

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, August 5, 1953.

The SPEAKER (Hon. Sir Robert Nicholls) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.**TREE PLANTING PROJECTS.**

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I find that considerable public interest is manifested in a recent statement by the Premier regarding the necessity to plant more trees in South Australia. The Opposition wholeheartedly supports this policy. Can the Premier give more details of what the Government has in mind—whether it is to be an extension of our Government afforestation programme, or is something intended to be done through local governing bodies, or as is practised in some countries, particularly the United States of America, will trees be planted along main highways? While I was in America I found that considerable assistance was given to private land-owners in the way of technical assistance and advice on how to care for the trees in the regeneration of natural timbers on their properties. Can the Premier give more ample details of the proposals he has in mind?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The proposals I had in mind went beyond the normal afforestation programme the State at present carried out. As members are well aware, the Government is planting in blocks for commercial purposes about 4,000 acres of trees each year, mainly in the South-East and in other high rainfall areas. That is a compact afforestation programme and does little if anything to provide for the general beautification of the State. What I had in mind was something in the form of a general tree-planting proposal. Some years ago Parliament passed legislation to enable the State to assist local governing bodies in afforestation projects and very generous financial provision was provided. For some reason of which I am not sure, generally advantage was not taken of that legislation.

Mr. Riches—They can't afford to.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The proposition has never been reported to me in that way, nor, I think, if the honourable member looked at the financial implications of the Act would he repeat his remark. I believe that the strongest support should be given to providing for avenues of trees along some of our main highways. For example, some considerable time ago the Government purchased additional land along the Gawler Road to permit of any

necessary widening, and I believe that an avenue of trees along that road is the sort of project we should encourage in every possible way. I have asked the president of the Tree Planters' Association if that body will consider my general remarks of a few days ago and submit to me what it believes to be the best method by which the Government could assist this project. The association is holding a meeting tomorrow and as soon as I have some concrete proposals from that organization I will be pleased to submit them to Cabinet. I express appreciation of the outlook of the Opposition as indicated by its leader; it is not a Party matter in any sense. I believe that we can give a lead, and perhaps some financial support, from this place in an effort to make our citizens more tree conscious, for I am quite convinced from observations overseas that nothing but good could accrue. In every country I visited I saw a wealth of trees and realized that trees were valued in a way they are not in Australia. Given such a lead I feel that the deficiency of trees, which is a serious one in our State, could be overcome.

Mr. RICHES—Considerable interest has been taken in the northern areas in the Premier's suggestion. Will he cause an investigation to be made into the possibility of concentrating on the planting of indigenous trees as there is a strong feeling that quite a lot of the northern areas could be brought back into tree production if trees native to the area were planted? Care would be required for the first few years, but we are quite convinced, as the result of experiments being conducted in the growth of trees in the dry areas of Victoria, that much of this work could be done also in South Australia. Will the Premier, in addition to seeking the advice of the Tree Planters' Association, either make a recommendation to it or himself obtain information regarding the possibility of the regeneration of many of our own native trees?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—When I say that the Tree Planters' Association has upon it such authorities as the Director of the Botanic Gardens (Mr. Lothian) and the Director of Parks and Gardens (Mr. Bone), he will realize that those authorities would appreciate to the full the necessity for planting trees known to be suitable to the areas in which they are to be planted. I entirely agree with the honourable member that it would be a great waste of public money and quite futile to try to grow trees in South Australia which were not characteristic of the State. The type of

deciduous trees grown in the high rainfall areas of northern Europe and America would not be suitable in Australia; we have to get back to trees and shrubs known to exist and thrive here. I assure the honourable member that the Tree Planters' Association comprises men of wide experience and I feel sure that full weight will be given to his suggestions.

VETERINARY SURGEONS ACT.

Mr. HAWKER—My question relates to a regulation which has been laid on the table of the House, and which refers to canvassing under the Veterinary Surgeons Act. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether a veterinary surgeon, veterinary practitioner, or veterinary permit holder can advertise in the press that he will be at a certain place at a certain time so that the local people may make use of his services whilst he is in the district?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—I discussed this matter with the Crown Law authorities because there was some doubt about it. I am advised that the provisions of the Veterinary Surgeons Act do not prevent a veterinary surgeon, a veterinary practitioner, or a permit holder advertising in the press, provided that such an advertisement shows the person in his correct category, i.e., a veterinary practitioner cannot advertise himself as a surgeon, and a permit holder must only advertise himself as such. Further, a person who has a permit to treat animals for disease and injury for reward would be able to treat animals only in the area prescribed in his permit.

DEQUETTEVILLE TERRACE LIGHTING.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Has the Minister of Works obtained an answer to the question I asked on July 30 about the lighting of Dequetteville Terrace, Kent Town?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Yes, and it is an amplification of what I said in my original reply, namely, that the Government, through the Highways Commissioner, has power only to spend £5,000 on each of two roads, Anzac Highway and the Port Road, which are not regarded as purely the province and responsibility of local government. The Highways Commissioner has supplied the following more detailed information:—

Dequetteville Terrace is not a proclaimed main road, and, in common with other public roads in the locality, is vested in and placed under the care, control and management of the Corporation of the City of Kensington and Norwood, one of whose many responsibilities is to cause the streets to be lighted as the council deems requisite.

The report then refers to what I have already said about the responsibility of the Government. It further states:—

As an alternative means of removing the cause of complaint of motor omnibus drivers mentioned by Mr. Dunstan it might be practicable for the trust to fit more effective headlights to the motor omnibuses.

As a result of statutes and by administration this State has caused funds from motor registration, rebates of petrol tax, etc., to be spent on roads. Obviously we cannot give to one unless we take something from another. The essence of the reply is that Dequetteville Terrace is the responsibility of the Norwood and Kensington Council and not of the State Parliament, to put it in the broader sense.

QUALITY OF LEIGH CREEK COAL.

Mr. JENNINGS—Recently I asked the Minister of Works a question about the availability of Leigh Creek coal and, as a result of action taken by him there is now sufficient coal available, but vendors allege there is much shale and rock in the coal they get to distribute. They have to accept it because it is already bagged, but their orders are falling off considerably. Yesterday some of these people approached me and said a truck, believed to be owned by the Premier, called and collected coal that was carefully screened and graded, a large amount of rock having been removed from it. It is not suggested by anyone that the Premier knew anything about this, but will the Minister have a further investigation made to see if the quality of the coal being distributed can be improved?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I regret that the implication is that the Premier could, or should receive any priority; in fact, I heard the reverse, that some coal ordered by him for household purposes contained a great deal of shale. The screening, as far as I know, is not done here, but on the field. The Government's purpose is to see that everybody gets the best coal available. It is regretted that the difference between coal and shale is hardly discernible. What looks like coal is sometimes, unfortunately, not as good as the outside indications represent it to be, but to suggest that some persons would be given the good coal and others inferior is so far wrong that I am surprised the honourable member took the matter up. However, I will have investigations made and bring down a reply, but I assure the honourable member that no preference is given to anybody in relation to quality.

BOOKMAKERS' LICENCES.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Yesterday the Premier submitted a report from the chairman of the Betting Control Board in reply to my question regarding bookmakers' licences, but I was not satisfied with it. It was to some extent evasive, particularly the statement, "It is not desirable to enter further into this matter." Before applications were invited a questionnaire containing, I believe, 35 questions was sent to bookmakers, some of the questions being most personal. Will the Premier request the chairman of the board to amplify the words, "It is not desirable to enter further into this matter," and will he obtain a copy of the questionnaire for me?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Legislation under which the Betting Control Board acts is an expression of the will of Parliament and specifically states that the board shall not give reasons for its decisions. It would be necessary to alter the Act if it is desired to make public the reasons for every refusal to grant an application. Personally, I think it would be most undesirable to state publicly the reason why every application is not approved as it would mean disclosing a large amount of matter that is obtained by the board in pursuance of its duties, including the personal and financial affairs of possibly 200 unsuccessful applicants. The board has a duty to receive and consider applications. Two or three applicants have asked that their cases be re-considered. I brought one such case mentioned to me by an honourable member under the notice of the chairman of the board, who said that the board would be prepared to interview the applicant, and that it had already interviewed a number of appellants. I think it would be unwise to have the affairs of various applicants disclosed to the public. In employing persons in the Government service we do not publish the reasons why certain persons are selected for a position and others overlooked, although frequently the reason could be publicly stated. As regards the second part of the question, I see no reason why the honourable member should not have a copy of particulars required from bookmakers, and I will ask the chairman of the board whether one can be made available.

