

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, July 30, 1952.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Dunks) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.**HOUSING AND SCHOOL AT RADIUM HILL.**

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Some difficulty is being experienced at Radium Hill, which is in my constituency, by married men employed there, who have to maintain homes elsewhere for their families. Can the Premier say what are the plans for the housing of employees there and what provision will be made for the education of the children?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—A housing programme for Radium Hill has been approved and is in operation. Speaking from memory, I believe 53 houses are included in that, exclusive of accommodation for single men for whom messing is also provided. When that programme is nearing completion consideration will be given to the provision of further accommodation there. There are only six children on the field, but it is expected that the number will speedily increase sufficiently to justify a school. I have already discussed this matter with the Minister of Education and in due course a permanent school will be established.

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT.

Mr. McLACHLAN—Yesterday a question was asked in another place as to the Government's intention to endorse servicemen's leases with the recent concession of the right of freehold after 10 years. Can the Minister of Lands give the House any information on this subject?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—The question of the freeholding of dry lands areas was under consideration for a considerable time, and the Government, in consultation with the Federal authorities, agreed that a soldier on dry lands could freehold his land after 10 years—and earlier if he had some really good reason. The position should be clear to all settlers, for the matter was publicised in the South-Eastern newspaper *Border Watch* and the Adelaide *Advertiser* earlier in the year, and later in the Returned Soldiers League magazine *Back*. The freeholding applies only to dry lands, for irrigation areas are always held under perpetual lease.

SULPHURIC ACID PLANT.

Mr. McALEES—Can the Premier say what provision will be made for the employment of the 62 men now employed at the fertilizer plant in Wallaroo when the new sulphuric acid plant operates at Port Adelaide? Will they have to be transferred to the metropolitan area against the Government's policy of decentralization? I understand that the whole of South Australia's requirements of sulphuric acid for the purpose of making fertilizer will be met by the new metropolitan plant.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The requirements of South Australian superphosphate manufacturers are largely drawn from the acid produced from zinc concentrates, and there are three plants in which zinc concentrates have been used to extract the sulphur fumes prior to the shipment of the zinc itself to Tasmania. I believe that the contract under which that arrangement was made expires in a year or two, and the industries concerned have notified that they are not prepared to make that material available any longer, and that will make it difficult to maintain the present acid plants at Birkenhead, Wallaroo, and Port Pirie, which have depended on this material in the past. I have no direct knowledge on the topic raised by the honourable member, but I will have enquiries made of the interests concerned to see whether it is possible to meet the position raised.

MUNICIPAL TRAMWAYS TRUST INQUIRY COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

Mr. FLETCHER—On the opening day of this session the final report of the committee that inquired into the finances and management of the Municipal Tramways Trust was laid on the table and ordered to be printed. Can the Treasurer say when the printed report will be available?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The report is a large one, containing a mass of material and information. The Government Printer will print it as soon as possible, but I cannot say when it will be available.

DESTRUCTION OF COUCH GRASS.

Mr. DUNNAGE—I understand that the Waite Agricultural Institute has perfected a poison that will destroy couch grass. I know it is the Institute's aim, and the aim of the Minister of Agriculture, to make two blades of grass grow where one grows now, but in this instance I, and metropolitan members as well as metropolitan councils, desire to have

something destroyed. If a poison for couch grass has been discovered it will save local bodies thousands of pounds. Has the Minister anything to report about this poison, and will it be available cheaply to local government authorities?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—I am glad the member for Unley appreciates the fact that the Department of Agriculture is one of production rather than destruction, but sometimes, in order to produce, we have to destroy noxious weeds. Consequently, we add to our work the control of noxious weeds through various means, such as the use of hormones and poisons. I will get the information required in regard to couch grass and let the hon. member have it as soon as possible.

REGISTRATION OF DOGS AT WOOMERA.

Mr. RICHES—Will the Minister of Local Government consider proclaiming the village area of Woomera a district under the Registration of Dogs Act? Woomera has become a township and is encountering the same problems as many other towns. At present owners of dogs have to register them at places over 100 miles distant. Under the Act police officers at a head police station can register dogs, and I understand that the Police Department has indicated that the Port Augusta West police station is the appropriate one at which to register dogs at Woomera. That is far too great a distance from Woomera to be of service, particularly in regard to the service of notices and the carrying out of the machinery provisions of the Act. Will the Minister have inquiries made with a view to issuing a proclamation to cover Woomera?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Yes, and I shall be glad if the honourable member will supplement his remarks by giving as much further information as he can about the matter.

CONTROL OF RACE AND FOOTBALL TRAFFIC.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Last Saturday I witnessed the large volume of traffic returning from a football match at Alberton and the races at Cheltenham. The traffic was so thick that it could move only at a snail's pace. This forced pedestrians and vehicles travelling on cross roads to be held up for some time. Will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary to have policemen placed on point duty on such occasions to enable those using cross roads to proceed in safety?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will have the matter examined.

RAILWAY CRANE FOR LOCK.

Mr. PEARSON—Some time ago I conveyed a request to the Railways Superintendent at Port Lincoln from people at Lock on Eyre Peninsula for the provision of a crane for loading and unloading heavy goods there. Lock is in a prosperous district and heavy tractors and agricultural implements are often sent there, but there are no mechanical means to unload them. Consequently, the railways staff, permanent way men, and train crews are called upon to do much heavy work which a crane would obviate. Will the Minister of Railways obtain a report from the Railways Commissioner on the provision of a crane at Lock?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I have not heard of any request for a crane at Lock or of any refusal to provide one. No request was made to me, this being a matter for decision by the Railways Commissioner. I will take it up with him and bring down a full reply as soon as possible. It is the Commissioner's policy to supply cranes where business justifies. Where business has fallen off cranes are moved to other places where it has increased.

OLARY-MACDONALD'S HILL ROAD.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Has the Minister of Local Government anything to add to the reply he gave me last week to a question concerning the improvement of the section of the Broken Hill road between Olary and MacDonald's Hill?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I took the matter up with the Highways Commissioner and have received the following report:—

The distance between Olary and MacDonald's Hill is approximately nine miles. This section consists mainly of natural rubble which has been graded and is unsuitable as a pavement under a bituminous seal. All of the rubble which has been tested up-to-date has been found to be too plastic for bituminous work and it would possibly be necessary to crush stone for the pavement. Approximately 30,000 cubic yards would be required for that purpose. On that basis, including earthworks, it is estimated that the cost of constructing this section with a pavement and bituminous seal would be £80,000 to £90,000. As an alternative, more intensive maintenance on this section in the form of grading and addition of rubble where necessary should improve the road. The district engineer will be instructed to take this action.

VEHICLE WASHING FACILITIES AT ABATTOIRS.

Mr. BROOKMAN—Will the Minister of Agriculture see if the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board will provide better washing facilities at the abattoirs to enable transport drivers to clean out their trucks? Often drivers have to transport stock suffering from foot rot, pink eye and possibly infested with lice or tick, and on occasions then bring back clean stock to a district for another client. They want some place to clean their trucks thoroughly and disinfect them so that the stock of another client will not be affected.

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—I take it that the honourable member's question refers to private vehicles engaged in the carrying of stock to and from the Abattoirs. I do not know what provision there is for the enforcement of cleanliness, but I will investigate the position and bring down a report.

NEW CLASSROOM, ETC., WOODVILLE HIGH SCHOOL.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER laid on the table the report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works on a new classroom and workshop blocks at Woodville High School.

Ordered to be printed.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for the adoption of Address in Reply.

(Continued from July 29. Page 178.)

Mr. PATTINSON (Glenelg)—I endorse the sentiments expressed by His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor concerning the profound sorrow and deep sense of personal loss experienced by all sections of the community by the untimely death of our late beloved Sovereign King George VI. of happy memory. Public opinion is fickle and public memory is short, but there is no doubt that our late King will go down in history, not only as a very great King, but also as a very gallant gentleman. His Majesty endured all the trials and tribulations of his people. His example was an inspiration to all people who venerate the highest standards of human conduct and family life. Largely because of his way of life and the manner of his death the Royal Family are closer to our hearts today than ever they were before. This happy state of affairs is in marked contrast to conditions which have obtained in Europe and elsewhere during the last few years, where a score of monarchs have

been swept from their thrones and age-old dynasties have ceased to exist. Recent history has given point to the words of Henry IV., "Uneasy lies the head that wears a crown"; but there is no doubt about the continuance of our system of government. But the King is dead, and so with unswerving loyalty and devotion we say, "Long live the Queen."

There was much in the speech of the honourable member for Gawler with which I strongly disagreed, and much which I consider would have been better left unsaid in a maiden speech. Particularly I refer to his linking of himself, the Leader of the Opposition and other members of the Labor Party with the Almighty: I forget who came first in order of priority. I also think that perhaps he claimed unnecessarily for himself and his colleagues in the Labor Party a monopoly of the practise of the principles of Christianity. On the other hand, I congratulate him on the manner in which he welcomed the accession of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. and prophesied that her reign would be as successful as the reigns of two of the greatest rulers in our history—Queen Elizabeth I. and Queen Victoria. Both these outstanding women were summoned to the throne at an early age, Elizabeth at 25 and Victoria at 18, and, as the honourable member rightly and truly said, their respective reigns marked two of the greatest periods in our history. "The golden days of good Queen Bess" were the days when England first took up her position as a world power, a position which she has continued to hold for 500 years and still holds, and I venture to suggest will continue to hold for another 500 years, and it will not be very long before she once again attains her former splendour. It was during the reign of Queen Victoria when the British Empire was at its finest flower.

Most of us are creatures of our day and generation. One of the characteristics and failings of advancing age is that we are inclined to look back on the past with respect, to view the present with disfavour and to envisage the future with misgiving. Yet any unbiased student of history, whether he or she is old or young, must admit that in many respects the second half of the nineteenth century was a more beneficial period for the world than was the first half of the twentieth century. It was certainly so for the peoples of the British Empire and for western civilization. We were then part of a mighty Empire on which the sun literally never set—an Empire which covered a marvellous expanse of

territories and infinite variety of nationalities over which the British flag proudly flew; an empire which was the shining light of western civilization and the undisputed leader of the world. Yet the bonds of empire were not in any way fetters to our freedom. They were only tiny silken threads of loyalty and love. This was a splendid era of discovery and development.

There was a spirit of adventure at home and abroad. Men and women in thousands set out from the homeland to carve out a new place for themselves in Australia, New Zealand, Canada, South Africa, India and other British dominions. After braving the long and perilous journey over seas in tiny sailing ships they dedicated their lives to the fulfilment of a great ideal, to carve a new land out of the wilderness, and to beget a new people who would hold fast to the ideals and aspirations of the race from which they sprang. I remind the member for Gawler that this outstanding period in the history of the British Empire, the Victorian era, was outstanding for two reasons. It was a great era of peace and progress during the reign of Queen Victoria who came to the throne as a young girl. Secondly, the beginning of the second half of the nineteenth century gave rise to the birth and growth of Liberalism, which was based on adventurous idealism.

Mr. Macgillivray—Now we are seeing the death of it.

Mr. PATTINSON—No. We are seeing a resurgence of it, particularly among the young people of this community. The Liberal Party ruled England and the Empire almost uninterruptedly for nearly the whole of this period—for 37 of the 50 years of the second half of the nineteenth century. With all humility I suggest that it is more than mere coincidence that we had this long and almost uninterrupted reign of Liberalism in one of the greatest and most outstanding periods of history. Liberal conception was then and still is now the encouragement of the initiative and enterprise of the individual, subject only to such constraints as are rendered necessary in the public interest from time to time, according to changing circumstances.

Mr. Macgillivray—They were different Liberals.

Mr. PATTINSON—We are a loosely knit Party. We are free men, I point out to the honourable member who claims some monopoly of freedom for the gallant quartette of Independents in this Chamber. I remind him and other honourable members that I am a free

man in a free Party in a free Parliament in a free country. Even as Government Whip, which I understand is tantamount to the position of Parliamentary secretary to the Government, I have the same right as any other member to express my views on the problems of the day.

Mr. Quirke—If there is no impact on your Party that is all right.

Mr. PATTINSON—My shoulders are broad enough to bear any impact which may come from any quarter. I firmly believe that as we stand on the threshold of the second half of the twentieth century history is likely to repeat itself for two reasons. Firstly, a vigorous and radiant young Queen has just come to the throne, accompanied by her democratic young Prince Consort. Secondly, there is a revival and resurgence of the spirit of Liberalism again among the youth of this day and generation. I claim that no member of this Parliament spends more time with the youth of this State in its various phases than I do. I go from place to place, not only in my own electorate, but in various parts of the metropolitan area. The youth of today is beginning to realize that it is the very negation of democracy and progress to allow an octopus Government to spread its tentacles over every field of human activity. They desire more freedom to fend for themselves, to choose their own careers, to make their own mistakes and profit by them. Despite all the dismal forebodings which we hear about the future I remain supremely optimistic about it. I believe that Australia has a future of spectacularly successful achievement. Many dangers and difficulties will arise, but there is little which courage, perseverance, tolerance and goodwill cannot overcome.

Australia is the land of opportunity. Today, as never before, is the age of youth. There is no office of State, no distinction in scholarship, no high enterprise which is not open to the assault of their talents. The glittering prizes of life are open to their grasp if they have the tenacity and courage to work for them. The Liberal conception is the encouragement of the spirit of adventurous idealism and the retention of the priceless heritage of freedom. It offers the benefits of ambition, the fruits of industry and the reward of merit. It encourages cultivation of a spirit of self reliance, to engage in healthy competition one with the other, to carve out one's own career for the betterment of oneself and the advancement of this great and glorious land in which it is our privilege to live.

There is another phase of this new era to which I want to refer. I firmly believe that it will usher in a new era for the women of the British race. Australia has, of course, made great progress in its comparatively recent history, but I believe that for the last century or so it has been predominantly a man's country, and in that respect it has been a backward country. Probably in no other democratic country of the world have women been given fewer opportunities to fill public positions than in Australia, and probably no State is more backward in this respect than South Australia. One of the few deficiencies in the mental outlook of our very progressive and imaginative Premier is his failure to appreciate the benefit which this State would derive from more frequent appointments of representatives of women's organizations on various commissions and committees, and to accept their advice on price control and many other relevant matters of which they have expert knowledge and experience.

I also join in the tributes of praise to Sir Willoughby and Lady Norrie. As Governor for seven years Sir Willoughby performed his duties with marked ability and distinction. He and Lady Norrie closely identified themselves with the activities of all sections of the community and gave inspiring leadership. I recall with pleasure that, after his swearing-in ceremony at the Adelaide Town Hall after his arrival in South Australia, Sir Willoughby's first public appearance was in the company of myself at the Proclamation Ceremony at the Old Gum Tree at Glenelg.

It was my privilege, as Mayor of Glenelg, in the presence of a representative and distinguished group of citizens, to welcome him as all his predecessors had been welcomed, and to point with pride—I hope with pardonable pride—to the splendid record of progress and development of this young State in its history of little over a hundred years. But it was somewhat an anti-climax when, in escorting him to the Glenelg Town Hall, we were obliged to pass the Patawalonga, the property of the Government of the State, which was still in the same deplorably primitive condition as when it was inhabited by the aborigines before the arrival there of the first Governor in 1836.

Mr. Macgillivray—Perhaps the idea is to keep it in its natural state.

Mr. PATTINSON—I sometimes wonder whether the Government does not regard it as a relic of ancient times which should be kept

in its native state as the cradle of the British race in South Australia. When we arrived at the seafront I could not point with pride to any boat harbour, public baths or other amenities. All I could show Sir Willoughby was the derelict remains of an abortive attempt to construct a breakwater and a little decrepit old jetty which was nearly as old as the State itself and which had reached the stage of senile decay. It was not a very happy introduction to the birthplace of the State. A few years later, in April, 1948, when a strong breeze blew up the gulf and blew the jetty away Sir Willoughby saw fit to call at the Town Hall and express his sympathy. I was then able to say "At least, Sir, we still have the sea. They can't take that away from us."

In November, 1948, the Government appointed a Committee to investigate waterfront amenities in the Glenelg and Brighton areas. By that time the Government was suffering from a sort of delayed remorse, whereas Sir Willoughby had come down the day after the storm to express the hope that something bigger and better would be erected. I was chairman of the committee, and the calibre of other members made it one of the most outstanding committees appointed by this Government, for it included Mr. Carl Meyer, Chief Engineer and General Manager of the South Australian Harbors Board, Mr. J. A. Fargher, Assistant to the South Australian Railways Commissioner, Mr. A. J. Fowler, District Engineer, in the Highways and Local Government Department, Mr. W. M. Anderson, Designing Engineer and Chief Draftsman in the Engineering and Water Supply Department, Mr. Frank Lewis, Town Clerk of Glenelg, and Mr. A. H. Sanders, Town Clerk of Brighton. The last two men had had extensive experience in municipal affairs and particularly in seaside council activities. The committee gave up much of its leisure time during the next 12 months to a consideration of the problem referred to it by the Government, and on December 14, 1949, delivered its report and recommendations. I think the Premier was very impressed with that report and those recommendations, for in his address at the Proclamation Ceremony at Glenelg on December 28, 1949, he spoke at length in terms of approval and praise of the report and said that the Government would immediately refer it to the Public Work Committee. It did so in January, 1950. Mr. Meyer and I gave evidence before the Committee in April 1950, but

so far no report has been issued by the Public Works Committee. I have many of the characteristics of Job in my make up, but this might be an appropriate time to remind the Premier of the old proverb that "Hope deferred maketh the heart sick."

