsh.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: He could not have made it before May 31.

The Hon. L. R. HART: The people would have been interested to hear this from Mr. Walsh, who most of them knew as "Good old Frank. He is a pretty honest old fellow".

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is right.

The Hon. L. R. HART: That is a term of endearment, and I consider that most of the people of South Australia believe that Mr. Walsh was an honest Premier. That is why he did not announce that the State had been able to balance its Budget.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It balanced the Budget last year, but it took trust funds to do it.

The Hon. L. R. HART: It is easy to balance a Budget, but the word "Budget" is used in rather loose terms by the general population.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: By some people!

The Hon. L. R. HART: When a Government announces that it has been able to balance the Budget, the people of the State assume that the economic situation in the State is satisfactory and that the Government has met all of its commitments, has carried out its functions, and has been able satisfactorily to finance all of the commitments that it promised. However, shifting finance from one set of books to another is not accepted by the public as the balancing of a Budget.

Another announcement that caused some concern in the State was the one by the Premier that legislation would be introduced to give

an extra week's annual leave to Government employees. Together with other honourable members, I do not begrudge anybody extra annual leave. This may be all very well to a person who is in a secure job, but one must realize that not only will the Government employees be given the extra leave: the extra leave must also be granted to all employees in the State. In making this announcement, the Premier has beaten the gun. He virtually placed our Industrial Commission in a rather embarrassing position, because he set the pattern on which annual leave must be adjusted. In fact, this has been exemplified by the President of the Industrial Commission, Judge Williams, who, when he brought down his judgment on the application for a nurses' award said, in regard to annual leave for nurses, that in the light of the recent announcement by the Premier the Commission would have to examine the position. That means that Judge Williams was somewhat embarrassed by the unheralded announcement of the Premier, and that whatever he had in mind regarding leave for nurses would have to be readjusted because of that statement.

The Premier said that this increased leave to Government employees would cost another \$2,250,000 a year. This is the direct cost to the Government. In addition to this, no doubt there will be indirect costs through the fact that all employees in the State will eventually get the extra leave, thereby increasing the cost involved. Many working men are not entirely happy about having an extra week's leave. This may seem rather unusual. However, let us have a look at the position of a working man who is on a fairly low salary, particularly a man who is in Government employment. I will take as an example a railway porter who works on the platform at the Adelaide railway station. I have talked to some of these people, and I know how they feel about having an extra week's leave. These people are in a fairly low salary bracket, but at various times such a person is given a temporary job as a guard for a day or two to take a train out on some particular job, and for that he is paid a guard's pay.

In addition to this, of course, these people are shift workers and they are able to obtain a little overtime. With all of these extras, they are eventually able to take home an improved pay packet. By virtue of being shift workers, they get not four weeks but five weeks' annual leave. However, as soon as they go on annual leave they are back to the

base salary that they receive as porters, and they do not then get any of these extras that come their way while they are working.

These people are expected to carry on for five weeks on their base salary, and many of them say that they are unable to do this. They say, "We have commitments that are based on the extras we get by our overtime, etc., and we are unable to live on our base salary." Consequently, we find that many of these people take another job during their annual leave period. In fact, some of them even have two jobs while they are in their regular employment. Nobody blames any person for having two jobs; I certainly do not blame anyone for that. I think that if a man has two jobs he is a person with some initiative. However, what I should like to know is where the unions stand in regard to this one-man two-jobs business.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: They don't stand at all.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Where do the unions stand, particularly at a time when many people are unemployed and looking for jobs? Do the unions consider it fair that a person should have two jobs when we have this situation? It would be interesting to know just what is the unions' attitude to this. It is not that I am suggesting that people should be prevented from having two jobs, but we do hear announcements from unions from time to time regarding responsibilities in this matter, and we hear also that because of the nature of a person's work it is necessary that he has an extra week's leave and that it is necessary that he has certain amenities. If this is all necessary when he has one job, what is the answer if he has two jobs?

The Governor's Deputy's Opening Speech this year I would describe as a document of words. It is a very voluminous document compared with that of other years. In fact, I did a little research on this and found that in 1964 the Speech contained 36 items and occupied four pages; in 1965 there were 38 items, occupying 4½ pages; and in 1966 there were 47 items occupying 4½ pages again. However, this year, although we are back to 42 items, the Speech occupies 7½ pages. This is an interesting comparison. However, when we look at the Governor's Deputy's Speech this year we find something more interesting still, particularly when we compare it with the

Speeches in the previous three years. I refer to the new-found interest of the present Government in agriculture.

When we look at the Speech in 1964 we find that half a page was allotted to agriculture. This was before the advent of the present Government. In 1965, just after the Labor Party took office, there were two lines in the Speech dealing with agriculture, and last year, again with the Labor Party Government, there were only two lines dealing directly with this subject. However, in this year we find in the document of 7½ pages that agriculture occupies 1½ pages.

Why this sudden interest by the Government in agriculture? Is it an admission that the Government has at last recognized the importance of agriculture to the welfare and development of this State, or is it that the Labor Party is worried about some of its districts in rural areas? I would think the latter is possibly a very good reason why the Labor Party is concerned with the question of agriculture at present.

The Hon. C. R. Story: I think it ran out of ideas in the other sections.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Of course, they do not add up to very much, either. We find quite a lengthy item dealing with Aborigines, and it would be interesting to get the answer to one or two matters mentioned in that connection, particularly the one dealing with the setting up of Aboriginal Councils. It would be interesting to know just how many councils have been set up. However, at the moment I am dealing with agriculture. When we come to read in the Speech the contributions towards agriculture we find that really the Government is mostly basking in the results of the above-average grain yields last year.

What agriculture needs in this State is some positive planning so that the primary producer knows where he is going. When I say "positive planning", I do not mean socialistic planning. There has been little increase in the allocations to agriculture in the State Budget since the Labor Party took office, so what is the Government doing for agriculture? What extra is being allotted to agriculture? I point out that the primary producing industries themselves are making some contribution to the budgetary position in regard to agriculture in this State. In fact, the contribution in the last 12 months amounted to \$451,300, and this came by way of wheat research and various



other levies that the primary producing industry places upon itself for use in the furtherance of agriculture in this State. In addition, the cattle and swine producers pay a levy that looks after any compensation arising from cattle and swine diseases. I ask leave to continue my remarks tomorrow.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

#### JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONSOLIDATION BILLS.

A message was received from the House of Assembly requesting the concurrence of the Legislative Council in the appointment of a Joint Committee on Consolidation Bills.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary) moved:

That the Assembly's request be agreed to and that the members of the Legislative Council to be members of the Joint Committee be the Chief Secretary, the Hon. R. O. DeGaris, and the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill, of whom two shall form the quorum of Council members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee.

Motion carried.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.13 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, July 13, at 2.15 p.m.