SHORTAGE OF POWDERED MILK.

Mr. RICHES—Has the Premier obtained a report, as promised, on the distribution of powdered milk in South Australia?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I investigated this matter and obtained the following report from the Chief Storekeeper:—

Nestle's advise that spray dried milk manufactured in Victoria has fallen off greatly due to the unfortunate winter conditions, and therefore mainly due to the lack of milk intake in their factory. They feel, however, that the position is improving and should improve during the summer months. Alternatively, I cannot understand why the country folk in Port Augusta area do not go over, temporarily, to the Farmers' Union product of Roller dried milk, full cream or skimmed quality. Roller dried milk is not as soluble as spray dried. I believe that alternative is in ample supply.

TYPHOID BACTERIA IN DESICCATED COCONUT.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Yesterday the Premier replied to a question regarding the possibility of typhoid germs being spread by the use of desiccated coconut, and today's press reports that Dr. Southwood is preparing a report for the Government. Can the Premier say whether the Minister of Health has received that report, if so, what its contents are?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I understand it takes some time to incubate the bacteria of typhoid in any material. As far as I know the Minister of Health has not yet received any report, and I doubt whether it would be possible for the health authorities to report on this matter for some days, but, of course, as soon as a report is available it will be given the utmost prominence.

GALVANIZED IRON.

Mr. JENNINGS—Has the Premier the further information he promised me on the possible black marketing of galvanized iron?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Prices Commissioner (Mr. McCann) reports:—

The Prices Branch is constantly checking transactions in galvanized iron and as a result has succeeded with one prosecution and has at the present time three other prosecutions pending. Officers of this department peruse advertisements for offers to sell galvanized iron and/or cement and where it is deemed necessary, follow up with investigation. However, it would help the Prices Branch if persons who consider they have been overcharged, would lodge specific complaints for investigation. Black marketing cannot be stamped out unless we have 100 per cent public co-operation.

PORT AUGUSTA HOUSING.

Mr. RICHES—Has the Premier the report, which he promised to obtain, regarding the number of houses to be erected by the Housing Trust at Port Augusta under the Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Chairman of the Housing Trust reports:—

Under arrangements made with the Commonwealth for the construction of houses at Port Augusta by the South Australian Housing Trust under the Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement, it has been arranged that 20 houses being constructed at Port Augusta West and 38 houses at Willsden will be constructed under the agreement, that is, a total of 58 houses. Future houses to be built for rental at Port Augusta will be built under the agreement.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR TUBERCULAR PATIENTS.

Mr. TEUSNER—I understand that financial assistance is provided for tubercular patients while undergoing treatment in Government institutions and follow-up observation. Can the Minister representing the Minister of Health indicate the extent of such assistance, and say whether it is paid irrespective of the means of the patient or is subject to a means test?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The assistance has been provided under an agreement between this State and the Commonwealth, which is designed to eradicate tuberculosis. One problem with regard to the treatment of tuberculosis is that a patient frequently takes a long time to completely throw off the disease. Steps have been taken to provide financial assistance to enable persons to obtain that relief. If the member will supply me with the circumstances surrounding the case he mentioned I will then be able to deal with it specifically and supply a reply.

CEMENT SUPPLIES.

Mr. STOTT—Since his return from abroad the Premier has answered many questions relating to cement supplies. The supply is worse now that it was during the war but allegations have been made in the trade and amongst people requiring cement that the biggest proportion of the available supply is being commandeered by the Housing Trust and other governmental authorities. Private persons, and particularly primary producers, cannot obtain even a bag of cement with which to effect repairs to sheep and water troughs, sheds, houses, garages, etc. I believe that when the position was extremely acute during the war the Premier obtained cement from Tasmania. Has he anything further to report on this matter and will he take steps to ensure a greater supply for consumers?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It is not correct to suggest that the Government has pre-empted

all the cement produced in this State. It is true that the Government is now drawing its supplies from South Australian manufacturers. Last year it imported its requirements of cement at exorbitant prices and by doing so relieved the local market and enabled private persons to purchase the cheaper local cement. The difference between local prices and imported prices was about £10 a ton and as 30,000 to 40,000 tons were involved any suggestion that the Government was unfair to local consumers is completely erroneous. If anything, the position was the reverse. The Government has provided assistance to enable the production of local cement to be accelerated. At present the Government is using increased quantities of cement in important works under construction, one of which is aimed at relieving the city water supply. The possibility of obtaining cement from outside sources is being examined and I believe the first shipment arranged from Tasmania arrived at Port Adelaide yesterday. That comprised about 600 tons and no doubt further shipments will be arranged. It was anticipated when the Government lifted building material restrictions—with the consent of the honourable member—that many people who had been unable to obtain cement for a long time would be seeking it. It is inevitable that for some time requirements will exceed production although South Australian production has almost doubled and its use today is high when compared with world standards. I can assure the honourable member that steps are being taken to import limited quantities to relieve the position.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

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

(Continued from August 4. Page 274.)

Mr. McALEES (Warraroo)—I join with other honourable members in expressing loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen and wishing her a long and happy reign. I also hope that His Excellency the Governor and Lady George will find their stay in South Australia a happy one. They have already become as popular as their immediate predecessors. I complain about the manner in which, on the first day of the session, we were asked to pass a large sum in the Supplementary Estimates. We had a right to question where the money was to be spent, but the member for Torrens, who moved the adoption of the Address in Reply,

went so far as to say that it was audacious for the Opposition to inquire into such questions when the information could be found in the press. In other words, we were expected to go to the *Advertiser* and wait on the doorstep for the next issue to ascertain that information. The Opposition is not built that way, and we are not here for that purpose. It is our duty to ascertain the true position; had the Government explained it earlier the sitting would not have continued until such a late hour.

Housing is a matter of great importance, not only in my district, but in other parts of the State. I was astounded to hear the remarks of the member for Goodwood concerning the extravagance of the Housing Trust. I feel sure that if the Kelly gang still existed and saw what was going on they would have blushed. The trust has spent huge sums buying blocks, some of which will probably never be built on. In one instance an area was offered to the trust for £18,000, but it was refused, and a Mr. Nitschke bought it and subsequently sold it to the trust for £75,000. What wonderful business people the trust must be!

Mr. Stephens—It happened in the Port Adelaide district in two instances.

Mr. McALEES—That shows how the trust is squandering money. For two years the Opposition advocated the appointment of a Minister of Housing. The Premier is in charge of this activity, but he already has too many other jobs. In Wallaroo, Moonta, and Kadina the people are a law unto themselves. Some time ago there was a very distressing case in Wallaroo and I approached the trust to get something done for this family, but I might as well have talked to the pictures on the wall. The trust officials were very civil, but there was nothing doing. Later I found that one of the tenants had left a trust home to live in another part of the world. The house was vacant for a month, despite that others were anxious to occupy it. The trust said that the rent had been paid on it and the tenant would be ready to go in as soon as he got his furniture. The month passed and he duly occupied the house, but my unfortunate constituent was still left high and dry. However, there were two other houses nearly completed and I asked again but was told that this person must take his turn. He produced a medical certificate to show that the house he then occupied was unfit for his wife and family to live in, so I got in touch with the trust again and was told it

had received the medical certificate and that it had been attached to the man's application, which would be dealt with in time. With that I went to the Premier and gave him particulars of the case. He came back in the afternoon and said that it was all fixed up. However, this man is still waiting and two more houses have been let. That is the way the Housing Trust arranges things and I want this House to know. I have taken the matter as far as I can; the Premier has failed and the trust has failed and it is up to this House to make some inquiries and some adjustments to the Housing Trust.