The Hon. M. McIntosh—But when it cometh it bringeth a crown of joy.

Mr. PATTINSON—I hope it will, but if it is deferred much longer it will not bring much joy to the hearts of the people in my electorate or to any South Australian. I am not suggesting that it is practicable to commence a work of this size and magnitude at this time, but I do claim that the electors of Glenelg are entitled to know whether or not the Government really intends to put in hand any of the proposed works when the occasion arises. We, at Glenelg, do not adopt a narrow or parochial outlook towards our beaches and foreshore, but realize that they are the property of the Government and the playgrounds of all South Australians, and that country residents in particular are entitled to some change from the hard conditions which they must endure, to some relaxation from the heat and burden of the day, and to a holiday at least once a year at such a beach resort as Glenelg. Interstate, country, and metropolitan visitors are entitled to expect the enjoyment of reasonable amenities at Glenelg, but I realize that this Parliament is dominated by country interests and that it is very difficult for a small handful of metropolitan members to obtain even small amenities in their districts in the face of the crushing burden of the strength of this majority. At times country members, seeing that they have a brutal majority in this House, could afford to treat us poor metropolitan members with a little gentleness and generosity. It is a sad fact in the history and tradition of this State that Glenelg, which is the birthplace of the State and the cradle of the British race in South Australia, has nothing to offer South Australians or interstate visitors except the sea. That is all they can get at Glenelg. What do they see? They see the sea.

Like other members, particularly those representing metropolitan electorates, I have read with interest the reports in the newspapers about negotiations between the Premier and metropolitan councils concerning the Municipal Tramways Trust's affairs. I am particularly interested in these negotiations because I represent the second largest electorate, numerically speaking, in this State and the largest by many thousands of any member

of my Party. I have not studied the report of the committee appointed and selected by the Government to inquire into the trust's affairs, for the very good reason that no copy has been made available to me, but I have carefully read the report of the Royal Commission on State Transport Services of which Judge Paine was chairman. There is no abler and more experienced Royal Commissioner in this State than Judge Paine and no abler and more experienced public servant in this State than the Auditor-General, Mr. Bishop, who was a member of that Commission. I have therefore read, marked and digested its report. I have also studied the reports of similar commissions in Victoria and New South Wales. Those commissions comprised able transport experts from Great Britain and elsewhere. I have also studied the transport legislation of all States of Australia and of Great Britain, and in the light of this information I am disappointed from the report of the negotiations between the Premier and the metropolitan councils which I read in the *Advertiser* this morning. If the decision, if it is a decision, is merely a stop-gap proposal I think it is worth a trial, but if it is intended to be a permanent solution of our metropolitan transport problems it is, in my opinion, a short-sighted compromise and I have little confidence in it. I am surprised that in this vigorous, democratic community a large number of the members of the metropolitan councils who comprise the A and B groups under the Municipal Tramways Trust Act should allow themselves to be so influenced and dominated by the Lord Mayor of Adelaide and City Council representatives. I believe that the Premier's third proposal was by far the best, and the only one capable of finally solving the transport problems of the metropolitan area.

Mr. Macgillivray—Isn't it peculiar that the councils' representatives on the Tramways Trust should allow the financial mess to develop?

Mr. PATTINSON—I am a great believer in and upholder of local government. I have had a long experience in local government and have at different times been mayor of both country and metropolitan councils for several years; in fact, for about half my life I have been associated with local government. I am proud to know that thousands of men over a long period have given honorary service in the splendid community movement of local government.

Mr. Macgillivray—Of course, I was not decrying the work of councillors.

Mr. PATTINSON—Nevertheless, I do not think any group of members of local government, elected from time to time, are more capable of running a complex system of transport than the same number of men selected from, say, this House. I am not belittling the experience and ability of any member in saying that. Inexperienced people are not capable of controlling the complicated network of transport in the rapidly developing metropolitan area.

Mr. Macgillivray—It would not be the function of the councils to interfere with the administration of the Tramways Trust, but the councils' representatives should have been aware of the overall policy.

Mr. PATTINSON—I agree. I remind country members that the development of the metropolitan area during the last decade has not been a normal development. There has been a forced growth, due principally to the building activities of the Housing Trust, the War Service Homes Commission, and the State Bank, and the very strong encouragement of secondary industries in the metropolitan area. I agree with the suggestion made the other day by the Leader of the Opposition that when we spend large sums of Loan money at Leigh Creek and elsewhere more opportunities should be given to members to inspect the development of such necessary undertakings from time to time, but I also contend that the time has arrived when the country members, comprising two-thirds of the total members of this House, and who can say "Yea" or "Nay" to the expenditure of any monies, were conducted on a tour of inspection to see what is taking place in the metropolitan area. In all the years I have been living in the metropolitan area I have never known of any such Parliamentary tour of inspection. It would stagger some members if they knew that the three building organizations I mentioned have purchased over 10,000 building allotments in my electorate alone. I am not objecting to the great development taking place in the metropolitan area. We hear much about the drift from the country to the city, and one might think that it was unique in South Australia, but the same thing has happened, only to a more marked degree, in every other capital city of Australia and in most other countries of the world. With other honourable members, I deplore that people living in the city should be referred to with scorn in

the House. I have had the unique experience in this House of representing both a country and a metropolitan electorate, and I deplore this tendency which has grown up in the House to divide the country and the city into watertight compartments. We are all citizens of the State and should be proud of the fact. As members we should view every proposal which comes before the House objectively and not in some narrow, parochial way and consider how it will affect our electorates, but view it in a broad way and ask, "Will it be in the best interests of the State as a whole?" Therefore, I hope the Government will arrange, particularly for the benefit of country members, a tour of inspection of the metropolitan area to show the enormous growth that has taken place. It may not sound much to some of the members, but it strikes me forcefully when I notice that 10,000 building allotments have been purchased by three activities in my own electorate within the last few years and consider the tremendous growth of homes there under mass construction methods. With the reduction of building controls foreshadowed, I hope many more thousands of homes will be built in my electorate by private owners. What I am putting is that the Municipal Tramways Trust has not coped with this enormous development in the metropolitan area. The transport system in the metropolitan and the outer urban area must expand rapidly. It should be planned on a proper basis. We cannot afford the luxury of two duplicating and competing systems.

Mr. John Clark yesterday expressed disappointment that there had been no suggestion of an electrification of the railway between Adelaide and Gawler. I share his disappointment, but I have a more optimistic outlook concerning it, and I think the time will come when steam trains will cease to serve the metropolitan and outer urban areas within a radius of 50 miles of Adelaide. Also I think that electrification is inevitable in the comparatively near future. Future planning of tram and bus routes should be integrated into an electrification of trains programme. In the meantime the tramways need to provide an attractive and efficient service. The trust has failed to keep trams up to a reasonably modern and efficient standard. I complain that the Housing Trust came to my electorate and purchased large areas of beautiful gardens, orchards and vineyards, put bulldozers in and ripped the land up with the object of building no fewer than 1,600 timber-frame homes; yet no-one

seems to bother about transport facilities and other public amenities for these people. They come to me for assistance, and I have to start where our instrumentalities left off and try to have something provided for them.

Over a period of 10 or 20 years the Tramways Trust has adopted a policy of masterly inaction. Most of its rolling stock is obsolete and much capital outlay will be necessary to bring it up-to-date, and still more to provide for the very necessary expansion to newly developed areas. In my electorate I can show the Government where there is not even an inadequate service, but no service at all. The State Bank erects a few hundred homes down in the wilderness and leaves the people there, and then it is left to me to try to do something to provide for them.

Mr. Macgillivray—A few minutes ago you were glad about this growth.

Mr. PATTINSON—So I am. We hear reference to the migration policy. I am sorry to see that our migration intake is to be halved, because I believe that New Australians will provide a great reservoir of talent for this country. Not only in this generation, but particularly in the next generation Australia will benefit enormously from the knowledge, experience and diversified talents of these people. I agree with other members that the best type of migrants are those I am getting in my own electorate—young married couples with children; and from what I see in my travels in the electorate there will be many more children in the near future. I think that is splendid for the community. Many people have no freedom of choice as to where they will live, but must go where they are directed; and many of them are going into under-developed areas where there are practically no facilities. I believe the time has come when there should be a proper planning of our transport system in the metropolitan area to meet the needs of such people. Transport services should not be planned in watertight compartments. They should be planned and co-ordinated, each in its own sphere, and should be subject to some regulations within that sphere. Nearly every leading country of the world and nearly every State of Australia has adopted a policy of transport co-ordination. I believe the metropolitan transport system should be subsidized by the Government, and I consequently agree with the Government's policy in this respect. For generations country residents have received hidden subsidies in the form of concession rates

for freights on railways. This is the result of Government policy of development, and I heartily agree. Railways have never been permitted to maintain a standard freight schedule based on cost of operation, and have never been permitted to adopt the cost of service standard. I agree with that, because it is necessary to develop this huge undeveloped State. However, the metropolitan area has developed so rapidly that now the people of the State generally should provide some part of the subsidies toward the metropolitan transport system. I agree with the report of Judge Paine on our railways, and also with the reports of the commissions of inquiry in Victoria and New South Wales that there should be some commission of transport control set up composed of men of the highest qualifications. It should consist of persons of wide experience who have shown capacity in transport, industry, commerce, administration and in the organization of employees.

Mr. Macgillivray—Where are you going to get such men?

Mr. PATTINSON—We must go outside the State if they are not available here, but I believe they are available here. The object of this Parliament should be to provide the people in all parts of the State with the most efficient, effective and economic transport system possible to operate in their respective spheres without duplication and wasteful competition.

Like the Government, I am seriously concerned at the curtailment of the State's programme of public works; also with the very definite and decided increase in unemployment which is commencing to show itself not only in this State, but more particularly in some of the other States. I am inclined to think that the curtailment of the various State programmes and the increase in unemployment are closely related. I warn the House—if it needs any warning, and I do not think it does—that when unemployment starts to increase it becomes chronic. I believe that in a young, undeveloped country like Australia there should be enough work to keep everyone employed for at least another generation. I very much regret that this unhappy state of affairs has come about after 10 years of great generosity on the part of Nature and 10 years of unparalleled prosperity. No one has a greater horror of inflation than I have, but I hope, that if there is any policy of deflation it will not be carried to extreme. I find it difficult to discover the financial policy of the present Commonwealth Government. A few weeks ago I

listened with great interest to the speech by the Prime Minister in which he made a report to the nation, and I could not decide then, and I cannot do so now, which he regarded as the greater pest—Communists or State Premiers. That is a sorry state of affairs in this Federal system which we enjoy. I regret that there is a constant feeling of antagonism between the Commonwealth Government and Commonwealth Parliament and the various State Governments and Parliaments. We are reaching the stage when it is no longer a real federal system because of the dominance of the central Commonwealth Parliament and Government over the Parliaments and Governments of the States.

Mr. Macgillivray—They control finance, and whoever controls finance controls everything.

Mr. PATTINSON—That is so. Irrespective of the Party, there has been over the years a striving on the part of the Commonwealth to gain domination over finance. That was seen during the years leading up to the inauguration of federation in Australia. Some of our greatest statesmen clearly foresaw the danger. Mr. Alfred Deakin, one of our outstanding statesmen and three times Prime Minister of Australia, prophesied the present struggle between the Commonwealth and the States, and in a letter to the *London Morning Post* of April 1, 1902, he said:—

The rights to self-government of the States have been fondly supposed to be safeguarded by the Constitution. It has left them legally free, but financially bound to the chariot wheels of the central government. Their need will be its opportunity. The less populous will be the first to come. Those smitten by drought or similar misfortune will, however reluctantly, be brought to heel.

Those words, written more than 50 years ago, were truly prophetic and uncannily accurate.

Mr. Macgillivray—How did he come to that conclusion prior to 1927 when the States had the right to control their own finances?

Mr. PATTINSON—He made the prophecy that there would prove to be insufficient safeguards in the Constitution. Some of the safeguards were removed by the financial agreement of 1927, when the Loan Council was set up and when the States fondly imagined that they were protected by the weight of numbers. They have the weight of numbers today and they pass unanimous resolutions, led by the Premier of the father State, but those resolutions seem to fall on deaf ears. I am glad that the question of the transfer back to the States of the power to collect their own taxes is being seriously considered. A

notorious example of the grabbing of power from the States was the uniform taxation legislation. The sovereign rights of the States to levy and collect their own income tax from their own people were arbitrarily taken from them by the Commonwealth. Ostensibly, this confiscation was a war measure, and was to continue for the duration of the war. It was so described at the time by the Prime Minister, Mr. Curtin, but we all know that his successor, Mr. Chifley, did not honour the undertaking given to State Premiers in 1942 by Mr. Curtin. I strongly disagree with many of the political views expressed by Mr. Calwell, present Deputy Leader of the Opposition in the Commonwealth Parliament, but I respect him for being usually frank and not ashamed to express his views clearly, accurately and forcibly, not dealing in innuendoes or half truths. I was particularly interested to read the report of his speech in the House of Representatives in 1942, when, as a Minister of the Crown, he was supporting a Bill for the introduction of uniform taxation. Here is a portion of his speech:—

Tonight we are participating in an historic incident. We are considering legislation which will fundamentally affect the future of Australia because it will inevitably result in the destruction of the States as we know them. They might linger superfluous a little longer, but they will lose their rights to impose income tax. They will become mendicants existing upon the bounty of the Commonwealth. They will in effect be on the dole and for all practical purposes they will cease to exist as States.

I place Mr. Calwell in the same category as his distinguished predecessor, Mr. Alfred Deakin, as having the uncanny gift of prophecy, but Mr. Calwell's prophecy was made 40 years after that by Mr. Deakin. These two prophecies have come true in a remarkable manner in 1952. Whatever may be the dangers or disabilities of re-introducing something like our former system of taxation, I hope that our Premier will put up a strong and vigorous fight to get back for the States some power to control their own taxation. Irrespective of Party, once a man goes from South Australia to the rarefied atmosphere of Canberra he regards himself as living in a little world of his own and endeavours to operate a system of government by remote control. Too many of these men forget the source from which they came and the support that enabled them to reach their destination. It will be a sorry day for Australia if we get a centralized system of government, and we seem to be moving inevitably to that position. It is a

system which is obnoxious to all Liberals and the negation of democracy.

Mr. Quirke—Are there no Liberals in Canberra?

Mr. PATTINSON—A large number of them do not voice the same principles of Liberalism as I do. I suggest that irrespective of Party allegiance, if we have a love of our State and its future development and prosperity, we should fight to retain some vestige of the sovereignty which has come to us from the Mother of Parliaments, and which we foolishly thought we were retaining when we ceded a power to the Commonwealth to deal with certain matters. If there were a real partnership we should be able to exercise co-ordinate powers of government. I support the motion.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart)—I have listened with much interest to Mr. Pattinson and join with him, and other members who have spoken, in a declaration of loyalty to Queen Elizabeth II. and to all she represents in our democratic system of government. I express the hope that her reign will be one of advancement and progress, of happiness and peace, to all those who owe allegiance to her, and indeed to the world at large. Mr. Pattinson made some extraordinary statements about reigns of previous queens. I do not pose in any way as an authority on history, but surely Mr. Pattinson's history reads differently from the history I was taught. He claimed that there were long periods of peaceful reign and said that there must be some relationship between the peaceful reign of Queen Victoria and the period when Liberalism was in power in the Mother Country. Perhaps he has not heard of the Crimean War, and the establishment of the Victoria Cross. I understand that there were two or three Afghan wars, an Indian mutiny, a Boer War, a Zulu War and other wars.

Mr. Pattinson—They were unequal to our two World Wars and our world-wide depression.

Mr. RICHES—Only in degree. In the earlier days communications were not as good as they are today. There was a time, even in our generation, when we were not advised of happenings overseas so quickly as we are now. What Mr. Pattinson tried to show by his reference to the days when Liberalism was in power I do not know, but I know that the movement of British so-called Liberalism was regarded in many circles as a radical movement and that later there was a further progression, apparently overlooked by the hon-

ourable member, the great benefits of which have been handed on to us from the Victorian era, which saw the birth and rise to power of the great Labor movement. The member for Glenelg said he believed that, synchronizing with the accession of youth to the throne, there had been a resurgence of Liberalism among vigorous young Australians, but my reading of Australian events indicates strong support for the Labor movement, whether in local government elections, Victorian Upper House elections, or the numerous by-elections held during the last 12 months. I did not like the honourable member's criticism of the speech of the member for Gawler, for I believe it is always good for us to publicly declare our belief, as the member for Gawler did. The almost hypercritical ridicule expressed by the member for Glenelg spoilt what was otherwise an interesting speech.