Until fairly recently the trust had a local agent in Wallaroo who collected the rents and kept the tenants up to the mark generally. However, he met with a fatal accident, and notwithstanding that there were applicants from Wallaroo residents for the post the agency was transferred to Kadina and given to some fancy man, someone whom the trust had under its wing. As the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said, "It appears to me that someone is getting a chop out of all these good deals." It appears to me also that someone is going to be chopped to pieces before long, and the sooner the Government shakes up the trust the better it will be for the people of South Australia. I am simply quoting a few cases which I know personally from my home town. The member for Adelaide said he was in the same fix as I am until he told the people in the Botanic Park about one case and within a few days the person concerned was allotted a house. I think I shall have to make arrangements to speak in the park to see if I can do some good.

The building erected as a grain distillery at Wallaroo was practically given to the Government on the understanding that it was not to be dismantled and the contents sold for profit, but was to be retained for the purpose of establishing an industry that would employ approximately 200 men. The Government sold practically all the equipment in it and from inquiries I made last session the sales realized about £10,000. I asked a local valuer to value the building, which stands on a block of 43 acres, and he said it was worth about £70,000. Pascoe and Company, under the title of S.A. Refractories Ltd., commenced manufacturing insulators and fire bricks and had reached the stage of employing 18 men. They told me that they would employ more as soon as the Electricity Trust connected up the new power line. It may be recalled that I brought up the question time after time and at last

electric power was connected. As soon as that was done however, the industry faded out and only three men are retained as watchmen. I have asked the Minister of Works and the Premier what is going to happen but they do not appear to know much about it. The people of my district are very anxious to find out what is to happen because they are not content to see the building standing there without an industry of some kind. The Government says its policy is decentralization; I do not know which way it means it, but it does not do much about putting it into practice.

I was very interested last night to hear the member for Flinders who, when he was speaking of matters he knew something about, was very informative, but when he spoke of things of which he knew absolutely nothing he uttered only rubbish. He talked about the two new members for Prospect and Norwood and criticized their audacity in saying anything about the Government. It is an awful thing to be jealous and there is no-one more jealous than Mr. Pearson when he sees those two men sitting on this side. I venture to say that they will be an asset, not only to this side of the House but to Parliament. He did not refer to the member for Victoria, who is not altogether new to this place, but there can be no doubt that the member for Flinders feels it very much and is jealous to see the new members so active and the old-timers having a rest.

Mr. Christian—They are recuperating.

Mr. McALEES—It may be that; it helps to prolong a man's life sometimes. The two new members will be able to defend themselves. Mr. Pearson then referred to unions. He knows nothing about them except the Liberal Union, of which he is compelled to be a member. Although he does not believe in compulsory unionism, he believes in being a compulsory member of the Liberal and Country League.

Mr. Pearson—I am not compelled to be a member of the Liberal and Country League.

Mr. McALEES—The honourable member would not be where he is if he were not a member of that union. The watersider workers of Australia, particularly those in South Australia, and above all those at Wallaroo, are an asset to the country. The troubles on the water-front are caused by the tactics of shipowners. We have read in the press that numbers of waterside workers have been sacked because they were not back on the job when the whistle blew. I can remember that years ago we had a smoko of 20 minutes; now it is 15 minutes.

A man at the bottom of the hold has to climb to the deck to get his billycan or thermos flask, eat his sandwich or cornish pasty or whatever he has in his pocket, and be at the bottom of the hold again when the whistle blows. It is impossible for him to do it in the time, yet the shipowners say it must be done. Because the men can't do it they are sacked. Mr. Pearson believes in compulsory military training and compulsory education, yet he says there should be no compulsion in industry, only a free go. What a grand time there would be! He wants half of the union members to pay thousands of pounds a year towards getting an Arbitration Court award whilst the other half pay nothing and get all the benefits. I know for a fact that he would not go to Port Lincoln and say that. I will not tell the people at Port Lincoln, but they will get to know about it somehow. If the honourable member went to Wallaroo he would have a different tale to tell the waterside workers. I think he was really talking to fill in time. Mr. Pearson put up a good job until he got off the track, and when he did so it was time for him to ease off.

No one could have dealt with the subject of education better than Mr. John Clark, to whom I listened very attentively. Education should be provided for everybody. It is not too heavy a burden to carry, even if it is not used. No one knows the value of education more than those who have had little of it, and perhaps none. Do not let it be said that the Government stood in the way of educating our children. Some time ago there was an earthquake at Moonta and it shook the wall of the school building, so much so that it was not safe for the children to be in the building, and they were transferred two miles away to the Moonta Mines school. Time after time I spoke to the Minister of Education about repairing the wall, but it is only now that tenders have been called for rebuilding it. I do not know why things like this are neglected; it must be carelessness, or perhaps the Minister has too much to do. That is why I think an additional two Ministers will be a benefit. There is much room for improvement at the Kadina primary school, which I hope the Minister will remember. The matter of homes for aged people was brought up last session by the Opposition, but their remarks fell on the deaf ears of Government members. In this debate Mr. Dunstan has already referred to it. The time will come when we will be up in years and we might want a home, perhaps not in Adelaide, but in a place where we are well-known and where our friends can visit us. This would

add years of life to aged people. The Government should seriously consider the matter and not let things stand as they are.

We are all glad that the Premier is back from his trip overseas. The first day that he came back to Parliament he had to sit in the Speaker's Gallery before being sworn in. At the first opportunity he was sworn in at the table of the Chamber. I could see nothing but flashlights all around the place; to me they looked like flying saucers. I asked one of my colleagues what it was all about and he said "Don't worry, get the *Advertiser* tomorrow and you will see." Next day I got the *Advertiser* which goes into everybody's home, and in it I saw the photograph of the Premier being sworn in. On the following Thursday the Leader of the Opposition arrived from Sydney by aeroplane and within two hours he was sitting in the gallery waiting to be sworn in. I did not see any flashlights then. It was just a matter of form, yet the Leader of the Opposition represents thousands more people than does the Premier. People who read the *Advertiser* ask us why there is this difference between members, but it is for the *Advertiser* to explain. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. BROOKMAN (Alexandra)—I associate myself with the remarks of the mover and seconder about the Coronation of Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II. I am pleased to refer to the happy event of the cessation of hostilities in Korea. We do not know whether they have ceased for all time, but at least they have for the present. We should pay much attention to this fact. Sometimes one wonders whether this Parliament pays sufficient attention to outside matters. There have been few comments inside these walls about the Korean situation, and this is typical of the attitude of Australians towards that war. There has been such lack of public interest that I do not wonder that the Australian troops feel at times they have been forgotten. It is extraordinary that such little interest was taken in the cessation of hostilities when one remembers the national rejoicings over armistices in previous wars.

The speeches of the four new members were unusually and uniformly good. I am sure they will make their mark in this House before long. Unfortunately, all speakers on the Opposition side showed that they favour more and more for less and less. They want nearly every service or commodity that can be obtained to be cheaper, and they require Government intervention in many matters. They referred to

the increase in rents of some Housing Trust homes, but trust rents are notoriously low. Landlords have had a very lean time in the last few years, rents having been controlled by the trust, though it can fairly be said that the trust has been a particularly lenient landlord. It is absurd that there should be widespread protest when the trust increases the rents for some of its homes.

Mr. Riches—Would you say £3 5s. was a reasonable rent?

Mr. BROOKMAN—Some Opposition members referred to the finances of the M.T.T., but since it has graduated into a public liability one senses that they are not altogether displeased about the position. Suggestions have been made that the trust should not attempt to make the undertaking pay, but that fares should be cheaper in order that people going to and returning from their work may have cheap transport. That is not the right attitude, for it will lead us into many difficulties. Parliament voted considerable sums to the trust to give it a chance to get back on the right side of the ledger, but it was not the view of members generally that the trust should receive assistance from the Treasury for more than a few years.

Mr. Macgillivray—The Treasurer told us it would need assistance for about six years.

Mr. BROOKMAN—Yes, but not permanently. That should be understood and agreed upon by everyone. City transport should not receive subsidies for ever. The potato shortage has received much attention, but it is rather a trifling matter. It seems we are expecting to get potatoes much too cheaply. However much we try to stifle the law of supply and demand we cannot do it. The shortage throughout Australia means that we shall have difficulty in getting adequate supplies, but this is not a tragedy or of tremendous concern. When speaking on primary production the Deputy Leader of the Opposition did not mention compulsion, but he made it clear he would like to see it. He demanded that the Government have a comprehensive policy for the co-ordination of primary production, which is another way of saying the farmer should be told what he may produce, but that would be a fatal mistake in trying to effect an increase in production. The member for Norwood criticized members on this side for not putting their views clearly. The member for Mitcham was congratulated on having clearly stated his views.

When it comes to camouflage and disguise members of the Labor Party have no equal.

It seems that the greatest deception of the Labor Party is that it stands for the socialization of the means of production, distribution, and exchange. Those words have never, in my memory, been used by Labor speakers in their election campaigns. They claim that they want cheap houses and transport, but do not mention their wholehearted belief in Socialism. Analyzing those views it means that socialization will completely enter into nearly every form of private enterprise. Notwithstanding what has been said, the Labor Party believes in the wiping out of private banking and the Australian States. The overall effect of Socialism, in my opinion, teaches the individual to depend rather on the Government for the good things and not to work so hard. It has a discouraging effect on people who wish to work.

There are a number of laws on the Statute Book, not put there particularly by the Labor Party, but in some instances by our Governments which, in any case, are supported by the Labor Party which complains that they do not go far enough. Such laws as early closing, compulsory retirement and similar laws are decidedly restrictive and bad legislation. There is a case for some of them, but, as a general rule, it is very poor legislation and a distinct means of preventing a person wishing to work hard and make profits. It seems that in Australia we are becoming conditioned to feeling that the profit motive is something bad—which it is not—the only thing bad about it is the humbug people talk about the profit motive. It will exist with whatever type of Government we have and whatever we try to do people will always endeavour to better themselves in some way. We should make this term a little more reasonable. One gets a little tired of hearing criticism of people who try to make a profit.

I congratulate the Government on its having lifted controls on building materials. Possibly the Government held out a little too long, but it has at least improved the position and has allowed people to build as and when they like. It also gives an opportunity for the speculative builder to build houses for sale and profit, all of which is a very fine thing. I hope that the people will take full advantage of it.

I am impressed by the United States' attitude towards Government and private enterprise. In America private enterprise extends much more deeply into the community life than it does in Australia. Things that are big Government utilities here are largely owned

by private enterprise there. That applies to railways and other services. Even the Niagara Falls, which have been harnessed to provide electric power, appear likely to be handed over to private enterprise to develop. Incidentally, we are in some trouble with the canning industry in Australia. It felt the need for advice on greater production and invited a world authority in Professor G. C. Hanna to visit Australia and make a study of the industry. He is an American authority on the growing of various types of vegetables and the American marketing system. He took a good look at the Australian canning industry and was horrified at what he saw. Let me quote a few of the remarks from his report, as published in the *Chronicle* of May 21 last. He said:—

Australia is noted for its wool and beef production. I understand that neither of these commodities has ever been subjected to governmental regimentation. As yet there is no formula for a suitable substitute to "the law of supply and demand."

He said that in America without regimentation, the vegetable industry was prospering beyond the dreams of Australian vegetable growers. He concludes by saying:—

In conclusion, let me say that regardless of the harsh and perhaps unjustified criticism I have offered above, I believe the vegetable industry in Australia has a great future. I realize it is a young industry. The young must learn to crawl before they can walk or run. My great concern is the mental crippling by regimentation of this young industry. There are some great men in it.

That is typical of the American attitude towards marketing. The professor is not by any means unique, as it seems that nearly all American experts take a somewhat similar view. Private enterprise in Australia, notwithstanding what I have said, is still flourishing. I would like to see more of it, but despite everything it has got along fairly well. In one or two specific instances I suggest that Governments should take a little more heed of private enterprise for its own ends. Now that private contractors are available the Government should engage them to carry out certain of its works, for a contractor seems to be able to do the work better than some Government departments. Some country roads have been made by the Highways Department and some by private contractors. I know of one made by a contractor in such a short time as to astonish local residents, whereas generally the complaint is that roads take too long to make. That road was built by a man who, a few years ago, was in a small way, but who today is a contractor of some standing. His

employees take pride in their work and are contented, most staying with their boss for a long time. That sort of private enterprise should be encouraged now that more contractors are available for country work.

Mr. Hawker—The Housing Trust engages private contractors.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—Over the last few years most private contractors have not been interested in many Government works.

Mr. BROOKMAN—Possibly they did not have the equipment, but today many contractors are available and could do a better job than that done by some Government departments. Much difficulty has been experienced with regard to the slaughtering of stock at the metropolitan abattoirs over the past few years and recently the Premier announced that a licence to kill lambs for export was to be granted to Metropolitan Wholesale Meat Co. Ltd., which would construct a works at Kadina and help deal with the large influx of stock for export at certain seasons of the year. Subsequently, in rejecting an application by Noarlunga Meat Ltd. for a licence to kill stock for export, the Government gave no reason for its rejection. Why was that application refused? The Noarlunga abattoirs started operations in 1949 since when its output has increased rapidly. It began in a small way with the idea of supplying a few butchers in the immediate vicinity of Noarlunga, but so quickly did the idea catch on that it now serves many towns and more than 20,000 people. It will have the ability to kill for export 10,000 or 15,000 lambs a year, and, as its plant is already operating, if it were granted a licence, even at this late stage of the season, it could kill some stock for export, although not as many as if the licence had been granted earlier and opportunity given to improve facilities before the beginning of the season. The Noarlunga abattoirs is licensed to export but not to kill lambs. It may buy lambs, but they must be killed at the metropolitan abattoirs.

Mr. Macgillivray—Would your Government allow the Noarlunga abattoirs to compete with a State monopoly?

Mr. BROOKMAN—In view of the proposed establishment of a killing works at Kadina, the Government's failure to grant a licence to the Noarlunga abattoirs is puzzling. I am not hostile to the company which is to operate at Kadina, but I am surprised that no similar licence has been granted to the company at Noarlunga. In dealing with reject carcasses the Kadina works would not be as well situated

as those at Noarlunga, which serve more than 20,000 consumers, probably three times the number in the Kadina district. Last January, after the announcement regarding the Kadina meat works, the Noarlunga company again applied for a similar licence, but although two conferences were held with the Minister, the Government's refusal to grant a licence was not communicated to the company until July 9, which was a bit tough. The killing figures of the Noarlunga Company since its existence may be of interest. During the period ended June 30, 1950, although it only worked for nine months, 3,098 lambs were killed; for the year ended June 30, 1951, 8,337; June 30, 1952, 19,323; and June 30, 1953, 28,078. Last year 31,994 sheep, 2,687 head of cattle, 756 pigs, and 1,710 calves were also slaughtered. That company has grown considerably and intends further expansion as soon as possible. It is a good example of successful private enterprise which not only provides a service to the community but makes a profit. No profits have been taken out of the business: they have all been put back into it to provide improvements. That reveals the faith that investors have in the project.