I have detected in the speeches of members opposite a longing to get back to the "good old days" of the Victorian era. Some referred to getting back to "normal times" and others yearned for a return to longer working hours and reduced wages, but it is about time we thought of looking forward and not back, for we have nothing but chaos to gain if we try to go back to the days that were. The Federal Government is attempting to set back the clock in order to secure for itself pickings from industry and positions of privilege, but it has on its hands once more the problems associated with earlier days, and, in an age when Australia is under-populated and any curtailment of the migration problem to be regretted, once again men are walking our streets looking for work. Men are living, not in freedom as stated by the member for Glenelg, but in fear. Where is freedom for a man who must live in constant fear of the future? Many men who, a few years ago thought the future so secure are today living in fear, not only for their own future, but also for that of their wives and children, for the outlook is very bleak for a man over 40 years of age threatened with dismissal. If any member can tell me where jobs are to be found for the older men, who are the first to be put off, I shall be very glad to hear from him. Under the system foisted on us by Canberra over the last two years we can find neither sufficient work nor sufficient homes for the people already in Australia, and instead of trying to turn back the clock we must advance with the times. There was a time when all believed that, so long as we had the material and manpower

and there were services to carry out, it would be possible to so arrange the Australian economy as to employ our people, but apparently that is no longer possible today, and, the sooner Australians get the opportunity to reverse the process that has recently taken place in Federal circles, the better it will be for the country as a whole, for everything the Federal Government has done has had the effect of increasing prices. Whenever wages are increased in an effort to catch up with rising prices there is a clamour from members opposite for an overhaul of our Arbitration system, but I remind them that increases in prices may be due to causes other than increases in wages. One such cause is an increase in the interest rate which we experienced recently, but I have not heard members opposite say a single word against that, although they all hold up their hands in horror at wage rises.

Mr. Christian—I am against increasing the interest rate.

Mr. RICHES—I have heard the honourable member express that opinion in years gone by, but I have not heard him say so over the past two years.

Mr. Christian—Because interest rates have been static during that period.

Mr. RICHES—A little leadership in that direction would appeal to the people at large and would be of more use than this condemnation of the "other fellow" who is not putting enough work into the week.

Mr. Christian—I do not think that was the tone of the member for Rocky River yesterday, for he called for a better return from everybody.

Mr. RICHES—He spoke primarily of the other fellow, but, if there is slackening anywhere, leadership, and not carping criticism—whether it be from an editorial desk or a Parliamentary bench—is required. All the criticism from members opposite seems to have been directed against the workman in industry, and if they wish to correct that impression I will be glad to hear from them. That type of remark seems to be linked with the intervention of the Federal Government in the case now before the Arbitration Court for a longer week and is in keeping with statements made in other States, but it is not the way to secure the co-operation of the worker in industry, and Government members know that such unpalatable utterances have helped cause our present economic plight which has been foisted on Australians as a matter of policy. Unemploy-

ment is not here by accident, nor can it be said that circumstances obtaining today are any different from those which obtained during Mr. Chifley's regime, except that our defence expenditure was not as heavy then and that Mr. Chifley did not have an American hundred million dollar loan to play with. Despite this borrowing from America, the Australian economy has become so upset that it is becoming increasingly difficult for the ordinary citizen to live, and how pensioners live I do not know.

The member for Flinders referred to what he called the "welfare State," and from references made from time to time one might well believe that an onslaught is to be made on some of the social services provided by the Curtin and Chifley Labor Governments so as to give the ordinary citizen—the man with whom Labor Governments are concerned—some measure of security. I understand that in some States the free hospital services available to the people are being withdrawn. I hope there will be no such move in this State. The member for Flinders deplored what he called the welfare State.

Mr. Pearson—Not the welfare State, but the welfare State *in extremis*.

Mr. RICHES—He went on to say that the welfare State sapped the vigour of our young men and retarded production. I should like him to explain what part of our present scale of social services could in any way affect our young men in the direction he claims. I recently read a speech by a president of an organization with which the honourable member is closely associated. This man said his organization did not object to taxation for defence and other purposes, but violently objected to being taxed for the sake of a welfare State. I believe that organization must mean by "the welfare State" the scale of social service benefits introduced by the Chifley Government. I deny that they encourage thriftlessness. If an ordinary working man during his lifetime can do better than secure for himself a home and pay for it and educate his children as well as by insurance or savings ensure an income of more than £3 a week on retirement, he cannot be thriftless. The Chifley Government provided security and happiness for the aged that they never enjoyed before. However, with the withdrawal of subsidies and higher prices old age pensioners, and others on fixed incomes, are living in a state of fear. Their security has been filched from them, and that is the price we

have paid for the advent of the present Federal Government to the Treasury benches. Again, public servants on retirement find that they need twice as much to give them a comfortable living as they thought they would need. Their superannuation units do not now provide enough for them to live on. I remember that the member for Torrens, who was Minister of Industry in the depression years and in charge of the department administering unemployment relief, stood in this place when the depression was over and said that never again would he allow himself to be associated with anything approximating the issue of the dole.

When the Chifley Government was in office it determined to take action to see that the dole was never again needed, and it legislated for unemployment relief. However, in the last two years the value of money has so depreciated that the 25s. prescribed can now buy only as much as the 7s. 6d. provided for unemployment relief in the depression years. The people are therefore no better off today. All the benefits conferred by the last Federal Labor Government have been lost irrevocably as a result of the actions of the present Menzies-Fadden Government. This has been brought about by a deliberately created situation, planned beforehand, advocated beforehand, and brought upon us by policy. Two years ago I read an article by Mr. Colin Clarke, the economist, who urged, when the rest of Australia was clamouring for greater development, a policy that Government servants be sacked, that the Snowy River hydro-electric scheme be abandoned, that the National University at Canberra be closed, and that interest rates be increased until it was impossible for people to build their own homes.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—Who employed him? The Queensland Government.

Mr. RICHES—Who sacked him? Mr. Clarke's article was printed by Sir Keith Murdoch in the *Melbourne Herald*.

Mr. O'Halloran—That was about the time he left the Queensland Government.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—No, long after that.

Mr. RICHES—Mr. Clarke's policy has been followed closely by the present Federal Government, which is achieving what it set out to do. The Government sought to abolish full employment so as to create a pool of unemployed.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—It has never said that.

Mr. RICHES—Sir Keith Murdoch and Mr. Colin Clarke advocated it. They said public servants should be sacked to provide the pool of unemployed, and the Federal Government carried out the suggestion. This was the result of the deliberate implementation of a policy previously conceived.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—I always gave you credit for more sense than that.

Mr. RICHES—Surely the last war proved that there is no necessity in Australia for men to be out of work and no necessity for public works to be held up as long as they are developmental or productive.

Mr. Pearson—Was the war developmental or productive?

Mr. RICHES—No, but we did not stop the war because we could not find money.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—If you had a child ill in hospital you would get a surgeon no matter what it cost, but having spent that money you haven't got it to spend on development afterwards.

Mr. RICHES—The Minister cannot tell me that the situation we have today has any relation to the war.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—I know 90 per cent of our troubles arise from the fact that our wool cheque is down by £300,000,000 from last year.

Mr. O'Halloran—And the Federal Treasurer (Sir Arthur Fadden) said we had too much money.

Mr. RICHES—I have never held myself out to be an economist, but as a man in the street I know that for a long period during the war we did not sell any wool or wheat overseas because we could not export it. That did not stop Australia from financing the war and we did not have to go to America for dollar loans.

Mr. O'Halloran—We had three wool clips stored in Australia when the war ended.

Mr. RICHES—The same circumstances exist today as when the late Mr. Chifley was Federal Treasurer. If there had been an earthquake or some other calamity over which we had no control the people in the street could perhaps have understood why we are in trouble today, but we had full employment two or three years ago. I heard today on good authority that 80 to 85 per cent of our rural postal services may be cut in one direction or another. I do not know how these cuts will effect the cities. I wonder what would happen if the daily letter delivery in the metropolitan area was cut out for some time. Country people are dependent

on the postal services they receive once or twice a week. For instance, they often receive medical supplies through the post.

Mr. O'Halloran—Country mails have been cut by from 30 to 50 per cent.

Mr. RICHES—I deplore that curtailment and I hope that every resident of the country areas will protest.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—I am sure some country postal services have not been cut at all.

Mr. RICHES—I said I was informed that between 80 per cent and 85 per cent of all country postal services will be cut in one direction or another, and that some will be cut by as much as 35 per cent to 50 per cent. I hope my information is wrong. I was interested in Mr. Pattinson's plea concerning the Glenelg breakwater and the operations of the M.T.T. As regards the trams, I think he will remember that a lead was given in this House in 1942 largely in the direction he is advocating. Although I am a country member I still stand where I stood then. I assure Mr. Pattinson that I deplore the influence of the brutal majority of country members in this Chamber over those representing the metropolitan area, and I promise that I will give him my vote on the first opportunity to correct the situation so that the metropolitan elector will have a vote of the same strength as that of the country elector. I believe, with Mr. Pattinson, that an inquiry into our transport services as a whole would result in substantial benefit not only to the metropolitan area but also to those areas starved for transport. Reference was made to the electrification of our railways in the metropolitan area by the members for Flinders, Gawler and Glenelg, but I hope this scheme will be proceeded with no further until a test has been made of the possible substitution of diesel traction, in the form of the Budd railcars as used by the Commonwealth railways in our northern areas. I understand that similar cars used in the suburban areas of American cities are giving a wonderfully satisfactory service. Those who have been associated with the Budd car in South Australia are convinced that it could meet the needs of our metropolitan area, and could be used on all country lines. They can be coupled together in any number with only one driver, as with an electric train. I have discussed this matter with railway engineers who know what the Budd car can do. It has terrific speed and all the advantages of the electric train, with the added advantage that it is more mobile. They are much more comfortable to ride in than any

electric train I have travelled in in Australia. I respectfully urge that before any further planning or development for the electrification of our railways is undertaken full inquiries will be made into the use of cars similar to the Budd car.

I shall now refer to matters which apply particularly to my electorate and refer first to the decision of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the proposed alteration of the railway route between Port Augusta and Telford. The decision has been announced and, in accordance with its terms of reference and the agreement entered into with the Federal authorities, we accept the findings that the construction of the line on the new route would be in the national interest. This news was received with mixed feelings in the north. In some quarters it was welcomed. Apparently it was welcomed by some people in Quorn itself who are looking forward to transfer to situations nearer places where there may be greater opportunity for advancement of young people. Others see benefit accruing to their particular locality and others again express the opinion that the new route will mean speedier transport for stock from the Northern Territory. I believe that all thinking people will feel sympathy for the people of Quorn—the people who over the years have given a lifetime of effort to build up a worthwhile community, and with very little Government assistance have provided the services essential to a thriving community. Quorn has been a progressive community comprised of people whom I have always admired for their vision and capacity for self help, and courage in embarking upon community enterprises. Only recently have they succeeded in opening a fine new community hospital. The news that they are to be by-passed by the railway has come as a severe blow to the district, because it can mean the end to much of their community enterprise. Unless some compensating industry is established, Quorn will lose 300 railway employees, including some of its very best citizens. The Commission says 254 homes will be vacated. The high school will close, it will be impossible to maintain its hospital, and all services which have been established and the commitments which have been undertaken will fall as a heavy burden on those who remain. Mr. McHugh has described the decision as a tragedy for Quorn. Some people were shocked by false reports. The chairman of the district council and the mayor have expressed concern. Not only will Quorn be affected, but to a lesser degree other parts of the district. The

news of the commission's decision came as a shock to the people of Quorn. It had been circulated throughout the town that the finding favoured Quorn and that the line would still go through there, and there was jubilation throughout the district. The news was spread throughout the schools, the streets, and shops, but when a representative of the *Advertiser* rang notifying leading people of the correct decision and asking whether they had any comment to make, they refused to believe that Quorn was to be omitted. When they learned the truth they were temporarily stunned. Since then, however, the people have rallied and are determined to work to see that Quorn does not suffer and that it will still remain a thriving community.

I want to look at the position objectively as it obtains today. Quorn is too good a town to die. It has the will to live. It will fight for its existence as an established community and I say all honour to the people in their fight. The Premier has suggested that a committee will be appointed to go into the question of compensation. This is very admirable and will be welcomed, but I want to suggest that there is need for a more objective approach. During the construction period Quorn will be busier than ever. Not only will all the coal for Adelaide be passing through, but also coal to build up a stockpile at Curlew Point, Port Augusta, for the Electricity Trust. An investigation should be made into the possibility of retaining the North-South line, and instead of scrapping the line and the rolling stock, they should be used to convey coal to Adelaide as at present. The Royal Commission unanimously found, on the basis of the evidence submitted, that there was a need for a line on the western side of the range to serve a national interest. That should cater for all the increased traffic to and from the Northern Territory and for the coal required at Curlew Point. Even when the power station is established at Curlew Point, the Osborne plant will continue to operate, and all the coal required at Osborne now will still be needed. I have not read in detail all the findings of the commission, but I have not seen anything in the press to convince me that there is a case for scrapping the existing line. From conversations I have had with railwaymen I understand there is a need for both lines.

Mr. Michael—Has anyone said that line should be scrapped?

Mr. RICHES—Yes. The Commonwealth said that the line should go only to Hawker.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—The State viewpoint is exactly the opposite.

Mr. RICHES—Yes. The State made out an excellent case for the line to go through Quorn and I want the State to stand up to that and to continue to operate the existing line. I do not know whether the Commonwealth would have the right to operate the two lines. Probably there is a need for further discussion on this matter. It is a question for experts and not laymen. The States should be able to nominate the point at which it will take delivery of its coal and there is nothing to prevent the State from asking for coal for Curlew Point to be delivered there, and for coal for Osborne to come through Quorn. That would be better than paying compensation. Before any move is made to take plant from Terowie to Port Pirie there should be an investigation into the possibility of continuing to bring coal for Osborne along the present route.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—The honourable member knows that the Commonwealth Railways Department said that whichever line was operated it would remove its men from Quorn.

Mr. RICHES—Yes. If the coal comes down through Quorn men will be required there.

Mr. O'Halloran—The men will be required at Quorn and not at Port Augusta.

Mr. RICHES—Yes. It would obviate the need to operate a line through the Pichi Richi Pass for heavy traffic.

Mr. O'Halloran—There would be an alternative line for defence purposes.

Mr. RICHES—Yes, and it would continue to provide a fillip for the stations en route, which the present coal traffic gives. Before the line beyond Hawker is scrapped there should be an enquiry. Whether it is made by the committee which will deal with the compensation problem or by some other committee, there should be an investigation. I have had many discussions with railwaymen of long experience and they have worked out the number of trains which will be necessary to bring coal from Telford to Curlew Point. In addition, there will be the stock traffic, and the traffic which will result from the development of the Northern Territory. There is an excellent case to segregate the coal for Adelaide and to allow it to come down on the present route. If compensation is to be paid, the Commonwealth must come into the scheme. It seems that whatever happens some railway employees will

be transferred. If they incur a loss in the disposal of their homes they should be compensated by the Commonwealth. Terrific hardship would be experienced if this were not done. The last Commonwealth Labor Government undertook to pay compensation.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—Where did you get that?

Mr. RICHES—It was a direct statement from the Commonwealth Minister, Mr. Ward, and it is in the Commonwealth *Hansard*. He said the Commonwealth would pay compensation to its employees.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—It is a pity you did not give that in evidence.

Mr. RICHES—Later I will refer to the evidence which was tendered. The Commonwealth Government undertook to pay compensation and we have every reason to expect that undertaking to be honoured by the present Commonwealth Government. A committee should be set up immediately to inquire into the possibility of retaining much of the existing coal traffic through Quorn, and of securing for Quorn some other industry. I favour the establishment of some permanent authority charged with the responsibility of inquiring into and assisting in the decentralization of industry. I think the present set-up has not succeeded in attracting industries to the country. Even with the establishment of Woomera there is a tendency to do at Salisbury more and more of the work essential to the operation of the Long Range Weapons Establishment and less and less at Woomera. I mention this because of the recent announcement of the establishment of new industries at Salisbury by the Hawker-Siddeley group.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—I do not think Port Augusta has any complaints about Government policy. The Government is spending much money there.

Mr. RICHES—I hope I am not adopting the attitude of a carping critic. I am advocating that a competent authority should be set up to facilitate the establishment of new industries in the country. Someone should be responsible for putting forward the claims of country centres. Were any representations made to the Hawker-Siddeley group about the establishment of its industries in the country, or did it just have a look at Salisbury and say that everything was all right? In South Australia no-one is charged with the responsibility of establishing new industries in the country. The Minister of Works mentioned Port Augusta, but everything in that town is associated with the Leigh Creek coalfield.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—Which was established by this Government.

Mr. RICHES—Yes. It was established by the Government of the day. Everything at Port Augusta is associated with the removal of coal from Leigh Creek and the generation of electricity.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—We could have done it down here if we had so desired.

Mr. RICHES—I am not debating that. Unless all we have heard from the Lieutenant-Governor in opening Parliament, and in the announcements by the Premier since regarding the probable establishment of an atomic pile, is window-dressing, we must assume that within 10 or 12 years we will be deriving our source of power from something other than Leigh Creek coal. Unless some permanent industry is taken to Port Augusta that town will face in 10 years' time the situation that Quorn is facing today. I am not concerned so much about any individual area, but there is a need to make a definite approach to the problem of taking industries to the country. We have the instance of three industries being established at Salisbury. We want to know whether one of those industries could not have been established at Quorn. We do not know what are those industries, but it is possible that one of them could have been established at Quorn. Someone should have the responsibility of putting forward the claims of Quorn or any other country centre when there is a proposal to establish new industries in this State. At present no-one can make representations for the establishment of an industry in a country centre until after the location of the new industry has been announced. It is a sad plight when we see communities becoming smaller instead of larger in this age of development. I have the conviction that Victoria is doing much better work in this regard because it has an authority to not only contact representatives of industries which may be coming to the State, but to explore the possibilities of decentralizing industries. The authority is charged with the responsibility also of examining the possibilities of taking industries already established into the country. Maybe there is something lacking in our country towns. If that is so, let us have a report from a competent authority in order that the position may be improved.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—Where has Victoria anything to compare with our South-Eastern forests, Whyalla, Port Augusta and Leigh Creek?

Mr. RICHES—There is a power station at Yallourn, and an industry at Portland, where surgical needles are made.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—One of the forests in the South-East employs more men than all the surgical needle factories in Australia.

Mr. RICHES—I am not deerying what the State has done. I remember the time when the State was going to sell its South-Eastern forests.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—You do not.

Mr. RICHES—I do. The State has done excellent work in the South-East, but is that a reason why we should not examine further the possibilities of decentralizing our industries? Quorn is too progressive a community and too much imbued with the pioneer Australian outlook to succumb to any reverse. I commend His Honor, Mr. Justice Wolff, and his two fellow Commissioners for the way they carried out their difficult task, but I do not think this House envisaged a hearing of the kind which was embarked upon, for I had the impression, which was shared by other members, that the Commission was to be a fact-finding body with the powers of a Royal Commission with regard to obtaining evidence and perusing documents, and I did not visualize all the legal folderol that characterized this hearing. Witnesses who went along to assist the Commission to reach a proper decision were subjected to cross-examination reminiscent of a criminal hearing and, in some cases, they were unnecessarily embarrassed. One man was asked to disclose the name of his customers north of Hawker, but I do not know what that had to do with the determination of the railway route. The hearing was a lawyer's harvest, and it would be interesting to know the amount of the legal fees connected with it. I am at a loss to understand the necessity for legal representation at all, and would like to know who was responsible for the decision to have the respective departments represented by a panel of solicitors, as I consider his Honor and his fellow Commissioners would have been quite capable of procuring all the relevant evidence, which would have saved much time and expense.

Mr. Christian—This House legislated for the appointment of the Commission.

Mr. RICHES—Yes, but when I voted on the Bill I had the impression that it would be a fact-finding body and I did not expect the

type of hearing that was eventually conducted. When one side decided to be represented by a panel of lawyers, including a Queen's Counsel, the other side had to be represented in that way, too.

Mr. Teusner—Interested parties before the Liquor Commission in New South Wales are represented in the same way.

Mr. RICHES—Yes, but we should not follow New South Wales or any other State willy nilly, because what happens in another State does not necessarily indicate a desirable practice. From evidence given by the Commonwealth Railways Commissioner before the Commission in the closing stages of the inquiry it appears that the route had already been decided upon before the appointment of the Commission, and that its personnel had been agreed upon before the introduction of the legislation setting up the Commission. When the Premier speaks in this debate he should explain some of the statements of Mr. Hannaberry, the Commonwealth Railways Commissioner, which have made the residents of Quorn very uneasy. Mr. Hannaberry is reported as saying at the inquiry:—

There was considerable discussion and it ended in a stalemate. The Commonwealth Government said, "We do not propose to construct a line at all unless it is on what we believe the most economical route." Mr. Playford said, "I do not think my Government will accept the position. They would want it to be constructed on the existing route." Shortly before I went to American in 1950, Mr. Playford and myself discussed this matter at Canberra. The Prime Minister and my Minister asked me to discuss it, to see if there was any way to arrive at some compromise. Mr. Playford said to me, "I have flown over the two routes. They are as different as chalk and cheese. You have no fear as to the result of an inquiry as to which route would be adopted." I said, "Not the slightest, but the fear I have is the delay."

That makes peculiar reading, for, if that was the feeling of both parties before the introduction of the legislation, what chance had the South Australian route? Mr. Hannaberry continued:—

I said, "You have committed yourself to a power house and I am not going to be in the position where my Government will be criticized for being late in the construction of a line to deliver coal to synchronize with the power house." He said, "I want an inquiry which will get it over as quickly as possible. What about letting the Victorian Railways decide the route?" I said, "I will not agree to it." I told him that we had up to that time spent well over 12 months with every possible member of the professional staff on survey work, estimates, and so forth, and that we had come to the conclusion after a good

deal of work, and that if another railway were to investigate I would insist that they do the same amount of work that we did to prove whether we were right or wrong. He said, "That is no good." Finally he said, "What about a Royal Commission?" I said that I would agree to it subject to certain conditions; firstly, that there was a Supreme Court judge to be selected by the Commonwealth Government and from a State other than South Australia, and one representative from either railway.

Mr. Hannaberry's next statement is most significant, for it shows that agreement on the personnel of the Commission had been arrived at before it was set up:—

At that time Mr. Playford and I agreed on the Commonwealth and State representatives, the Commonwealth representative being Mr. Fitch and the State representative being Mr. E. J. Watson. Mr. Playford retracted from the agreement when I was abroad, and I received a cable that Mr. Playford had selected Mr. J. A. Fargher and asked me did I object. I had no alternative but to agree. The Royal Commission commenced during my absence.

There is much more in the same strain and it is clear from the evidence of Mr. Hannaberry that, before the Commission was set up, it was apparent that the Commonwealth route would ultimately be adopted. The Premier received a deputation from Quorn on this matter and the setting up of a Royal Commission was discussed at that conference. Members of that deputation were under the impression that the suggestion of a Royal Commission emanated from that conference, but from Mr. Hannaberry's evidence it would appear that the suggestion of a Royal Commission was made long before that deputation and also that there was an acknowledgment that the Commission, when set up, would agree to the Commonwealth route, for, according to Mr. Hannaberry, the Premier said to him before the legislation was introduced, "I have flown over the two routes. They are as different as chalk and cheese. You have no fear as to the result of an enquiry as to what route would be adopted." My constituents appreciate the promptness with which the Premier assured them that a full investigation would be made into the question of compensation where such could be proved to be necessary, and that question should be considered in conjunction with a full investigation into the possibilities, firstly, of routing as much of the Leigh Creek coal traffic as possible through Quorn to Osborne, rather than scrapping the present line and rolling stock associated with

it, and, secondly, of taking a new industry to Quorn to compensate it for any industrial loss which may occur.

I was pleased to hear the member for Flinders refer to the need for the establishment of a steel industry at Whyalla, as I have been anxiously awaiting some indication of the Government's policy in this regard following a submission in Parliament of the special report made as an appendix to the report of the Director of Mines last year. In that report Mr. Dickinson makes one plea—that this Parliament should earnestly consider the establishment of a completely integrated steel works at Whyalla—but, although the report was submitted over 12 months ago, the Government has made no statement on the subject. The report states (page 18):

The expansion of Australia's steel production capacity is vital to her growth, her security and the preservation of her exceptionally high standard of living. The following report is a plea for a much greater expansion of steel productive capacity in Australia, in particular the establishment of a completely integrated steel works at Whyalla without delay.

The preamble to the document states:

Iron and coal are the very foundations upon which modern industry has been built. They are basic to our modern civilization and to industrial and military power. The demand for iron ore arises chiefly from the demand for steel.

In a modern steel plant pig iron is first produced in a blast furnace. A relatively small proportion is cast for foundry use whilst the greater part is charged into steel-making furnaces. The steel produced is moulded into ingots which are then rolled into semi-finished or finished products. These products include steel rails for railways, tramways, overhead cranes, etc.; steel plates for ships, pipes, heavy equipment, and boilers; structural steel for building construction and heavy equipment; steel reinforcing rods for concrete construction; steel bars for manufacture of machinery; steel wire rods for drawing into wire; steel sheet bars for rolling into sheets; skelp for making into butt-welded pipes; steel billets for making into seamless pipes and tubes; steel blooms and billets for sale to engineering works for forging, and to re-rolling mills for manufacture of light sections; and alloy steels, including stainless steels, for tools and various engineering and electrical components.

I believe the Director of Mines has gone to the trouble of explaining the ramifications of the industry with a view to impressing on Parliament the need for implementing his suggestions, because he goes on:—

The product of the secondary processing of the steel from the steel works reach the user either fabricated as special machinery or in forms from which an amazing variety of

articles, essential to almost every activity of modern life, are manufactured. For example, small bolts and nuts, nails, screws, springs, wirenetting, and fencing wire are made from steel wire. Steel drums, shelving, stoves and ovens are made from black steel sheet. Motor body panels, refrigerators and dairying equipment are made from bright steel sheet. Galvanized iron is used for the manufacture of roofing iron and for rainwater tanks. Containers for perishables, food, tobacco, etc., are manufactured from tinplate. Water, gas, and steam piping is made from butt-welded steel pipe; bore casing and piping for carrying steam, gas, or oil under pressure are made from solid-drawn steel pipe. Steel tubing goes into the manufacture of motor vehicles, refrigerators, and bicycles. Steel rods, shafting and axles, engine nuts and bolts are made from cold drawn steel bars. Electrical conduit, hardware and box strappings are manufactured from cold rolled strip steel.

The Director has conducted an exhaustive research into the methods of production and the supply of raw materials, into the demand for and the supply of coal, and as a result he has sounded a warning that South Australia should not continue to export iron ore which cannot be replaced and of which we are blessed with magnificent natural resources in any greater quantities than necessary. He says that within the next two or three years we should establish a completely integrated steel works at Whyalla. He said that the importation of steel into Australia was costing about £20,000,000 a year more than the cost of Australian steel. In 1949-50, 769,000 tons of steel were imported at prices up to 100 per cent above those for Australian steel. He also said that the Broken Hill Proprietary Company's plans for expansion cannot hope to catch up with the actual demand and that when the works now being planned are completed the position will be even worse than today so we shall be losing more than £20,000,000 every year. If we had imported all the steel ordered the cost would have been £40,000,000 more a year. It is ridiculous that with the great quantities of iron ore at Iron Knob and with a blast furnace at Whyalla we have to import steel sheeting for the coffer dam at Port Augusta regional power station from France and the steel supports for the structure from Holland. We should give most careful consideration to the report by the Director of Mines. I remind the House that he has drawn our attention to these points year after year, but last year he went to the additional trouble of preparing a special appendix, which I commend to every member. I hope all will read it because it has a bearing on the life of every citizen in the

community. I am awaiting a statement of Government policy in regard to the Director's report. Mr. Dickinson is aware of the difficulties of the Broken Hill Proprietary Company in regard to equipment and manpower. However, he has stated that the matter is so urgent that if the company cannot obtain the necessary labour and material a completely integrated steel works, together with tradesmen, should be imported. The Director also stated:—

It has been clearly demonstrated that Australia can produce the cheapest steel in the world, that her resources of coking coal and high grade iron ore are ample for expansion, that a stable market exists both within and outside Australia capable of consuming far larger quantities of steel products than have been produced in the past. The industry is organized and controlled by the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited, which, in its relatively short history, has achieved technical proficiency and efficient management equal to any other steel industry in the world. Finished steel products for sale are produced at Newcastle and Port Kembla and foundry pig-iron at Whyalla. For the first time in its history it has insufficient capacity to supply the enormous Australian post-war demand and the practical problem of the moment is to determine locations for new plants which will meet this demand in the shortest possible time. If possible the capacity of Australia's steel plants should always exceed the demand by an appreciable margin to allow industrialization to proceed unhampered with adequate supplies of steel available from Australian plants at economic cost. New plans should aim, therefore, at the establishment of 4,500,000 tons of ingot steel capacity in 1955 and 7,500,000 tons in 1960.

Apart from the present producing centres at Newcastle and Port Kembla, Whyalla in South Australia, and Bowen in Queensland appear to be the only other seaboard sites where conditions are favourable for new steel plants. Whyalla, already a growing centre of heavy industry, has the nucleus of a steel industry, whilst Bowen, adjacent to coking coal deposits, could probably be developed in a similar manner to Newcastle and Port Kembla. In Australia the cost of an integrated steel plant with blast furnaces, coke ovens, steel furnaces and rolling facilities capable of producing and working 1,000,000 tons of ingot steel would be approximately £20,000,000. Using this figure as a basis, the additional expansion envisaged will amount to £40,000,000 for steel plants alone. The expansion of raw material production and establishment of services, housing, and ancillary industries may well absorb another £20,000,000, an overall capital expenditure of about £60,000,000. Even so, this expenditure is small compared with the premiums paid on imported steel and the advantages to be gained in having a steel potential capable of meeting all emergencies.

A former chairman of directors of the Broken Hill Proprietary Company gave evidence before a Select Parliamentary Committee which inquired into the question of giving the company special rights to iron ore deposits in the Middleback Ranges and for the establishment of a blast furnace and shipping facilities at Whyalla. Mr. Essington Lewis stated:—

We (the directors of the Broken Hill Proprietary Company) feel if a steel works is established subsequently, and a water supply is put down to Whyalla, part of which we would pay for, an enormous benefit will be derived by the primary producers around the coast to Whyalla, and the position of such places as Wallaroo and Port Pirie would be strengthened in so far as their becoming manufacturing centres in the future is concerned. There is no reason that I can visualize why a certain number of industries should not develop from the establishment of steel works in this State. There is no reason why then should stop at Whyalla. There is every reason why perhaps some of the finishing industries should be carried out at Port Pirie or Wallaroo, or even at Adelaide. The feeling of our directors is that they are endeavouring to put a pivot in the industries in South Australia, to which can be hung various other allied industries.

On June 10, 1948, Mr. Essington Lewis gave the Joseph Fisher Memorial Lecture at the Adelaide University on "The Importance of the Iron and Steel Industry to Australia." He referred to the Broken Hill Proprietary Company's plans for Whyalla as follows:—

The Broken Hill Proprietary Company is now planning a development of peculiar significance to South Australia, namely the establishment of a steel works at Whyalla, thus further aiding the scheme of decentralization. When the Newcastle steel works were established, it took approximately 1½ tons of ore and 3 tons of coal to make a ton of finished steel. Obviously, the economics were in the direction of taking the ore to the coal. In the intervening 30 years, tremendous strides have been made in the art of fuel conservation and nowadays an Australian steel works take about 1½ tons of ore and 1½ tons of coal to make a ton of finished steel. The economic situation has therefore changed and it becomes a practical proposition to carry the coal to the ore under some circumstances. This Whyalla development will involve the erection of coke ovens, open hearth facilities and rolling mills—in fact, a completely integrated steel works. The nucleus already exists in the wharf facilities, blast furnace and machine shops and, with a large clear area of land available, there is the opportunity to lay out a fine modern plant. Before the works can be built it will be necessary to conduct negotiations with the South Australian Government for further supplies of fresh water. The planning of this works will take some years and in any case, other more urgent work has to be undertaken at present. With the present dearth of men and materials it is impossible

for any active erection to commence; indeed, at Whyalla today there are insufficient men to maintain the shipbuilding programme.

Mr. Dickinson's comments on that statement by Mr. Essington Lewis are:—

It is true that the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited is more than fully occupied at present with expansion programmes at Port Kembla, Newcastle, and on the New South Wales coalfields and would find it very difficult to undertake concurrently another major development, such as the establishment of steel production at Whyalla. This problem is not singular to the Broken Hill Proprietary Company but is present in varying degree in all undertakings which are expanding the production of essential raw materials in Australia.

From that Mr. Dickinson develops the argument that if it is impossible for the industry to be established by the B.H.P. a steel works should be imported. He gives the following conclusions:—

(1) Australian steel is the foundation of Australia's peacetime industrial structure and a measure of her strength in the event of war.

(2) In 1949-1950 Australia's requirements of steel amounted to 2,830,000 tons of which 1,178,800 tons or 42 per cent was produced in Australia, and 769,306 tons or 27 per cent imported, leaving a deficiency of 881,894 tons or 31 per cent.

(3) The present total Australian steel capacity is 1,900,000 tons which falls short of current Australian requirements by 930,000 tons.

(4) Australia's steel requirements in 1955 and 1960 are estimated at 3,000,000 tons and 5,000,000 tons respectively. These estimates are likely to be on the small side since they do not take into account the possible effects of new defence programmes in process of formulation or accelerated migration schemes.

(5) The overall demand for Australian steel is not likely to fall off. It is the lowest priced steel in the world. If the demand should fall off in Australia export markets should always be available to absorb any surplus production.

(6) Present plans allow only for the establishment of a total capacity of 2,400,000 tons in 1952 and 3,000,000 tons in 1957-60. Unless additional plants are established, the steel capacity in Australia in 1960 will be 2,000,000 tons below the estimated demand. It is vital, therefore, within the next 10 years to establish additional plants to those already planned at Port Kembla and Newcastle.