Last year I complained that though there are a large number of agricultural scientists in Australia and South Australia, we are not well served in the dissemination of scientific findings. When scientists ascertain various facts they proceed with their next problem and it is not their concern, nor should it be, to see that their findings are passed on to people who could make use of them. That responsibility rests with the Department of Agriculture and its services in that regard could be improved. The *Journal* which it issues contains many interesting and informative articles for the use of primary producers, but it is not imaginative and does not include sufficient scientific findings. It is largely used to report the results of departmental research, which is quite valuable, but findings by the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation and other scientific bodies should be incorporated. At the moment private magazines—the *Chronicle*, the *Adelaide Stock and Station Journal*, and the weekly magazine *Farm*, published by the Farmers' Union—disseminate that information. The department should be on the alert and when new ideas are formulated in other States they should be speedily passed on to farmers. The department need not guarantee the success of those ideas, but such action would enable

farmers to conduct their own experiments. I have previously mentioned a classic case of delay in spreading information, and it is worthy of repetition. An Austrian monk, Gregor Mendel, made remarkable discoveries about the breeding of garden peas which were of the utmost significance in the founding of genetical knowledge, yet his discoveries were not made known for about 20 years. The present Director of Agriculture and agricultural experts recognize the importance of disseminating information, and although the department has done good work it could improve its efforts. The C.S.I.R.O. has provided a good lead in publishing pamphlets which can be easily understood by laymen. In addition to quarterly pamphlets that body publishes bulletins relating to many topics: about eight or nine were published in the last 12 months. They are extremely valuable; one about the tablelands of New South Wales was of great interest to South Australians, not because the work was done in New South Wales but because the results could apply here. The department should note the efforts of the C.S.I.R.O. and private periodicals in passing on information gleaned from anywhere in the world. We should have someone with an agricultural bent stationed at South Australia House, London, looking for innovations in English farming methods and these things should be conveyed to South Australia as quickly as possible. I have in mind an implement known as the buck-rake which is widely used on English farms. It is attached to an ordinary wheeled type tractor and is useful in making ensilage. This machine has revolutionized the making of ensilage because of its cheapness and the labour it saves. Previously the making of ensilage was particularly arduous. This machine has been operating in England for several years and has become very popular there. I do not think that South Australia ever heard of a buck-rake until Mr. C. R. Kelly visited England on a Nuffield Scholarship to study agricultural methods there. He either brought back one of these machines or had one made here. Two seasons ago he tried it out successfully on his own farm and publicized the results, and now thousands are being used in this State. The making of ensilage had almost ceased in South Australia because of the arduous work involved, but it is now being produced on a big scale. I feel that the Department of Agriculture might have helped in saving a year in the introduction of the implement to this State had a man with an agricultural bent, who could study English farming methods, been

established in the Old Country. The application of new agricultural technique is perhaps the simplest and most important way of increasing agricultural production. Every year we are learning more about how to utilize what appears to be waste lands and to make better use of land which is already considered to be fertile. I again urge the Department of Agriculture to increase its efforts to get agricultural information quickly from the scientific laboratories out on to the farms. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh)—I take this early opportunity of replying to the honourable member for Alexandra. After having heard his remarks I am wondering where he has been during the last 12 months. He accuses the Labor Party of having, as a policy, the socialization of the means of production, distribution and exchange, and of refraining from making any announcement of that policy during the election campaign. I remind him that during that campaign I travelled the greater part of the State and never did I speak without mentioning and explaining that policy. He demands that a greater percentage of Government work should be made available to private enterprise. I was delighted to hear the Minister of Works say that there was the time when private enterprise declined to accept Government work. Mr. Brookman gave one isolated case to try to establish that private enterprise could carry out work more effectively than a Government undertaking could. I should like him to go interstate and examine the Snowy River scheme. I was recently there and saw the work being carried out most efficiently. The Commonwealth Government and Governments of New South Wales and Victoria are working side by side with private enterprise carrying out most effectively this highly organized programme. I predict that not even the honourable member would be able to differentiate between the work which was being done by the Governments and private enterprise. As a member of the Labor Party I am not willing to deprive private enterprise of taking part in this type of work. When Mr. Ben Chifley, as Prime Minister, and Dr. Evatt were speaking during World War II, they made a statement, which was publicized throughout Australia, that in the post-war period private enterprise would have a very important role to play and that the Government would assist it in every way possible.

I join with other honourable members, Mr. Speaker, in congratulating you on re-election to your office. You are now the oldest member

of the House in years of service. Your influence has always been of the highest and your rulings without bias. I am sure that members are pleased to see you occupying the Chair. I subscribe to the remarks made last evening by one honourable member, with whose policy I disagree in the main, that every member was trying to do his best within his own limitations and the limitations of the policy of his Party. I feel that every member has a character beyond reproach and that each is a gentleman of the highest order. Any suggestion that members on this side of the House representing the Australian Labor Party have the slightest confidence in any one individual on the Government benches can come only from one who has reached a stage of senile decay. Having been temporarily appointed to a high office one of those honourable members, with an eye to appointment in the Ministry, and in a state of frustration, tried to draw attention to himself.

I offer my sincere congratulations to new members. The speech of the mover of the motion, Mr. Travers, was of a high standard for a new member. I also congratulate him on his election for Torrens. He achieved much in securing his seat, and during the campaign refrained from making statements which could be considered unfair to his opponent, Mr. Sexton, who I am sure was one of the first to offer congratulations to the honourable member on his election. It was a good and clean fight. I feel that Mr. Travers and his sponsor had a decided advantage because of their training in pleading, and I am sure we shall have evidence of that ability in the House as time goes on. I spent quite a time in the electorate and attended the Walkerville polling booth on election day. I associated myself with some of the honourable member's canvassers and we had a very happy day together. During the day the Minister of Works, who was contesting an electorate far removed from the area, came to vote, but left as early as possible. The same remark applies to the Hon. R. R. Wilson.

I also congratulate the member for Murray, who seconded the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I enjoyed listening to his speech. I consider that his knowledge of agricultural matters will be of great assistance to the House, and I trust that his advice will be heeded by the Government. Undoubtedly he defeated in Mr. Moroney a man of the highest integrity and one who has given much public service. I know that Mr. Moroney took the earliest opportunity to congratulate

Mr. White, who, it is alleged, spent about two hours at one of the polling booths and conveyed a canvasser with "How to Vote" cards to another booth.

Mr. White—That is entirely wrong.

Mr. HUTCHENS—If it is wrong I am glad to hear the honourable member say so.

Mr. White—You only made it up.

Mr. HUTCHENS—I ask that that be withdrawn; I did not make it up.

Mr. Brookman—You should accept the honourable member's denial.

Mr. HUTCHENS—I did. I said I was pleased to hear him make it, and I will not pursue the matter further. However, I do wish to draw the attention of the Ministry to the conduct of elections, and lest I be misunderstood, let me say at the outset that I was privileged to act as a scrutineer in the recount in the Murray electorate, and I say most sincerely that the returning officer's honesty and efficiency is beyond doubt, and I appreciate the friendly spirit of those who were present on behalf of the opposing Parties. However, I made some observations and I think every member will agree that it is time we took steps to prevent what might become a dangerous practice. Ballot papers should never be handled except in the presence of scrutineers.

Mr. John Clark—They aren't, are they?

Mr. HUTCHENS—It has been alleged, and I know from experience that it happened in one electorate and is alleged to have happened in another; the scrutineers were with the returning officer at his private home where the votes were being counted at the last election at 11.30 p.m. when he suddenly announced that there would be no more counting that night. He rang one of the scrutineers before 8 a.m. the following morning advising him that he had counted 170 votes. It is true that ballot papers are taken to private homes and that rooms are left while the returning officer goes to meals, and I think action should be taken to prevent possible interference with ballot papers and consequent reflection upon the integrity of the returning officer or any other person.

Mr. White—Don't you think you are now reflecting upon the returning officer?

Mr. HUTCHENS—I said at the outset that the integrity of the returning officer in the case referred to was beyond doubt. Congratulations are due to the new members for Prospect and Norwood. These two young men

had to gain victories over established members much experienced in the art of campaigning, so they should feel considerable satisfaction on their election. Their maiden speeches were so good as to need no commendation from me. The member for Victoria, who is not new in the true sense of the word, also defeated a well-established member and we are pleased to have him on this side to lend his very considerable ability to the debates. A previous speaker on this side informed me that he regretted his omission to express pleasure at the recovery of health of Mr. Pattinson, the member for Glenelg. We know that prior to and during the elections he was very ill and it is pleasing to know that he has recovered. Concerning the elections for that district, however, I wish to make some comments. The Labor Party, and its campaign director in particular, feel very keenly about certain incidents that occurred. It appears that the wife of the member found in her front garden some very distasteful matter, and later similar matter in the back seat of her car. We tried to ascertain who was responsible for these despicable actions and we have some ideas—but, of course, only ideas. We regret that they were based on the actions of a Mr. Arthur O. Richardson.

Mr. Lawn—Is that the person who was taking matter out of letter boxes?

Mr. HUTCHENS—He is alleged to have done so. We view these actions with considerable concern, and say that they were the actions of despicable, uncouth people, and we regret that anyone should stoop to such methods.

I join with others in expressing pleasure at the successful celebrations of the coronation of Queen Elizabeth II. South Australia will be greatly honoured by the Royal visit next year. Many of the poor unfortunate electors whom I have the honour to represent—unfortunate not because I represent them, I hope—have reached the age of 27 without ever having had the privilege of seeing a ballot paper for State elections. There are many thousands in that category, and there are many thousands of elderly people who have never seen a ballot paper for a Legislative Council election, owing to the pernicious property franchise.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—I can remember Legislative Council elections in Port Adelaide for Messrs. Condon, Gluyas, Carr and others.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Perhaps the Minister is not aware of the pernicious system to which I am referring, and now that I have been able to gain his ear and give him some enlightenment he may take steps to improve it.

Mr. Quirke—Your mistake is in not realizing that any system that puts them back is a good one.

Mr. HUTCHENS—In the eyes of the ignorant that may be so.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—What about your own? It puts you back in the Opposition.

Mr. HUTCHENS—I hope the Minister does not claim any credit for that. I was pleased to hear the speech so ably delivered by the Governor, who had not been long in this State, but one must remember that the Governor's Speech is prepared by the Government of the day and in it we expect the Government to give an account of its stewardship and to outline its programme for the ensuing session. The Acting Leader of the Opposition said that very little information was given, and I accuse the Government of being most evasive as to giving any details which would assist the country and Parliament.

Mr. Quirke—It went a long way round to do it.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Exactly, but the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in the Commonwealth Parliament has been accused by the supporters of the Liberal Party of being a humbug because he has been giving warnings about the future economic state of the Commonwealth. Amongst his greatest critics has been the Minister for Immigration, Mr. Holt, who said that he was dreaming all these things. It is strange, however, that after a thing becomes obvious to everyone else the Liberal Party makes some concessions. The following report appeared in the *Canberra Times* of July 27:—

Depression may follow Korea truce.—Together with the decision of the United Congress to make substantial cut in Mutual Security Aid, the prospect of a peace in Korea has given rise to fear of possible recession, both in Europe and the United States. The Minister for Immigration, Mr. Holt, said this in Melbourne today following his return from overseas yesterday . . . There were already signs that the United States had passed its boom peak, and there has been significant decline in farm and other commodity price. The *Institute of Public Affairs Review* of July-September, 1952, said:—

Over the last few months the business outlook has become puzzling and uncertain. The suddenness of the change from the post-war years of inflationary demand and easy earnings to a tougher period of tight finances has given rise to doubts and in some instances to pessimism. Pessimism is highly contagious. It may at first infect only a small segment of the community. But once it gets under way it can be as devastating as a bushfire in dry timber. Economists have long been well aware of the vital part played by the hopes and

expectations of business about the future. Some indeed have assigned to business psychology the major role in their analysis of the causes of fluctuations in economic activity and in the cycle of prosperity and depression. Lord Keynes wrote chapters about it. Certainly the physiological atmosphere, the mental state of mood prevailing in board rooms, managerial offices and clubs, and among the spending public, can have a profound effect on business activity and thus on the level of employment. It is no exaggeration to say that the community can think itself into a recession far greater than that warranted by the underlying economic conditions.

I do not agree at all times with the contents of this journal, but it is clear that for a lengthy period we are not to enjoy the economic prosperity of past years. The Government has not seen fit to tell the people the plan it has to meet the inevitable position.

Mr. O'Halloran—It cannot do so because it hasn't got a plan.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Exactly. The Government has long evaded its responsibility in this matter. It should have amended the Electoral Act to permit the electors to have the Government they want. Without reflecting in any way on the Governor, and still having a deep sense of loyalty, I have the responsibility of entering a protest against the action of the Government in wooing the electors by means of the Governor's Speech. For years this has been going on, and it is time that there was an emphatic protest. When I listened to the Governor's Speech this session I likened it to a villain serenading in the night, and dispensing sweet music with evil intent. The Government claimed credit for the good rainfall and the favourable weather which prevailed in most parts of the State.

Mr. Quirke—Don't you know that the Devil looks after his own?

Mr. HUTCHENS—That is so. The Government was conscious of its weaknesses and shortcomings and knew that the Almighty would not trust it with a bad season. We were told that there had been a record average wheat production of 23 bushels to the acre—five bushels higher than the previous record. In the Address in Reply debate last year I pointed out that since the Government had taken office there had been a serious decline in cereal production from 79 bushels to 66 bushels per head of population. The cereal production for this year has been one of the best. I do not forget that the value of the production means much to the State, but I am alarmed at the total wheat figures. For 1952-53, the production per head of population was 45

bushels; in 1938-39 it was 54 bushels. Such a decline is alarming, yet the Government says that last year we had one of our best seasons. In a speech in another place the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Condon, said, as reported on page 96 of *Hansard*:—

In 1950-51 the industry produced 1,696,000 tons of flour, 303,000 tons of bran and 339,000 tons of pollard, a total output of 2,338,000 tons. The output from South Australia was 206,570 tons of flour, 37,000 tons of bran and 33,000 tons of pollard, a total of 276,570 tons. It is an industry well worth fighting for.

The SPEAKER—I point out to honourable members that under Standing Orders they may not allude to speeches in another place.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Much depends upon our wheat production if many of our secondary industries are to continue. The matter needs careful attention. There should be every encouragement from the Government. The Governor's Speech would lead us to believe that all is well, but I suggest that all is not well. At Booleroo Centre on July 1 this year the Minister of Agriculture told an entirely different story, and put the position in its true perspective when he said:—

Wheatgrowing in South Australia has declined to a dangerous position in the past five years, said the Minister of Agriculture (Sir George Jenkins) at the 37th Upper North Agricultural Bureau Conference today. The State was now producing only about one and a half million bushels a year compared with four million five years ago. Australia would have difficulty in supplying its own wheat needs if a drought occurred in the near future.

Mr. Stott—That is not correct. Acreage should have been mentioned instead of bushels.

Mr. HUTCHENS—In any case, the matter is urgent and should be attended to by the Government. It has been said that our fat lamb exports have risen from 130,000 to 440,000, and from that it seems something has been achieved, but I remind members that the number exported in 1940 was 741,000, and that the 440,000 is 62,000 below the 1949 figure. It was misleading to have such statements in the Governor's Speech. The Government should give us only facts. The people want the true position, which they will face no matter what it may be. They want the Government to give a good and conscientious lead. In my electorate water supplies are causing concern and discontent. Recently I put a question to the Minister of Works and on hearing his reply I felt that there was some hope for an improvement, but on further examination I have become perturbed. Paragraph 10 of the Governor's Speech claimed progress in no

less than six country water schemes, and then continued:—

The sinking and equipping of bores in the metropolitan area is now almost complete; and a number of these bores were used to great advantage during last summer for maintaining water pressure in the metropolitan area.

However, in the next paragraph we find:—

Despite the limitation of loan funds the Government has steadily pursued its policy . . .

I appreciate “steadily,” but in reply to a question about water pressures in the metropolitan area last session the Minister said:—

Ever since I have had the privilege of being the Minister of Works every penny, every man and every piece of material available for water supplies has been used on plans recommended, in the first place by eminent engineers, then examined and recommended by the Public Works Standing Committee (a non-Party body) and in turn ratified by Parliament.

I draw attention to “every penny.” When speaking on the Address in Reply the member for Goodwood, as Acting Leader of the Opposition, said:—

Why, also, have the people in the metropolitan area had to wait for new water services, and why has the Engineering and Water Supply Department curtailed its activities to such an extent that the backlog will take years to overtake? And what is to happen to the ever-increasing flow of new applications for services? What has been done to improve the reticulation system in the metropolitan area, so that people can benefit from a regular and sufficient supply of water when the reservoirs are full?

The member for Goodwood was commenting on the fact that the Government could show a surplus yet the Minister said “every penny.”

The Hon. M. McIntosh—The Auditor-General’s report shows that what I said was correct.

Mr. HUTCHENS—The Minister went on to cover up his shortcomings by hiding behind the Public Works Committee but some projects have not been referred to it.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—Every penny that has been voted to the Government has been spent on the works authorized by Parliament.