(7) Australian production of steel since 1945 has been seriously restricted by inadequate supplies of coal resulting in a loss of the equivalent of 500,000 tons of steel which would normally be produced in the existing plants. If this loss had been made good, however, it would not have overcome the necessity for importing 880,000 tons of steel to make up the deficiency between steel producing capacity and demand.

(8) In 1949-1950, 769,306 tons of steel were imported into Australia at prices up to 100 per cent above those for Australian steel. These imports involved payments of a premium amounting to about £20,000,000 as the difference in cost between Australian and imported steel.

(9) Having regard to development and defence needs and the location of the ample resources of high grade iron ore and coking coal that are available in Australia, the most economical method of increasing the steel capacity in Australia is by the erection of a completely integrated steel works at Whyalla, based on a two-way trade in coking coal and iron ore. It is suggested that the capacity of the plant should be at least 1,000,000 tons of ingot steel. A second steel works of similar capacity is suggested for Bowen in Queensland near which valuable deposits of coking coal are located.

(10) A steel plant at Whyalla promises attractive economic advantages to the Broken Hill Proprietary Company, to South Australia and to the Commonwealth as a whole. Its establishment could be accomplished in two or three years by co-operative action. The incentive to get on with the job lies in the advantages to be gained by having always available an abundant, cheap and convenient steel supply for the development of Australia.

(11) A steel expansion programme will make heavy demands on existing steel production and will rank with other major projects, such as the Snowy River scheme, as a steel consumer.

(12) If Australia is to become an arsenal for Pacific defence, the expansion of her steel-making capacity is vital. It can be used for development purposes and switched quickly to the production of armaments if required.

I doubt whether anyone could write a stronger report. I have the greatest respect for Mr. Dickinson's ability. When he has taken the trouble to conduct such an exhaustive research into all aspects of the iron and steel industries of Australia and sets out such a forthright statement showing the dire necessity to give attention to the establishment of steel works at Whyalla, some notice should be taken of his recommendations. Unless additional works are established Australia will fall short of its steel requirements by 2,000,000 tons a year by 1960. That is a situation deserving of the earnest consideration of this Government. There has been no announcement which would lead members to believe that any notice has been taken of the Director's report. I hope that before the debate closes the Premier or the Minister of Works will give a clear indication of the Government's policy concerning the claims advanced.

I should like it to be clearly understood that because I do not speak on certain subjects at length during this debate they are therefore to be regarded as being of less importance. I

extend to the people in my district who have been stricken with poliomyelitis the greatest sympathy. This month more than 20 cases have been reported at Port Augusta alone, and the outbreak is causing great concern among parents in the town. There is a general feeling of appreciation of what has been attempted in the treatment of the victims. It is necessary to convey all Port Augusta patients to Adelaide by ambulance. Fortunately the people of Port Augusta got together and by co-operative effort and without Government assistance purchased two ambulances. They set out to give service not only to Port Augusta but to districts extending over a large area. Patients have been taken from Quorn and Booleroo Centre, there being no ambulance in those districts. The Port Augusta Ambulance Committee makes a charge of only 1s. a mile, but this charge falls rather heavily upon families who engage the ambulance to take a patient to Adelaide. The charge works out at £20 a return trip. The Government has agreed to subsidize ambulance services in the metropolitan area, and has called upon the St. John Ambulance Brigade to take over the work of co-ordinating these services. The Port Augusta ambulance was called upon four nights in succession to take patients to Adelaide, and when a call arose for an additional case it was considered that a little too much was being expected. The ambulance authorities were afraid that the machine would break down, which it actually did last Saturday. On enquiry, the St. John Ambulance Brigade said it could provide an ambulance to bring a patient from Port Augusta at 2s. 6d. a mile, or £50 a return trip, as against £20 for the Port Augusta ambulance. I plead that country ambulance services should be subsidized, but the Government has passed the buck in this regard on to the St. John Ambulance Brigade, which has been faced with a terrific task in co-ordinating the metropolitan ambulance services and therefore has had little opportunity to consider the claims of country centres. The Government has set the country applications aside, all of which must be submitted through the brigade. The service with which I am associated cannot wait another 12 months, it being in need of financial assistance by way of subsidy this financial year. Although the St. John Ambulance Brigade had a busy time co-ordinating the metropolitan services, we are asking it to give special consideration to country applications. Subsidies for these services should not come out of the grant allotted to

the brigade, but should be in addition. Our committee could not possibly charge 2s. 6d. a mile. The secretary of St. John Ambulance Brigade assures me that its services cannot be run in these days under that charge, even including the subsidy. He said that at one time it was 2s. a mile, was lifted to 2s. 3d. and then to 2s. 6d. He also told me that in Victoria the charge is 3s. 3d. a mile. Surely a service which is struggling to provide transport for country people at 1s. a mile is worthy of some recognition by the Government. The same position applies to Whyalla, and because of the greater distance the charge works out at £25 a return trip, which is a terrific burden on the people who have to pay. The Whyalla Town Commission, the combined unions and other local organizations there have asked that this matter be ventilated in Parliament. I intend to make representations to the Premier and I hope they do not fall on deaf ears.

Once again I express disappointment that ways and means have not been found to give financial assistance to the Church Bush Aid Society and the Flying Doctor Service operating from Ceduna. I will not again give all the details I have placed before Parliament as members have heard sufficient from me in previous debates to appreciate the work this organization is rendering. Members must realize the high cost involved in maintaining two air ambulances and the provision of a service to outlying parts of my district. Not only are emergency cases answered, but the doctor is also available for regular consultation once a month. Much of the money needed for this service is contributed by people not living in South Australia and that should make us hang our heads in shame. I again voice my protest that this service has not been subsidized. However, it would not be fair to make that protest without at the same time expressing gratitude for the financial assistance rendered by the Government to the hospitals run by these organizations. I will not be satisfied until such time as this service, one of the noblest services operating in the State, is recognized and subsidized.

I join with other members in expressing appreciation of the services rendered to South Australia by Sir Willoughby and Lady Norrie, and in wishing them well in their new appointment. Some of us are wondering what is in the mind of the Government regarding the appointment of a new Governor. I am pleased that Sir Robert Nicholls was selected

to be the representative of the local branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association at a meeting at Ottawa. I record the appreciation of the people in my district of the services rendered there by Sir Robert when he deputized on one occasion for Sir Willoughby Norrie. At that time Port Augusta was celebrating its one hundredth birthday and the celebrations were to pivot around a visit by Sir Willoughby. Unfortunately he became ill and Sir Robert graciously accepted an invitation to take his place. He came to Port Augusta and was well received on every hand. Sir Willoughby could not have carried out the duties more ably than did our Speaker. South Australia has reached the proportions of other States and it would not be out of place to honour a South Australian by appointing him our next Governor. The people in the north of the State would welcome that honour being conferred upon Sir Robert Nicholls. Everybody was impressed by the dignity with which he carried out his duties at Port Augusta and the kindly way in which he met everybody. He went out of his way to speak to the sick. There was no need for him to do that because he is not the representative of the district. He did everything like a gentleman and the dignity he showed could not have been exceeded. I do not know whether it is proper for an ordinary man to suggest the appointment of Sir Robert Nicholls as Governor of South Australia, but such an appointment would be welcomed by the great number of people in the north who were privileged to meet him when he deputized for Sir Willoughby Norrie.

Mr. MOIR (Norwood)—I join with other members in expressing loyalty to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. I was acting mayor at Norwood when King George VI. died and had great pleasure in passing on good wishes to our new Queen through His Excellency Sir Willoughby Norrie. Kensington and Norwood is a loyal area. We will miss two great friends in Sir Willoughby and Lady Norrie, who endeared themselves greatly to all people in the city and country. They visited my district several times and, whether it was sports or church turnouts, they were immensely popular. I agree with the remarks made by Mr. Riches about Sir Robert Nicholls, who is most popular. People in my district repeatedly ask for Sir Robert to show them over Parliament House, because of his great knowledge of Parliamentary procedure and his gentlemanly ways. To all members in this House Sir Robert has been a great adviser, and as a Speaker he is

second to none. We hear over the air proceedings in other Parliaments and from the broadcasts we realize just how those Parliaments are conducted. I join with other members in regretting the passing of Mr. Les. Duncan, who was liked by everybody. He would not do any harm to anyone. He was a good Party man and he adhered loyally to Labor principles, for which I admired him greatly.

In his Opening Speech the Lieutenant-Governor said that our Ministers are concerned at not being able to fulfil the State's programme of public works. Every member is disappointed that the programme must be curtailed. When told the position the public will believe it, in the same way as members must believe what the Premier tells us. We want more hospitals, schools, and electricity extensions in the country. There is a need for greater water supplies in outback areas, and our transport facilities are far from modern. For years we have been trying to catch up the lag in housing. The Housing Trust is doing a good job, but the position is getting worse because of the continual arrival of migrants. I am glad that the Commonwealth Minister has decided to reduce the number of migrants by 50 per cent. I do not agree with Mr. Pattinson that we can do with many more migrants here. I have seen enough of some of them, but if he has only seen the best of them he must praise them. We should consider our own people first. They should be housed and kept at work. Hostels must be built for housing migrants, but such building operations take much timber and iron which could be used in the building of houses for our own people. The Government has assisted country councils in connection with country roads, but some of our metropolitan councils should be assisted also, particularly regarding roads traversed by tramway buses. I have had complaints from tramway employees about the lack of proper lighting on some roads. The Government, the council concerned and the Tramways Trust should get together and each bear one-third of the cost of providing better lighting. If this were done there would not be so much risk of people being injured. I know the Government has many calls upon it and we Parliamentarians are accustomed to getting refusals from the Government. Our metropolitan councils need assistance, and something should be done to make roads like the Port Road and Anzac Highway much better. Roads leading to the hills also need attention.

As soon as the Housing Trust indicates that it proposes to build houses in an area the Highways Department and the Engineering and Water Supply Department get to work, but people in my area have been waiting 30 to 40 years for better sewerage facilities. It is 12 years now since I first entered Parliament and I have pleaded again and again for these facilities to be provided, and I am still pleading. I hope that it will not be too long before the work can be done. I know it cannot be done at the moment because of the curtailment of our loan programme. When I first came here one of my pet suggestions was the bringing of River Murray water to Adelaide, but I was told that the work could not be done because of the expense. Later the work was suggested by someone else, and now it is being done. My uncle was caretaker at the Gorge for 34 years, so I should know what I am talking about. The Housing Trust is helping local councils by providing roads in some districts, and if this help were not given some councils would find difficulty in fulfilling their normal obligations. In some areas such as Enfield and Woodville Gardens the roads have not been properly graded and water is lying everywhere. More amenities are required in such rapidly growing districts as Campbelltown, Paradise, and Marden, and gardeners in those areas who have repeatedly appealed to the Government for the reticulation of water from the Gumeracha wier so that their trees may be kept alive during hot spells will be pleased when they may eventually take advantage of the supply of Murray water to their gardens and orchards.

In South Australia afforestation has progressed by leaps and bounds. The member for Stuart this afternoon said that there was a time when the South Australian Government considered selling its forests, but I for one am pleased that that sale was never effected. Our timber should be sold in South Australia rather than sent over the border. Recently a price rise in respect of timber was gazetted, but the timber merchants took advantage of the rise by making it retrospective, and, therefore, I am at a loss to know whether the Government or the people who sell the timber to the public are running the industry. Earlier this year some timber mills were unable to keep their employees on because they had no timber with which to make cases, and I appealed, successfully, to the Minister for some relief for a timber merchant in my district. He had to send his own truck, driven by one of his men,

to the South-East, where he loaded a railway truck, and then loaded his own lorry, which he drove back to Adelaide. While in the South-East that driver, who is my brother-in-law, saw semi-trailers being loaded with timber for transport to Victoria—timber which should have been sold in this State. The South Australian Government should handle the sale of its timber and reap the not inconsiderable profits which at present go to the timber merchants. It is pleasing to see that the Education Department has included dentistry in its free services, for parents cannot possibly locate tooth decay as quickly as a dentist using modern instruments. When advised that their child's teeth are decayed most parents are anxious to take him along to a dentist for treatment.

Mr. Stephens—Free advice, but not free treatment, is given.

Mr. MOIR—A note is sent home to the parents so that they will know that the child's teeth must be attended to.

Mr. Stephens—In New Zealand free treatment is given.

Mr. MOIR—Under the present stringent financial conditions such a service could not be expected here. In past years I have advocated the pre-marital medical examination of couples to ascertain whether or not either partner to the marriage is suffering from cancer, tuberculosis, venereal disease, or any other of the many diseases which attack mankind. Such examinations should be compulsory so as to minimize the risk of women bearing children who will be physically handicapped throughout life. Indeed, couples should be compelled to present a clean bill of health to the person who is to perform the wedding ceremony. Doctors treating patients for any of the diseases I have mentioned should do so on a confidential basis so as to encourage the patient to continue receiving the treatment and so minimize the risk of infection. If a person known to be suffering from one of these diseases refuses to be treated for it he should be reported, and treatment made compulsory.

I cannot let this opportunity pass without advocating the provision of better accommodation at the Parkside Mental Hospital. On a recent visit to that institution I was horrified and shocked at what I saw, and members who have not visited it can have no idea of the conditions under which those patients are accommodated, although the staff look after them as though they were their own brothers and sisters. I commend them for their devotion to a duty at which I could not stick for a week,

let alone for years, as some have done. One man has worked there for over 26 years—surely an indication of a high sense of duty to his less fortunate brethren. While at the hospital I saw a number of patients who, I understand, were suffering from tuberculosis, accommodated on outside verandahs and, although fresh air may assist in the treatment of their complaint, I think the weather in the last month or two has been a little inclement for them. For myself, I would need a cast iron overcoat before being persuaded to sleep under such circumstances, and the Government should erect more buildings on the hospital grounds as soon as possible.

I am pleased to see that the Government intends to investigate the possible development of the Moorlands coalfield. For years the member for Murray, Mr. McKenzie, and I have advocated such a move, and it is 30 years since a close friend of mine, who did some boring in the area, told me there were coal deposits throughout the Moorlands and the Taillem Bend districts. Mr. McKenzie has repeatedly told members that a cement works and power house could be established in that district and, after a thorough investigation, the Government will probably agree with him. I am also pleased to note that the Government is assisting in the development of the pyrites deposits at Nairne and the establishment of a sulphuric acid plant at Port Pirie. The latter should assure to the State a constant supply of superphosphate, and it is to be hoped that next year the farmers will receive all the superphosphate they require.

The Housing Trust is to be commended for the splendid job it is doing. As a result of representations to it I have been able to secure temporary homes for one or two of my less fortunately placed constituents, but these overtures have been successful only in extremely urgent cases. I hope that the Trust will, during the coming year, be able to double the rate at which it is building homes, so that more people may be placed. If building restrictions are lifted and, as is expected, cement and galvanized iron become more readily available, more young couples will be able to build their own homes, and this will naturally relieve the Housing Trust, which still has a long list of waiting applicants. Young people desiring a private builder to build their homes are usually quoted a price over £2,000, but, after the house is completed, they often find that they are liable for some additional hundreds of pounds which they must find. Some have come

to me seeking loans of up to £200, but, as I am not a money lender, I have been unable to accommodate them.

His Excellency indicated that the Government intended to assist children suffering from slight mental defects, and to this end a property in my district has been purchased for the purpose of using it as an occupational centre where such backward children may be kept separate—a very proper procedure. It is hardly fair to expect a child with a slight defect to be quite happy with other children. The Government is to be complimented on this scheme and at the same time it is endeavouring to have deaf children properly educated. Teachers with special qualifications are being appointed to teach them. The public must be pleased to hear that the Government is considering a relaxation of price fixing in some directions. I believe that several items could be released from price control. I heard over the air that control of the price of chocolates was to be lifted, and this could well be done here.

Some people have expressed concern about import restrictions, but Australian industry is capable of producing good substitutes for those goods that may be in short supply and for which we pay so dearly. During the war we had to be content to do without many things, but the American forces showed us what can be done by efficient plant and organization. Australia can do almost anything if our people are only willing to try. The Premier has discussed with representatives of councils the report of the committee that inquired into the affairs of the Municipal Tramways Trust. According to newspaper reports the councils have been talked into accepting the Premier's second proposal, the appointment of a more efficient controlling body with substantial financial aid from the Government, but I am strongly opposed to it. I was chairman of the councils' representatives in the A group and I advocated acceptance of the third proposal, namely, that the Government take over the undertaking completely. If the councils finally accept the second proposal they will have to put up with what is coming to them. If the Government took over the undertaking entirely it could tax the people to meet any deficiencies and not merely the ratepayers. A man may own six or seven properties in different suburbs and be rated for each. If ratepayers are to be held responsible for tramway losses such a man would be involved in heavy rates. The money required to run the railways and

other public utilities is obtained from taxes, and money required to run the tramways should be obtained in the same way. I will do my best to convince the councils that the Premier's third proposal is the best for them to adopt. If they accept it the Government can appoint five qualified members to the board. They should not be councillors who are in today and out tomorrow, or perhaps working in a jam factory one day and on the roads the next. Generally speaking, councillors are not capable of carrying out the work of an expert accountant. My remarks do not belittle local government authorities in any way. I emphasize that experts must be appointed to control the affairs of our tramways.