Mr. HUTCHENS—In the *Advertiser* of May 20 appeared the following astounding statement:—

Mr. McEwin was the only State representative to support the Commonwealth contention that £200,000,000 was the maximum practicable limit for public works.

Then he went on to say:—

There would be no dismissals in South Australia. There will be no curtailment of South Australian works in progress and it would enable the State to make a start on more urgent new works.

Then within a short time we had the cry in the Governor’s Speech, “Despite the limitation of Loan funds.” There is no more urgent need in the metropolitan area than more water mains. When answering the member for Semaphore last session the Minister of Works said:—

We were never in a better position for supplies but we have been connecting up to 9,000 new services a year, and that automatically means that existing mains in the metropolitan area are quite inadequate to give a full service to these new homes. Although there is adequate water in the reservoirs there are not sufficient main facilities to meet demands.

On the same day he replied to me:—

Because the Government, as a matter of policy, has extended the great advantage of water reticulation to a huge number of people, it automatically follows that some people who once had a full supply now have a reduced pressure.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—What is the alternative?

Mr. HUTCHENS—I was trying to tell the Minister, but I regret he cannot understand. Lest it be thought I am making statements without foundation I will read letters from two of my constituents.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—What about the people who have no water services? Wouldn’t they complain if I gave your constituents better pressures without giving them any?

Mr. HUTCHENS—The first letter, addressed to the Engineer-in-Chief, states:—

I have just had my bath heater repaired. It was burnt out! Two out of three Gas Company employees who attended the heater expressed amazement at the poor flow of water and pin-pointed that as the cause of the trouble. I was told that further trouble was inevitable unless the flow of water could be increased. I am fully appreciative of your department’s difficulties. Of necessity, however, I have also to be cognisant of my domestic budgetary requirements. The expense to which I am being put must be a repetition of what is happening to other possessors of gas bath heaters in poor pressure areas. This may be a matter for joy to holders of Gas Company shares, but it is quite the reverse to all who are being subjected to an unexpected financial burden, most of whom are resident in the lower income areas, where industries tax the water supply heavily. If your influence can be wielded in any way to bring an amelioration of the situation I have described, I am sure that proper publicity to it would bring you great appreciation from a large number of thankful citizens.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—If you let me have the particulars of that case I will give you a reply. His complaint probably arises from the fact that his own water pipes are in poor condition.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Just before writing the letter he had a complete new system installed. The second letter, addressed to the Woodville Council states:—

For many months, in fact years the Rate-payers in the Woodville district have been shamefully and disgracefully treated regarding the Water Supply. It is an insult to the human race for not at any time during the day can one have a bath. Today, Sunday, I have periodically tried—from 9 a.m. until evening to obtain a bath, and it is impossible to get one drip of water out of the bath-heater. It is high time the water mains were altered to meet the needs of the increased population in this district. I would also point out there is not sufficient force of water to work a lavatory cistern which is highly dangerous for breeding diseases. It takes at least 10 minutes to fill a water jug. The water supply in other districts such as North Adelaide is marvellous. We pay our rates the same as that district so why should we be penalized. According to a statement in the *Advertiser*, Hindmarsh Council are making a move in this direction and if one is expected to pay Water-Rates which are much higher than previously this matter should be attended to without delay. It is of no use the Water Sewerage Department or of you as a Council, blowing the pipes to the taps for my next door neighbour who agrees and endorses my statement has had new pipes laid. He is in the same position as we are awaiting a reply as to what the Council intends doing in this very urgent matter. The council are very concerned about the matter, so that shows my statements are no exaggeration.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—You are arguing in a general way. Why didn't you take up the matter with me or the department?

Mr. HUTCHENS—I did.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—Generally speaking, the supply is excellent.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Then I now know the Minister's interpretation of "excellent." Complaints have not been received from the Opposition only, for members sitting behind the Government have lodged complaints. The member for Glenelg made an impressive speech in reply to a matter raised by the member for Chaffey last year and I had much admiration for him when he took the Government to task, almost to the extent of a motion of no confidence, when he said:—

Likewise, the country water districts showed a deficit of £818,349 last year, whilst the metropolitan water district showed a surplus of £92,206, leaving a net deficit of £726,053. For the last five years the Adelaide Water District has shown a surplus of £552,392, whereas the country water districts have shown a deficit of £3,196,070.

It is evident that the metropolitan water district has yielded surpluses enabling water to

be taken to country areas. City residents do not complain about this, but they feel it is an injustice for them to be denied good pressures. They are suffering great inconvenience from the lack of foresight of the Government. They are confused when they are told that except for limitations of loan funds their demands could be met, when another Minister says there will be no curtailment of public works. It reminds one of the well-known song "Tell Me a Story." The people want something definite and this old, worn-out theme is no longer satisfying. What about the greater number of children who attend our public schools and have to be regimentated in the use of conveniences in a limited time? What, again, will be the effect on their health? It is unpredictable.

Last year I pointed out that in my electorate councils were paying more than £5,000 a year in Fire Brigades Board contributions. I trust that the interest the Minister has shown in this matter this afternoon will continue. There is a great possibility of large industrial buildings being razed by fire. I repeat the claim I have made on several occasions about the injustice of declaring fire brigade districts and the contributions required by the Fire Brigades Board. I have prepared tables which, because of their length, I ask leave to insert in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

Contribution to Fire Brigades

| | Board, year ended | Annual Values Assessment, | Rate Revenue, |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------|
| | 30/6/52. | 1951-52. | 1951-52. |
| | £ | £ | £ |
| Adelaide . . . | 29,996 | 2,185,153 | 396,059 |
| Port Adelaide . . | 12,262 | 809,754 | 91,816 |
| Woodville . . . | 2,654 | 762,808 | 108,064 |
| Hindmarsh . . . | 2,052 | 226,644 | 34,166 |
| Glenelg . . . | 1,199 | 356,430 | 44,966 |
| Unley | 1,217 | 636,014 | 87,452 |
| West Torrens . . | 1,107 | 607,082 | 86,588 |
| Prospect | 1,018 | 338,253 | 43,691 |
| Burnside | 1,003 | 587,500 | 85,677 |
| Marion | 774 | 311,659 | 41,357 |
| Enfield | 777 | 350,106 | 52,516 |
| Brighton | 636 | 185,744 | 25,577 |
| Mitcham | 630 | 460,249 | 74,433 |
| Thebarton | 453 | 213,297 | 26,122 |
| Kensington and Norwood | 354 | 208,027 | 27,737 |
| Walkerville . . . | 304 | 134,821 | 15,167 |
| St. Peters | 330 | 221,544 | 25,295 |
| Henley and Grange | 360 | 143,466 | 18,531 |
| Payneham | 270 | 200,407 | 23,871 |
| Campbelltown . . | 91 | 142,092 | 17,762 |
| Colonel Light Gardens | 169 | 47,993 | 6,411 |

| Comparison of Contributions, 1948-49 and 1951-52. | | | |
|---|----------|----------|-----------|
| | 1948-49. | 1951-52. | Increase. |
| | £ | £ | £ |
| Adelaide . . . | 13,592 | 29,996 | 16,404 |
| Port Adelaide . . | 6,283 | 12,626 | 6,343 |
| Woodville . . . | 1,476 | 2,654 | 1,178 |
| Hindmarsh . . . | 1,118 | 2,052 | 944 |
| Glenelg . . . | 706 | 1,199 | 493 |
| Unley . . . | 670 | 1,217 | 547 |
| West Torrens . . | 602 | 1,107 | 505 |
| Prospect . . . | 598 | 1,018 | 420 |
| Burnside . . . | 592 | 1,003 | 411 |
| Marion . . . | 350 | 774 | 424 |
| Enfield . . . | 327 | 777 | 450 |
| Brighton . . . | 327 | 636 | 309 |
| Mitcham . . . | 327 | 630 | 303 |
| Thebarton . . . | 321 | 453 | 132 |
| Kensington and Norwood . . . | 255 | 354 | 99 |
| Walkerville . . . | 255 | 304 | 95 |
| St. Peters . . . | 198 | 330 | 132 |
| Henley and Grange . . . | 194 | 360 | 166 |
| Payneham . . . | 122 | 270 | 148 |
| Campbelltown . . | 42 | 91 | 49 |

Mr. HUTCHENS—The tables show the necessity for an amendment to the Act. It will be seen that Mitcham had an annual assessment of £460,249, with a contribution of £630 to the Fire Brigades Board for the year ended June 30, 1952. St. Peters has an annual values assessment of £221,544 and paid a contribution of £330, and Unley had an annual values assessment of £636,014, with a contribution of £1,217. Hindmarsh council has an annual values assessment of £226,644 and an annual contribution of £2,052. Its annual assessment value was less than half that of Mitcham, yet it had to contribute more than three times as much. St. Peters, with an annual assessment practically the same as that of Hindmarsh, paid an annual contribution of only £330. Port Adelaide, with an annual assessment value of £809,754, paid £12,262.