Several of my constituents have recently approached me about the liquor laws. I told them I was not prepared to introduce any amendments this session as I thought perhaps the Government would not entertain them. However, it is high time the hours of opening and closing were re-considered. Nothing is worse for any young man than to knock off work at 5.30 p.m., get to a hotel by 5.40 and then consume more liquor in 20 minutes than he would in a whole day if he could get it at any time. He may then go home and refuse to eat the dinner that took his wife perhaps two hours to prepare. If I am returned to Parliament next year I will have more to say about our liquor laws.

Mr. Davis—Do you favour an extension of hours?

Mr. MOIR—I want the hours altered. I regret that the dairying industry has had a severe blow. I have the interests of the dairy farmer at heart and will support him up to the hilt for a better deal. He is one of the lowest paid men in the primary producing industries. No section of the community has been hit harder during the last two years. Many primary producers have been getting wonderful prices for their wool and talked some dairymen into getting out of their industry and taking to grazing in order to get rich over night. The dairymen soon discovered that wool-growing is not without its problems and many came to their senses and bought cows again. South Australia is the only State showing an increase in dairy production, although it has been only slight. I regret that the price of butter has risen to 4s. 1½d. a pound. Most families consume 2½ to 3 lb. a week, and at 4s. 1½d. a pound that represents a big lump out of the bread winner's wages. It is particularly severe on the pensioner.

Mr. Lawn—Haven't you gone out of the dairying business and become a middle man?

Mr. MOIR—No. I was a middle man, but found that the big man got the lot. The middle man has to pay the price the big man dictates. One member said he was sorry to see school children getting free milk. I say the free milk scheme is one of the best things we ever introduced. I realize that some children are allergic to milk and I certainly would not stand over a child and make him drink it if he could not take it. Complaints have been made that the milk for consumption by school children has been left in dirty places. If the member had travelled on my truck when it was calling at schools he would withdraw his remarks. Although the hygiene may not be observed in the Mount Barker area it is in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Stephens—If the honourable member noticed unhygienic conditions and did not report them he failed in his duty.

Mr. MOIR—I shall look forward with interest to a doctor's report on the results of the free milk scheme. A survey was conducted 27 years ago at the Gilles Street school and the records show that the children attending the school developed remarkably.

Mr. Stephens—That survey was conducted by Dr. Gertrude Halley.

Mr. MOIR—I hope the honourable member to whom I have been referring will read Dr. Halley's report and change his mind. I have asked several questions on notice about a promoter of companies. I have not been caught by this person in any of these present companies, but I asked the questions because I hate to see a person taking anyone down. I was trying to warn people and not to gain any kudos. I desire to do the best I can in the interests of all South Australians as well as those of my own constituents. After World War I. many people invested their savings with land sharks and share salesmen. It is up to Parliament to protect people from the wiles of unscrupulous people. Many salesmen and sharebrokers with a seat on the Stock Exchange are honest people, and if the public would deal only with them instead of share salesmen going from door to door with glowing accounts of gold or wolfram mines they would get a much better deal.

Mr. Stephens—Don't they have to get a licence to sell shares?

Mr. MOIR—I know they have to get permission from the Commonwealth Government,

but I do not know whether they have to be registered. If necessary, the Government should amend the Act to protect the general public. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. QUIRKE (Stanley)—I join with other members in expressing regret at the untimely death of our late sovereign, King George VI. He was a remarkable man in many ways. He was universally acclaimed a good man and one cannot have a prouder title than that. He faced tremendous difficulties and perhaps in some ways was not perfectly fitted to carry the heavy tasks and burdens he had to bear. However, in spite of those disabilities he rose supreme above them all and for that we honour him as a great monarch. His daughter, Elizabeth II., by the grace of God, is now Queen of England. To her we owe allegiance, and it is to be hoped that nothing will be done now or in the future that will destroy her proud heritage. At present there are factors which, if not halted, can bring that very undesirable result. We owe her allegiance and it is our duty as members to uphold her Realm and do nothing, according to our pledge as Parliamentarians, to destroy it. Because of that we must not be associated with factors which today are working against the best interests not only of England but of the whole British Commonwealth. These factors are operating in Australia as well as in England.

We were sorry to lose Sir Willoughby and Lady Norrie. We know that Governors after serving their term eventually pass on. South Australia is all the better for the term of office served by Sir Willoughby and Lady Norrie. I congratulate them on their new appointment and know that New Zealand will benefit as South Australia benefited. I regret the passing from this earthly sphere of the former member for Gawler, Mr. Leslie Duncan. Peculiarly enough there was a close association between him and me. That may not be generally known; but whatever the attraction was—it must have been the attraction of opposites—I liked Mr. Duncan and I am proud to flatter myself that he in turn liked me a little. I congratulate his successor, Mr. John Clark, whom I am sure will be an acquisition to the House and will worthily uphold the traditions established by his predecessor.

Paragraph 5 of the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech tells practically the whole story of the present position. It is as follows:—

My Ministers are seriously concerned at the curtailment of the State's programme of public works. Despite all the efforts of the Government, the arrears of construction work accumulated during the war have not yet been overtaken and the present need is for expanded rather than restricted programmes.

In the following paragraph he says:—

Whilst some economic adjustments now appear inevitable, they may well be followed by a sustained period of stable and prosperous economic conditions.

While we have the existing order operating under our spurious type of economic system the adjustments will inevitably be followed by the usual muddle and tribulations of the people, because what is occurring now has taken place before. I always like to hear the member for Glenelg address the House as he generally has something fresh to say, but today he joined in the practice of Party discord. He said his shoulders were broad enough to carry any attack which might be made upon the Liberal policy. He joined in what is becoming the accepted thing among Parties now, a kind of "You do or do not" attitude. It gets us nowhere and achieves nothing.

Mr. Pattinson—It will in time!

Mr. QUIRKE—I forgive the honourable member if that is the only objective, but I think there is something more than that to it. Members opposite say they are free to do as they like. They are not. I have been in only one Party, but I know from statements of other honourable members how free they are. These people say they are as free as the air and can do as they like—if they do they will be assuredly left. I remind the House that one honourable member opposite in 1943 remarked in a speech:—

There is a great deal of merit in the Leader of the Opposition's suggestion in this matter, and a great deal of principle, but I must of course, be loyal to one of the very few planks that bind members of this Party.

This attitude has never achieved anything and never will. Conditions in South Australia today are such that we need the application of something better than Party recriminations in dealing with problems. We have to do something about it, otherwise we are not worthy to represent the people who look to us to do something.

Mr. Pattinson mentioned two parallels with the present gracious Queen of England, Elizabeth II.—her predecessor centuries ago, Elizabeth I., and Queen Victoria. I should not

like to think that the lovely and gracious young lady who today is our Monarch is like either of them, or that the conditions she will find are in any way parallel with the conditions existing earlier. There was never a period in the history of the world when the human race was so debased as during the reign of Queen Victoria. We had the industrial revolution from 1770 onwards down to the pitiless days of the 1800's when everything which is looked upon as a reproach to our race occurred—when we had the birth of capitalism, as it became known, and, practically everything that was done in its name was a reproach to the people who operated the system. Under it was Party politics. Liberalism was a revolt against those conditions, the Liberals forming their policy in opposition to what was taking place. In those days there were men who made great mistakes, and one which caused much tribulation in England in those days was the repeal of the Corn Laws which brought about dire poverty and destitution and the destruction of agriculture in England, something from which she has never recovered. During that period we had such things as the destruction of the native arts and crafts of India, the foisting of opium upon the innocent Chinese race, the sorry story of Africa and diamonds, the Crimea, the raping of the West Indies and the desolation and horror associated with the growth of tobacco, sugar, maize and cotton—four factors which have done more to destroy the food potential of the world than anything else. We had the plantation system of the repetition of cotton, cotton, cotton, tobacco, tobacco, and then maize (corn as it is known) and sugar. These were four destructive elements in the food cycle of the human race. All those things were exploited during that period and they have left an indelible mark with its heritage of bitterness and rancour. I issue a warning against the so-called food production by British interests in Queensland; massive areas of monotype production which, if persisted in, will inevitably do to those areas what sugar did to the West Indies and the southern States of America, and as ground nuts are doing to the colony of Kenya in Africa.

Mr. Brookman—Do they grow any?

Mr. QUIRKE—All they have succeeded in doing is to destroy the good earth which, before they attempted this programme, was at least providing sustenance for the native races who have been dispossessed of that land in order to grow a mono-crop of ground nuts which, as it happens to be a nitrogenous crop, it is

believed can be persisted in. That the whole thing is a colossal failure is something on which the nations of the world should congratulate themselves. We have also witnessed such things as the building of the colossal dams on the River Nile in Egypt, which promised to bestow great benefits on the people by regulating the turbulent annual inundation, and allowing a continuity of cropping of, in the main, cotton, cotton, cotton. Vast areas of land annually leached by the inundation of the Nile are now given over to black alkali and the land has been destroyed for ever.

These are the so-called benefits that instead of being benefits can destroy. The intention was good, but it was not intended to be good for the native land workers of Egypt but for the big interests to enable them to extract vast amounts from the production of cotton. That era has gone. All of the mistakes are apparent; some can be remedied, some cannot. We in Australia are in the position that we too will commit unforgivable sins against posterity unless we watch our step. Food production in Australia is not being pursued on proper lines. There is a tremendous shortage of phosphate, in which our soils are naturally deficient, and very strong moves are being made to overcome that shortage. I hope they prove successful, but if we continue along the lines of previous agricultural methods in Australia all the super-phosphate in the world will not increase production. A favourable circumstance has been brought about quite by accident and not by striving for it; the world demand for wool, the fear of war, and the consequent stockpiling of wool and the tremendous increase in the price of that staple fibre has enabled many millions of acres in Australia to obtain a very sorely needed spell from the rigid rotation of fallow-wheat-fallow which has rendered hundreds of thousands of acres desolate. Driving through the so-called fertile parts of the States between Gawler and Auburn one finds on both sides of the road, in such a splendid season as this, large areas growing nothing but weeds. It is a common thing to see one paddock growing principally asphodel or heliotrope—principally on fallows—and another saffron thistle—some paddocks with all of them.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—We were selling the seeds of some of them.

Mr. QUIRKE—I know, as food for parrots; but I know of a far better use for the soil than growing saffron thistle, because it is usually indicative of a soil that has been mur-

dered or is in the process of being murdered. No-one will say that it is as good as a crop of rye grass or barrel clover, for instance. The farmer is being railed against today—“Why don't you produce more wheat?” I hope he continues his holiday until he restores to his land the fertility necessary to grow crops of wheat, for there is no more soil exhausting cereal than wheat. I trust that no farmer will attempt to grow wheat on a closer rotation than four years, and if he continues this spell, when he does break his land he can easily obtain from half the acreage the greatest number of bushels ever produced on the whole area. It is not a matter of putting every acre under wheat, but seeing that every acre is in a condition to grow it, and there are many acres in South Australia not yet in that condition.

I pay a tribute to the Agricultural Bureau of South Australia which today has more branches and members than ever before. At a time not far distant it was looked upon by the people in the country as an idealistic show that could not teach the farmer anything, but now the young men are coming into it. It is quite a usual thing to find 30 to 50 members attending meetings; they come out in the evenings in the middle of winter, and the bureau is doing a magnificent job. I commend the officers and other people who address farmers and try to lead their minds away from farming as a business and show them the craftsmanship necessary in order to be a good farmer. Nothing calls for a more exquisite skill than proper working of the soil. It is not merely a matter of tearing the ground up, adding some super-phosphate, and sowing seed. There must be a knowledge and understanding of the biological life of the soil; of what takes place in a growing crop; of how much water it needs, and how much of the various constituent elements that go to make its whole. When we achieve that we will again be in a position to export wheat and other primary commodities.

I am not a Dismal Jimmy who says that this country is going to starve. We can produce food for many times the present population, but we cannot do it by our present methods. Another factor is necessary, namely, that each farmer shall grow more of the food he eats. There was a time when a farmer would be ashamed to be found using condensed or powdered milk. Today it is common practice; if there is a shortage of tinned milk in the city it is probably because farmers are using it in the country. That is wrong. There is nothing of the true cycle of farming in that. It should

be the proud boast of every farmer that everything he needs for his sustenance which can possibly be produced is produced on his own property. When we reach that stage we will have gone a long way towards achieving self-sufficiency on each farm—a most necessary thing. A wheatgrower is not necessarily a farmer, but just a wheatgrower and there is a vast difference between the two. Now that the lesson has been taught many farmers have realized the value of resting their land from cereal production and consequently many more wheatgrowers are becoming farmers. To that extent the lesson, if it is well learnt, is one that could not have been taught in any other way.

The time has come for large-scale experiments in the use of superphosphate to determine how much of it is necessary, and on what rotation. Of course, being a layman, I cannot put it forward as an established fact, but in my opinion vast quantities of superphosphate are being wasted; they are being locked in the soil and they do no good for the crops that are grown in the immediate present. In certain areas a form of lime calcium carbonate can take the place of superphosphate with advantage.

Mr. Pearson—Very temporarily.

Mr. QUIRKE—What is superphosphate but a temporary measure. You add it every year. If that be so why must the application of lime be anything but a temporary measure?

Mr. Pearson—It only unlocks the superphosphate already in the soil.

Mr. QUIRKE—If you can lift soil with a Ph. content of 4.5 to a Ph. content of 6.5 is not that achieving something? If you can reduce the acidity of that soil and unlock the superphosphate already in the soil is not that a saving of phosphate. We are told that only 10 per cent of what is added becomes available to the plant life. Is this country different from other countries in many respects because it has land in zones ranging from tropical to temperate? It has all the types of climate in the Southern Hemisphere, except the climate of the frigid zone. It is peculiar that across the water in New Zealand millions of tons of lime are used to tremendous advantage, yet little is considered necessary in Australia. In the United States of America about 45 million tons are used each year. England gets the benefit of using millions of tons. The South-East would benefit tremendously from the application of lime. I ask for nothing more than an experiment to be made over a large area, and if satisfactory it would be worth millions of pounds to Australia.

I come now to the sulphuric acid plant which is to be erected near Port Adelaide. We have seen many stupid things done, but to put such a plant in a closely populated area is a tragic mistake. Why concentrate this and other plants within 10 miles of the G.P.O.? Along the coast northwards from Port Adelaide there is land suitable for such a plant. To continue to concentrate industries in Adelaide is a ghastly error. One of our troubles is that over 50 per cent of Australia's population is within 100 miles of Melbourne and Sydney. That figure has been given by Mr. Casey of the Commonwealth Government. Why should we continue to do such a thing around Adelaide? The people in Melbourne and Sydney have three meals a day and the food for them comes from the country, and it is nearly always one day old when received. I feel sorry for city people because of the secondhand type of food that they are called upon to eat. Even the lettuce they eat was cut several days before. It started to die from the moment it was cut and lost its food value, and that applies to other foods, too. We can have far better food in the country because of the large open spaces. Industries are jammed into a city in the economic interests, but not in the interests of the people.

Mr. Riches spoke about bringing Leigh Creek coal to Adelaide. I do not want a useful town like Quorn to die and I hope something will be done to assist it. Recently I bought a truckload of Leigh Creek coal for a business with which I am associated. About 25 per cent of the 40 tons was shale—solid rock. The proof of that can be seen in the creek where we tipped the ashes. More care should be exercised to prevent this shale being sold with Leigh Creek coal, which is dear enough at 56s. a ton, and then there are loading and unloading costs. I do not know what is going to happen to the fireman who had to use the coal, because what he said did not redound to anybody's credit. In one direction what he said was a masterly effort, but in another direction it was not creditable. I hope the position in regard to Leigh Creek coal will be remedied.

We have all sorts of schemes for bettering the economic life of our people. If a scheme is put forward as a remedy and it puts one man out of a job, it is not a remedy. What is happening today in our economic affairs is a disgrace to our so-called leaders. If they cannot evolve a scheme to run our country without subjecting a section of the population to privation and want they should get out and let someone else tackle the problem.

Mr. Riches—It is part of their policy.

Mr. QUIRKE—I am accusing them of the effects as we know them today. I have a vivid recollection of the 1928-35 period. Is it not peculiar how opposite methods are being used to achieve the same end? In those days we saw pitiful human beings without a job, and they were being thrown into the streets like pariahs of society. We tried to make conditions better by first making them worse, and the same thing is happening today. In those days there were plenty of goods. Warehouses were full, but there was no money to buy the goods. Today we are told there is plenty of money, but in order to balance budgets we must produce more. In order to produce more we start by sacking thousands of men. The system is doomed to be as great a failure as the system devised by Otto Niemeyer.

I have not made up my mind as to who is behind the present scheme; I think there are several behind it. The man at the head of our affairs has never been anything but a failure. He was a failure when the last war broke out and so was his right-hand man. Later other men carried on the affairs of this country, but they were also considered to be failures by the people and in their places the same old war horses were returned. They were the men they had turned down years before. We want new blood in this country, young people with new ideas. We should do away with Parties, Party platforms, and what-nots. We must have a new monetary order and until we get one we will get nowhere. Until we subsidize properly our protective commodities in the way of foodstuffs and clothing there is no hope for us. Our friends of the Opposition say that it is necessary to have Canberra price fixing—price fixing immutable like the laws of the Medes and Persians. We cannot have half a dozen monetary policies; there should be only one.

I hope our Premier will soon have to start taxing the people of this State, because until he does that he will not be the representative of a sovereign State. We could have a monetary policy agreed to by the States with the States administering it, and if necessary retaining price fixing. We get snarled up with authorities associated with price fixing. We have one at Canberra and we have one in each State. I feel sorry for our Prices Commissioners. They are the most hardly used people in Australia. They get kicked to death by everybody when the price of a commodity goes up,

but it is not their fault because they are victims of a system. There is nothing to guide them. If I go to the Prices Commissioner and say, "There are my costs; the basic wage has gone up 13s. My costs have increased and I have a legitimate claim for increasing prices," and he agrees I probably would be allowed to increase them. The Commissioner has no control over the causes that are producing the upward spiral. That is inevitable until such time as some of the costs are taken out of the price.

Mr. Macgillivray explained how that would be done. Members on both sides of the House are aware of the method, but I want to see one who is brave enough to stand up and advocate it. When I entered this House twelve years ago, three years after Mr. Macgillivray, we used to talk about such things as central bank credit and bank credit. We were laughed to scorn and told that we could not get something for nothing. On the front page of last Saturday's *Mail* the public was told that there would probably be relief in taxation to the extent of 12½ per cent and that the 12½ per cent will probably be made up by bank credits. But how will it be made up? As a debt, which probably will be brought into existence with Treasury bills as a basis or some like form of security. It will become interest bearing, yet it will cost nothing. Have we not been doing that ever since this country was inhabited by white people? Nearly 150 years ago, when colonists came to Australia, there were no roads, bridges and big buildings. There were no railways and the country was not cleared, but down through the years thousands of millions of pounds have been spent on it. Where did that money come from?

Mr. Heaslip—From work.

Mr. QUIRKE—Let us say that years ago Mr. Heaslip took up an area which was covered with scrub—mallee I presume. Although having sufficient to make a start he did not have enough to clear it. The land was pledged to a bank and he was able to obtain a further loan. By the time he had the land cleared the bank had a mortgage over the lot. After he had cleared the ground he started to clear off the mortgage. But how many have failed in that direction? Every time that money was lent it was a direct creation by the lending authority. No intelligent person can deny that. Banks lend from deposits. I have some figures with me from last

month's statistical bulletin of the Commonwealth Bank which shows the amount of trading banks' deposits as £1,246 million, with permitted advances of £667 million—55.6 per cent of their deposits. The Commonwealth Bank's deposits totalled £116,600,000 and advances £158,900,000 or 136 per cent of its deposits. The Commonwealth Bank has the whole of Australia for security. I am not criticizing that, but the statement of people who say that banks do not create credit today.

Mr. Brookman—Should a man not pay off a mortgage after he has cleared his land?

Mr. QUIRKE—I was using that as an illustration to show where the money came from. His work on the property was "monetized." That is where the thousands of millions, representing all the money in Australia today, came from. Every penny of that money came into existence as a debt and was credit expansion. I want that method put into operation costlessly to stop the upward spiral of prices and, to the extent that there are subsidies, bring prices down to the people. After prices have been brought down increases in wages will stop.

Mr. Brookman—Hasn't extra production something to do with it?

Mr. QUIRKE—No. America had all the production in the world, and is still getting it, but has as much unemployment as any country. I am not against production. If anybody, by some legerdemain, filled all the stores in Adelaide and every barn in the country with grain today, as in 1928-30, its only effect would be to provide a little more wheat for overseas.

Mr. Heaslip—With plenty of buyers.

Mr. QUIRKE—What does that mean? During the depression we exported wheat at 1s. 6d. a bushel. It probably produced as much then as it would at 7s. 6d. a bushel today. Mr. Heaslip's argument is that the pound is worth only 7s. That is a lot of rot. If the pound is based on what it purchased in 1939 we will have so much less. But we will never return to 1939 conditions and never again will there be a basic wage of £3 10s. a week in Australia. The purchasing power of the pound is what it will buy today. We can increase its purchasing power by stopping the upward spiral, the only way of doing so being by subsidies. In 1940 the basic wage was £3 17s. and in 1948 it was £5 11s. Naturally, during that period there were subsidies—to the extent of £35,000,000. That amount did not include

subsidies to the dairy industry or on superphosphate. It was only on direct foodstuffs. Mr. Chifley was beaten in his desire and said, "If I cannot control the machinery, you will not get the subsidy." From that minute up went the cost spiral.

Mr. Geoffrey Clark—He had high taxation to pay those subsidies.

Mr. QUIRKE—The honourable member is taxation minded. In 1952, four years after the lifting of subsidies, there was a basic wage of £11 4s., an increase of £5 13s., or 2s. over 100 per cent on what the basic wage was when subsidies operated. That is the answer to the question. Until we return to that we will not stop the upward spiral. Not one of these tame economists, and others not so tame, some of whom should be caged with the lions, has a genuine security plan for stopping inflation. They are sterile and it is a pity that they did not remain like it. Unless we do this job, both for Australia and England, we will be taking part in the final dissolution of the Old Country. It will be no use our making displays of loyalty to the young Queen of England if we are to take part in battering England to death. But that is what we are doing today. I have never been able to understand how a policy, which is sound in relation to America, is unsound in relation to England.

We are told that we must have in England a built-up pool of credit and that if we purchase to the extent that no credit is left we will be faced with a horrible situation that cannot continue. Why can't it continue and what ill-effects will it have? Is it any worse than crawling to America and having a swash-buckling president of an American bank coming to Australia to see how we spent the last loan before giving us more? We may borrow 150,000,000 dollars from America, but what do we get for it? Machinery, diesel tractors, petrol, and such commodities, but we are left with a debt in perpetuity which we will never be allowed to pay off. When the war broke out and the England about which we talk so much had her back to the wall and her young manhood was being killed one at a time in the skies over the North Sea, we were trading on a cash-and-carry basis, America giving us war materials provided we paid for them, which we did by selling every British security held in America. Only when the last dollar had been extracted were we given lend lease status. By then the Americans had destroyed what were classed as England's invisible exports; today

invisible exports are being built up in Australia, and we are allowing the process to continue.

We can take from England all that England is prepared to give and all that we are prepared to import; if we do not pay for it in full, we can pay for as much as we are able and in the same way as the Australians were paid when we had a credit balance of over £800,000,000 in England. Did it occur at that time to our orthodox friends how the gardener, the wheat farmer, and the pastoralist were paid for their exports to England when England owed us £800,000,000? Did those producers have to wait for their money until such time as England exported goods, the proceeds for which paid for our exports? Of course not, for the debts to primary producers for the millions of pounds worth of wool, wheat, dairy produce, and other commodities were met by the Commonwealth Bank and paid in Australia, the debt remaining over there. England can do the same with regard to the payment to her people for the materials we require and for which we are told we cannot pay, because we cannot export sufficient. This system of finance is hurrying on that dastardly international scheme which seeks the final dissolution of the Old Country.

We know that England must manufacture and export or go under as a nation, and we are helping to put her under by refusing to take her products, because, we say, we have not sufficient credit over there. We are told that increasing imports from Britain is an unsound economic policy, but it is considered sound to build up a debt in perpetuity with the money bags of the United States. We owe allegiance to the young Queen of England, but we must see that it is a proper allegiance and that we do nothing to destroy the Realm over which she is Monarch.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I assure members that, although I do not intend to discuss all the topics introduced in this debate, their remarks will be brought to the attention of the departments concerned and, as in the past, any useful suggestion will, if practicable, be put into effect. I join with other members in expressing deep regret at the death of King George VI., and also my admiration for and loyalty to our new Queen. I believe the British Monarchy holds a unique place in the affections of the British people, and, when we see—as we have seen recently—the spectacle of a King obliged to abdicate because he has lost the respect of his people and, incidentally, of the whole world, we value the high tradition set

up by our Royal Family over many years—a tradition of service to the nation founded on a Constitutional Monarchy. It is significant that, no matter how much we may vary in our political views, all sections of this great Empire look with one accord to the Monarchy as one of the great stable features of our Empire.

I must express a few words of appreciation of Sir Willoughby and Lady Norrie who have left us so that Sir Willoughby may take up his appointment as Governor-General of New Zealand. I suppose I can claim a more personal knowledge of Sir Willoughby's work than perhaps any other South Australian citizen, and I say without fear or hesitation that the service he gave to South Australia was equalled by none in conscientious endeavour. He knew neither class nor creed but gave his service to the State and to all, setting a high tradition, which I hope will be emulated by his successors.

I have sometimes heard it said, "What value comes out of a long Address in Reply debate?" Personally, I think much value comes out of it, particularly if the speeches are directed to solving the big problems of the day, and today we are probably confronted with more difficult problems than we have faced at any time since the end of World War II.—economic problems arising from many causes. The solutions of some of these problems are within the scope of this Parliament, others may be within the scope of the Federal Parliament, and yet others probably have international implications. It stands to reason that the free nations of the world cannot dissipate thousands of millions of pounds every year in preparing for defence without its having some very great economic repercussions, and one of the great tragedies in the world today is the fact that, although we successfully won the war, we are confronted with other dangers and by other nations, which are not prepared to live at peace and harmony with other countries but want to force their particular ideology on us, and enslave us just as surely as the German Nazi Government of the 1930's and early 1940's wanted to enslave the people of Europe. In these circumstances we have no alternative but to rise and protect ourselves, but such action must have tremendous economic and social consequences on all concerned.

The Leader of the Opposition commenced his speech by referring to a report that had emanated in his district to the effect that, because it was represented by a member of the Opposition, it did not progress and develop to

the same extent as if it had been represented by a Government supporter. I was pleased that Mr. O'Halloran said that he did not believe that, for the political life of this State would be coming to a low ebb indeed if that type of policy emanated from this place.

Mr. O'Halloran—That is precisely what I said.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes, and, if members will look at the notable developments with which the Government has had some influence in the last few years, they will see that they are widespread and have been dominated by economic rather than political factors. As a notable example, Port Augusta, which is very ably represented by the member for Stuart, is at present the scene of tremendous public expenditure. I remember not many years ago when Mr. Riches rose in his place and asked whether the State Bank would assist in the erection of houses at Port Augusta. I took up the matter with the State Bank Board at that time and was informed that it did not intend to build houses in Port Augusta as it considered it a decadent town; but what is the position today? A magnificent power station is speedily rising in an area that was previously a marsh. Not only is it taking definite shape—it will come into production in 1954—but the plans and specifications for a second power station are now being prepared, because it must be operating by about 1958 to meet the requirements of this State. This further scheme is not, as the member for Adelaide would have members believe, something mythical, for, when I announced that the second power station was to be erected at Port Augusta I said that the work on plans and specifications for it was to actively proceed. As I listened to the member for Adelaide my mind went back only a few years to the day when I announced, to the very great merriment of the world, that the time would come when Port Augusta would have a power station supplying South Australia. At that time the Adelaide Electric Supply Company pooh-pooched the idea as being something that could never happen, and members opposite showed a good deal of scepticism on the subject.

Mr. O'Halloran—You depended on members on this side to carry the South Australian Electricity Trust Bill.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes, but members opposite will always support me when I am right. The electricity to be produced at Port Augusta will be the cheapest in this State. It will, in fact, have a very marked effect in the future in stabilizing the cost of electricity

throughout the State. The point I am making at the moment is that that power station is not being established in a district represented by a Liberal member but in a district represented by a Labor member. A new undertaking is to be established in Port Pirie, again an electorate represented by a Labor member. Mines upon which millions of pounds will ultimately be spent are located in the district represented by the Leader of the Opposition. The fact that those deposits were located in his district did not prevent the Government from having them investigated when many people were sceptical as to any real development's taking place. That investigation went on just as surely as if the mines had been in a district represented by a member with any other brand of political thought.

Mr. O'Halloran—With the enthusiastic support of the Opposition.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—With the very enthusiastic support of the Leader of the Opposition. If the Address in Reply debate concludes in time I propose to introduce the Loan Estimates tomorrow. Members know that at this time Loan money is not the most plentiful commodity available to State Treasurers, but I will leave them to judge when the Loan Estimates are introduced whether the money that is available is being fairly spread over the length and breadth of the State. I think that will give the answer to the comment that was made and which the Leader of the Opposition hastily declaimed as being inaccurate. However, the honourable member, in his enthusiasm to prove his argument on another matter, got away from the facts. I particularly refer to his statements concerning rural development. The Leader of the Opposition said that great centralization had taken place in South Australia and that it was leading to the development of a large metropolitan area and had resulted in reductions in primary production. He then tried to prove his point by citing the number of holdings that existed some years ago and went on to illustrate his case by comparing the production of wheat in the years 1938-39 with that in 1950-51. Those years are significant because my Government has been in office during that time. I am happy that the Leader of the Opposition chose those dates and happy that he chose this topic because he will remember that wheat has had fluctuating fortunes in the last few years. Prior to the depression the Commonwealth Government had a slogan "Grow more wheat." It was even used to

cancel postage stamps, but it led to the biggest tragedy that ever happened to the wheat industry. As the last speaker stated, South Australia has a limited area of good agricultural country. If that limited area is to be managed wisely it will not be overcropped, but the area under wheat is not the predominating thing in our agricultural State. Of course, that is significant, but the returns and the state of the land from which the wheat is being produced are more significant. I shall quote the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition on this matter. I will not quote them all because I do not think he would like me to.

Mr. O'Halloran—I should be very happy if you would quote me in full, because I do not like sentences to be taken from their context.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I think the Leader of the Opposition will agree that these statements are not being taken from their context, just as he has not yet disagreed with my summary of his remarks so far. The honourable member said:—

Whilst this centralization has been proceeding primary production and land settlement generally have had a sorry tale to tell.

I think those remarks aptly summarize his contentions.

Mr. O'Halloran—Hear, hear!

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—What are the facts? One of my colleagues has already quoted figures in regard to agricultural production in this State and I know he will pardon me if I repeat some of them. Firstly, as stated by the Leader of the Opposition, the number of wheat farms in South Australia—and these are figures supplied to me by the Government Statist—fell from 11,842 to 8,416. The number of landholders dropped from 31,000 to 28,000; but although the number of holdings have decreased the total area of those holdings has increased. The fact is that there have been changes in ownership, but the total area of the holdings increased from 144,000,000 acres to 153,000,000.

Mr. O'Halloran—You are lumping pastoral and agricultural areas together.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No, I am dealing with the same points that the Leader of the Opposition raised. The Government Statist has supplied me with those figures, so I am quoting the same authority as did the honourable member.

Mr. O'Halloran—In any event, those figures support my contentions about aggregation of holdings.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will deal with that in a moment. What the Leader of the Opposition has not appreciated as a result of his blind enthusiasm to try to secure a political point is that the methods of farming in South Australia have changed enormously since 1939. While the area of agricultural holdings has increased the areas under production have increased. This is mainly the result of the employment of modern machinery which enables the economic unit to be of a different size from what it was in 1939. In 1938-39 there were less than 6,000 tractors in South Australia, but in 1950-51 there were over 16,000. The number of tractors in use has therefore increased by about 150 per cent. The whole basis of farming is dependent to a large extent, as the Leader of the Opposition said, upon mechanization. In 1938-39 there were only 684 milking machines in the State. That was when my Government first came into power. The poor unfortunate dairyman could not then afford to purchase a milking machine. In 1950-51 there were 4,590 milking machines in South Australia, and no doubt there are many more now because the State has continued to prosper. There were only 16,000 stationary engines in 1938-39, but today there are nearly 24,000. The number of shearing machines was negligible before the war, but now there are 8,000. Rotary hoes number 1,286 and there are now 900 hay presses and balers. Before my Government came into office primary producers could not afford those things.

Mr. O'Halloran—With all this progress there are 3,000 fewer people on the land.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will deal with that point in a moment. Mechanical potato diggers were unknown in 1938-39, but today 427 are being used by primary producers. The member for Mount Gambier would agree that potato diggers enable a farmer to grow potatoes not by the rod but by the acre.

Mr. O'Halloran—And that has led to the highest prices we have ever paid for potatoes.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—And to what may even be an embarrassing surplus in potato supplies. The Leader of the Opposition will see that the whole basis of his argument was wrong. While it is true that the acreage under wheat dropped between 1938-39 and 1950-51 from 3,000,000 to 1,800,000, the actual production of wheat only dropped from 31,600,000 to 30,900,000 bushels, an insignificant reduction. The figures for 1951-52 are not available in every instance, but where they are I will give them. In 1951-52 there was a further fall in the

area under wheat to 1,600,000 acres, but the fall in the production of wheat has again been insignificant as 27,305,000 bushels were reaped.

Mr. Riches—Extreme seasons have had something to do with it.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The methods of farming have had most to do with it. Bad farming makes bad seasons.

Mr. O'Halloran—Wouldn't you agree that rainfall has a lot to do with it?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes, but one can go into farming districts in seasons of low rainfall and find one farmer with a good return, whereas the neighbour has experienced a failure.

Mr. O'Halloran—There is a lot in that.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Good farming, to a certain extent at least, nullifies the adverse effects of a season. Let me deal with other forms of production upon which the Leader of the Opposition was significantly silent. The acreage under barley increased from 457,000 in 1938-9 to 764,000 in 1950-51, and to 831,000 acres in 1951-52. The Leader of the Opposition forgot all about that.

Mr. O'Halloran—I was afraid of the criticism of the Prohibitionists.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—And during that period the production of barley increased from 7,500,000 bushels to 16,800,000, but that had escaped Mr. O'Halloran's notice.

Mr. O'Halloran—No, it didn't. Again I was afraid of the criticism of Prohibitionists.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—In the same period the area sown to oats increased from 266,000 to 387,000 acres and production rose from 2,400,000 to 5,400,000 bushels. The plantings of cereal rye advanced from 5,000 acres to 45,000 acres and production increased from 18,000 to 206,000 bushels.

Mr. O'Halloran—That was introduced in that period as a soil conservation measure.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I appreciate that, but nevertheless it was production and it does not show what the honourable member was trying to prove was the position—"this sorry state of affairs." That was a figment of the honourable member's imagination. I shall give other figures. The number of sheep increased from 9,900,000 to 10,100,000 and cattle from 318,000 to 432,000. Wool production rose from 102,000,000 to 114,000,000 lb.

Mr. O'Halloran—You will admit that during the period we had the best pastoral seasons on record.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The honourable member was telling us that it was "a sorry state of affairs" and now he says it is all due

to the good seasons. He has changed his tune. We have heard much about the decline in milk production. That is generally true. In the Labor States milk production has tumbled; South Australia is the only State in which production is increasing. Here it advanced from 72,000,000 to 83,000,000 gallons in the period under review.

Mr. O'Halloran—Tell what happened in the Labor-governed States.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I do not propose to quote figures for the whole of Australia.

Mr. O'Halloran—You make a broad statement without any support.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The honourable member knows that I am correct in saying that periodically in the eastern States they have been unable to produce enough butter for their own population.

Mr. O'Halloran—We have been in the same position here.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Pastures top-dressed in the period under review increased from 1,095,000 acres to 1,859,000, and this is the "sorry state of affairs" the Leader of the Opposition would have us believe was brought to pass! Let me give further figures to show how the country is going to rack and ruin! Timber production from State forests has gone up from 18,000,000 super feet a year to 99,000,000. The value of mineral production has advanced from £3,300,000 to £5,400,000 and here again this is the "sorry state of affairs" of our primary industries. As a matter of fact, the Leader of the Opposition picked out the only industry he could find where there had been any significant decline in production as the one upon which to base the whole of his argument.

Mr. O'Halloran—I also mentioned population figures.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—This is what the honourable said:—

The Playford Government has been in office since 1939 and it has had a majority in both Houses. With that majority it had the power to do anything it wished to bring about decentralization of population and industry, to assist our primary industries, and to help in the establishment of new industries in country areas. I realize that during the war little could be done, but the war has been over for a long time and nothing has been done since. In fact the position is rather the reverse, for all the industries which could be attracted to South Australia have been established in and around the metropolitan area.

Actually, the Playford Government has been in office since 1938. It could not do very much about the position during the war, but since

then industries have been crammed into the metropolitan area—that in effect is what the honourable member says. Let me give a set of figures which I think will completely alter his view upon that matter. The number of South Australian country factory employees in 1938 was 7,000, and in 1950-51 it was 11,128, an increase of more than 50 per cent, and this happened, according to the honourable member's own statement, since the war. It could not have happened during the war because we had no say in the position during that period. After more than 100 years of progress in this State the number of country factory employees amounted to 7,000, but in the following period of six years at the most the number has been added to by more than 50 per cent.

Mr. O'Halloran—But of course in the years from 1939 to 1952 the population had increased by about 10 per cent.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No-one denies that the population has increased and that is all for the better. Fortunately, Australia is still a free country and the Government does not order the people where they are to live. If they want to live in the country they can, and if they desire to live in the metropolitan area the Government is not going to set up a dictatorship and say, "You are not to live here, but must live somewhere else." So far as I am concerned, they can live in the environment they choose.

Mr. O'Halloran—You created the environment in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I did not create the environment. As the honourable member knows, more Government-sponsored country housing has been undertaken during the last seven years than ever before in our history. If the honourable member wants statistics I will readily supply them tomorrow when I bring down the Loan Estimates and show the extent of Government-sponsored housing. I make this offer to the honourable member—if my figures do not double those of the previous 100 years, I will give him a garden party. He put forward some suggestions for the development of country areas and I think that part of his speech was worthy of analysis, but even if it is analysed, it does not carry very much weight. I have found that the mere cutting up of the land in the State does not of itself result in an advantage to the community unless more effective methods are introduced to achieve greater production. The mere changing of the ownership from John Smith to Tom Brown does not make any economic difference to the

State unless the change results in greater production from that area, and I think the Leader of the Opposition will agree that that is substantially correct.

Mr. O'Halloran—I agree with that.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—In my electoral district was an area that previously carried sheep. An earlier Government took that land over and subdivided it into fruit blocks, and as a result there was probably a thousand per cent greater production from the area and the population carried was also increased a thousand per cent. There was an economic advantage from that. I could also quote instances of the State's having cut up land and where previously there had been one wheat farmer the number had been increased to three. As usual before long one of the wheatgrowers finds himself in difficulty and sells out, and the total area reverts to two wheat properties. Shortly afterwards another one finds himself in difficulties and sells out to the remaining one of the three, and so the land reverts to one holding, and all of the expenditure by the State has been wasted. The solution offered by the Leader of the Opposition is to take land away from its present owners and give it to others, but that is not a solution unless it is accompanied by a change in the production of the area in question. In some instances that change will take place. For example, in areas suitable for dairying but held for pasturing that change could come about, but that is precisely what our legislation provides for. Underdeveloped areas, subject to the sanction of a Parliamentary Committee, can be taken over, subdivided and settled, and the Government is only too anxious to have such land brought under its notice. I know that every member here wants to sponsor soldier settlement, but they are not one bit more anxious to do so than the Minister of Lands, himself a returned soldier.

Mr. Ritches—That is only land for sale.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No, land can be compulsorily acquired and, what is more, acquired on the basis of its present production value.

Mr. O'Halloran—How many areas have been referred to the committee in the last two years?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Off hand I do not know, although I could probably find out, but if any member, or any organization of returned soldiers, any district council or any other authoritative body knows of any area that it believes to be suitable for subdivision

under these conditions the Government will be only too happy to have it referred to the committee if amicable negotiation are unsuccessful. The practice has already been put into operation, and it has been very effective. It will have a very important bearing on the development of this State, particularly in areas of high rainfall in the South-East.

I am very sorry that members of the Opposition did not pay more attention to the economic problems of the day than to furthering propaganda for the next election. In Australia we have been going forward very quickly indeed. The development that has taken place, not only in this State, but in all States, and indeed in other countries of the free world, has been phenomenal since the war. In Australia it has been brought about fundamentally by one or two factors. The first of importance is that during the war we had made available to us technical assistance from abroad which normally would not have been available—indeed, would have been withheld from us—and which increased our factory efficiency and general know-how more in three years than normally would have been the case in 20. This was not confined to one type of industry but extended into every phase of industrial activity. As a result factory production in Australia has been enlarged in almost every direction. I remember that in 1938 one quite frequently heard discussion on whether or not a motor car could be manufactured in Australia, and it was freely asserted that it could not possibly be done successfully. Not only are motor cars now made in great numbers but we are now making the most modern aeroplanes produced in the world and doing it as a matter of course. This sort of thing is not peculiar to the engineering industries, but something of which every industry has had its share.

Mr. O'Halloran—Because you had competent workmen receptive to new ideas.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The member for Adelaide last night appeared to hold the view that the efforts of employees in South Australia were not appreciated by the Government or members on this side. I have on many occasions spoken to South Australian audiences on the question of the development of industries in South Australia and never have I placed second the fact that the big advance that has taken place arises from our good fortune in having here factory workers second to none in the Commonwealth.

Mr. O'Halloran—You are disowning your supporters now.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I am not. Many of the remarks of my colleagues have been distorted to appear to be something never intended. What has enabled South Australia to make the great progress it has? Why is it that South Australia from being, in values, the lowest producer per head of population in 1938, is now the second highest, if not equal with the highest, which is Victoria?

Mr. O'Halloran—The answer would be a more balanced production.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The answer, predominantly, is the efficiency and stability of the South Australian workman, and I have said that on many occasions. I go further; a part of that stability has been brought about by the fact that our industrial unions have been much more wisely led than the majority in other States. One has only to see the figures relating to time lost per worker in the various Australian States to see what a big advantage it has been to industry here to have that stability in its manufacturing processes. I think the Western Australian figures were remarkably good until the recent disastrous strike there, but at one time New South Wales had 200 per cent more industrial stoppages per worker than we had, and that is significant from the point of view of industrial efficiency. This Parliament and my Government, and the Opposition for that matter, have all assisted and supported the development of industry here, but that is not the predominating factor; it is that we have been able to get a production cost which could never have been achieved unless our factory operatives were effective. What is it that enables a firm like General Motors-Holdens or Chrysler-Dodge-De Soto Corporation or British Tube Mills to bring their steel requirements from Newcastle to South Australia, manufacture their commodities here and send them back to be sold in the eastern States, with all the high transportation costs involved, and remembering that the fuel which generates electricity for industry also has to be brought here? The only reason is that there has been an efficiency in production not achieved in the eastern States.

Earlier this session I was asked whether I believed it would be practicable to revert to a 44-hour week and whether my Government intended to support in the Arbitration Court an application to that end. My reply was that I did not propose to take such action as I did not think it was feasible at present, so to say that we desire to effect something at the expense of the worker is incorrect. I listened to the member for Adelaide very attentively

last night and on most occasions he referred to the Government. I do not know whether he meant the Government, but what we should strive to do in Australia is to get an effective 40 hours' work. In many industries we are not getting it.

Mr. O'Halloran—Do you say we are not getting it in South Australia?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No, I meant in many industries which have an impact upon South Australia there is not an effective 40 hours of work. I can speak from personal knowledge because I went down the mines in New South Wales to see the conditions, and we are not getting it in the coal industry.

Mr. Lawn—With record production today?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I know all about that. We get some of that coal in South Australia. The member for Stanley referred to the fact that he had received an inferior shipment of coal from Leigh Creek. Unfortunately, with a large mechanized plant, this does occur where there is an interspersion of shale in the coal seam, but I can assure the honourable member that every step practicable is being taken to prevent shale coming in. The coal we were getting from New South Wales before the war was normally of a standard of 11,500 h.t.u.'s whereas frequently today it is less than 10,000. Only last week representatives of the Coal Board and coal owners were in this State and they admitted that there were most deplorable conditions in the coal industry. They said that this muck was forwarded to us because coal was urgently needed for ships at Newcastle and no other coal was available. There is a substantial quantity of coal at grass in New South Wales. It is on the western field and is the result of open cut mining. Unfortunately we have been told we must take our share of it. It is inferior and it will cost over £7 a ton.

Mr. Lawn—That is not the fault of the workers.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The increase in coal production in New South Wales has been largely brought about by mechanization. When there is some shale associated with coal and a large plant operates there must inevitably be low grade coal. In 1938 we could get coal landed at Osborne for 37s. a ton; now it costs over £5 a ton. In many industries we should strive to get an effective 40-hour week. Probably no country in the world has a greater production per unit of labour than the United States of America, which is on a 40-hour week. I do not say that there is something inherently

wrong with a 40-hour week, but we should have an effective 40-hour week, and that view is held by many of my supporters. In the main I support the remarks of my colleagues in this Address in Reply debate, but there is one to which I want to particularly refer. It was unhappily made this afternoon by Mr. Pattinson, the Government Whip. For the information particularly of the new member opposite, I point out that this shows how a member on this side of the House can speak at variance with Government policy. Mr. Pattinson is closely associated with the Government, yet he made a statement today with which I completely disagree. He referred to remarks made in the House of Representatives in 1942 by Mr. Calwell when he supported the Uniform Tax Bill.

Mr. Lawn—How did you manage to get a verbatim copy of his remarks so quickly?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I asked the honourable member for Glenelg to supply it, and I told him that I completely disagreed with what he said. Mr. Pattinson said that Mr. Calwell's remarks were:—

Tonight we are participating in an historic incident. We are considering legislation which will fundamentally affect the future of Australia because it will inevitably result in the destruction of the States as we know them. They might linger superfluous a little longer, but they will lose their rights to impose income tax. They will become mendicants existing on the bounty of the Commonwealth. They will in effect be on the dole and for all practical purposes they will cease to exist as States.

These remarks show the aspirations of the Federal Labor Party. Mr. Calwell is the Deputy Leader of the Labor Party in the Commonwealth Parliament. I believe he may have aspirations to go higher than that.

Mr. Lawn—He was not Deputy Leader then.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No. They liked his remarks so much that they promoted him. Mr. Calwell frankly and brutally said that his Party would support the Bill because it would wipe out the States. I believe that is the fundamental policy of the Labor Party.

Mr. O'Halloran—I remember one State Premier saying that under a Liberal Government we had reached an all-time low in Federal and State financial relationships.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes. I said that myself but it does not mean that I believe in wiping out State Parliaments. Mr. Pattinson went on to say, "How true Mr. Calwell's words spoken 10 years ago proved to be, and how uncannily accurate was the prophecy made

by Mr. Deakin 50 years ago." I do not think Mr. Calwell's remarks will ever come true. The State Governments are now closer to the people. At State elections the Opposition bring in Federal issues as much as possible. They did it at the last Gawler by-election.

Mr. O'Halloran—No.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes. They had on the job every Commonwealth politician they could get. I know that our friends opposite like to introduce Commonwealth issues into the State sphere. They can continue to do it, but this Parliamentary institution will live. Mr. Calwell said that the uniform tax legislation would kill the States. He said:—

They will in effect be on the dole and for all practical purposes they will cease to exist as States.

Mr. Macgillivray—That part is correct.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No. State Governments are now much closer to the people than the Commonwealth Government. Two things are fundamental in good government. Firstly, the Government must be close to the people and, secondly, it must be able to hear the voice of the people.

Mr. O'Halloran—That is denied in South Australia.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No. I have been listening patiently to the voice of the people for many years. This State Parliament will live. All attempts to broaden the Federal sphere by means of a referendum have failed miserably. The exuberance we used to see for the holding of a referendum is no longer seen. Far from killing the States uniform taxation has made them.

Mr. O'Halloran—It has made South Australia.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It has emphasized to the people what are the functions of the State, and it has also had the effect of quickly showing that the system was wrong and that it could not live. When uniform taxation was first introduced I organized opposition to it. I said it was fundamentally wrong and organized an attack on it by the States in the High Court. At that time we were in danger of being invaded by Japanese forces, and everything was set against the States getting a decision favourable to them. I said after we had lost the case in the High Court that the time would come when the Commonwealth would fling uniform taxation back into our faces. I said that only a few weeks ago in answer to a question by an honourable member.

At the last Premiers' Conference the Prime Minister came out with his trump card and said, "We will give you back your taxing authority" and I said, "Let us have it tomorrow because it is the only way to restore balanced judgment in our political life. It will give the States the power to carry out their functions in a proper way and then if they do not do that they have only themselves to blame." What is the position today? I have criticized the Commonwealth Government strongly in connection with the Loan programme. The present programme is not in keeping with the times. When there is rising unemployment steps should be taken to absorb the unemployed. When I introduce the Loan programme tomorrow I shall have to introduce one designed not to meet changing times, but one which has been curtailed. If the Prime Minister were here tonight I would tell him frankly that the policy is wrong and is not in keeping with times. Now that I have said that, I point out that I have the greatest sympathy for Commonwealth Governments generally, because when uniform taxation was adopted it automatically put the States on the back of the Commonwealth. It is easy for the Prime Minister to say that the States were on his back for finance. They had to go to him for money. What are the facts? The State's borrowing powers were taken away by the Commonwealth. Where else could we go for the Loan money? The revenues were taken by the Commonwealth Government. Where else could we go for revenue? The system is wrong and cannot live. I join issue with the member for Glenelg in the statements he made. I do not believe that Mr. Calwell's statement was prophetic; it was very short-sighted. It was the statement of Socialist who desired to accomplish these things without having studied their implication. This institution will be here, flourishing and serving the people long after we and Mr. Calwell are forgotten.

I thank members for the attention they have given to the debate and assure them that all the speeches will be carefully analysed by the departments concerned and if it is possible to give effect to solutions suggested they will be adopted.

Mr. TAPPING secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.47 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, July 31, at 2.00 p.m.