Mr. Tapping—It is £13,000 this year.

Mr. Quirke—On what basis do they work out the contribution?

Mr. HUTCHENS—Under the Act the board declares a fire district. The industrial and commercial areas are situated in these districts where the majority of wage-earners reside. It is an unjust tax on people who can least afford it.

Mr. Quirke—Do the insurance companies pay the same ratio?

Mr. HUTCHENS—I cannot give the figures. I do not cast any reflection on the chief officer of the Fire Brigade, Mr. J. J. White, or the firemen, whose efficiency has never been questioned. The standard required does credit to the chief officer. But for the

muddled, uneconomical, union-splitting policy of the Fire Brigade Board much would have been accomplished by a happy band of men, enjoying justice and making sacrifices if necessary for the safety of human life and property. Today there are more officers than men. I am not influenced in my remarks by the circular letters all members received, but I was astounded to learn from two former firemen, who left the brigade and never returned, that they feared to do so because of the criticism which would inevitably arise. Ratepayers were placed in a most unhappy position because of the reduced efficiency of the brigade. Of about 40 men only three or four with qualifications necessary for appointment were promoted to the ranks of officers. That cost the suburban councils an additional £5,000 a year. Efficiency was reduced and the money which was spent in installing a radio-telephone system has, to a large extent, been wasted. If the Woodville firemen were called to a big fire in the city all the men would be needed to handle the hoses, leaving the appliances unmanned, and the only means of advising the crew of an outbreak of fire at Woodville would be by manual message through Adelaide headquarters. Even had fire fighting efficiency been maintained it would have been an economic crime. The very fact that promotions were made without the requisite qualifications for the purpose of union splitting is a social crime. All these things have happened since the Government made an appointment to the board and it makes me wonder whether he is a puppet to carry out the Government's wishes.

Another important matter affects the Housing Trust. I make these remarks without reflecting on any officers of the trust, all of whom I have always found courteous and willing to do their best. The trust, however, has partly failed in its work. It is often claimed that it can build houses more cheaply than any other State. It is not a fair comparison, nor is it a reasonable statement. In New South Wales house-building was undertaken by a Labor Government. The houses are of a quality of which anybody can be proud and are equal to, if not better than the houses built in South Australia. They are self-contained single unit structures, with cement paths. Furthermore, many homes of a standard superior to that of our trust homes have been provided by a humane Government for old age pensioners at the low rental of 8s. 6d. a week.

The member for Norwood drew the attention of the Government to the shocking housing conditions of old people in his district, and one Government member was so disturbed by that speech that he described it as "a brazen hussy of a speech." At Ballarat I have seen a home for the aged with many amenities such as bowling greens, billiard tables and pianos, where 600 people are enjoying their old age. I support the courageous request of the member for Norwood, who was unreasonably and unjustly criticized for speaking on behalf of some of his aged constituents. From time to time, when the plight of the aged has been mentioned, the Playford Government has adopted a sanctimonious air, and last session, when the Opposition advanced a workable proposition to provide decent living conditions for old people, the Government, stripped of its mask of hypocrisy, was shown in its true colours—lacking in feeling for our old folk. Government members defeated the motion of the Leader of the Opposition, which was designed to provide improved housing conditions for the aged, but at the last election South Australians indicated their dissatisfaction at that Government vote. Pensioners should be housed in eventide homes under conditions similar to those operating under the Nuffield scheme in England. In my district some such institutions are conducted by God-fearing men and women who are trying to lessen the burdens of our aged folk, but such a task is well beyond the limits of any private effort.

I have been told by some constituents of some cases, admitted to the Parkside Mental Hospital, which are cases not of mentally defective people but of old people who are worn out and have nobody to care for them. This state of affairs must be corrected immediately, and, if the Premier does not divert some attention from doubtful future projects to these immediate social questions, posterity will have hard things to say not only about him but also about every member of his Government. Members have received sufficient warning from impartial sources and there has been no greater fighter for a fair deal for the aged than Dr. Birch, the Superintendent of Mental Institutions, who has referred to this matter both in his annual reports and as a witness before the Public Works Committee. While recently submitting evidence in respect of future accommodation requirements at the Parkside Mental Hospital, Dr. Birch said it was estimated that by the end of 1960 the population of South Australia

would reach 900,000. This estimate was based on the approximate population of 743,720 at September 30, 1952, and the average annual increase of about 18,000 between 1947 and 1951. As Dr. Birch pointed out, the population growth would be governed by natural increase and migration and as the increase by migration would depend on Government policy it could not be calculated with accuracy. He said that one in 298 persons was in a mental institution. Therefore, accepting the estimate of 900,000, about 570 extra beds would be required by the end of 1960, but if the average annual increase in population were 20,000 the number would be 630. These figures would be modifiable by certain factors, the main one being whether the State decided to continue with the policy of admitting to mental hospitals a large percentage of elderly, infirm patients who could be treated more appropriately in an infirmary type of hospital or eventide home. The Committee's report goes on to say:—

The total estimated cost of new buildings which have been recommended at Parkside and Northfield and of the work now contemplated is £1,333,332. While not in doubt as to the necessity for all the accommodation, the committee is of opinion that in view of the large expenditure involved in providing it the question of erecting an infirmary type of institution in order to relieve the pressure on other hospitals must be closely examined in the near future.

I need say no more on this subject for the facts have been repeatedly placed before this House and the Government should act immediately to meet the housing requirements of our aged people, if Parliament is to retain the respect of the people. In introducing the Housing Trust Bill in 1936 the Hon. R. L. Butler quoting a report from Mr. Wainwright, the Auditor-General said:—

There is at present a shortage of houses suitable for families on or slightly above the basic wage and basic wage earners are being subject to considerable hardship by having to put up with unsatisfactory housing or paying rent which they cannot afford . . . If, however, the industrial expansion so vital to South Australia is to continue, rents must be prevented from rising. The Government project of building a number of small houses for rental to wage earners at about 12s. 6d. per week will have a double effect. The provision of some hundreds of houses for rental at 12s. 6d. per week by filling the present shortage could prevent further rises in average rents of 3s., 4s., or 5s. per week.

Recently the Premier said that it would be necessary to charge a rent of £2 8s. 6d. on future Housing Trust homes—an increase of 288 per cent on the 1937 rental. From the

figures given in His Excellency's Speech, I assume that the minimum number of homes made available by the trust for rental has been about 10,000, and the statement yesterday by the member for Adelaide that a deposit of £4 is required from each tenant means that a considerable sum is held by the trust and earning interest. During the same period over which the rents have increased by 288 per cent the basic wage has risen from £3 5s. to £11 11s.—an increase of 255.4 per cent. It is evident that something is wrong with the affairs of the trust and needs investigation. One problem today is the lack of a satisfactory rent fixation formula. I have received letters from trust tenants who do not know on what basis their rents have been increased. A letter from the trust to a tenant states:—

You have been selected by the trust as tenant for a five-roomed house at Seaton which will be ready for occupation on Saturday, March 2, 1949, from which the date of your tenancy will commence, on condition that if you are the holder of a buildings material permit, this permit is returned to the Building Materials Office immediately, and a clearance is received. If building materials have been issued these must also be accounted for. The weekly rent of the house will be 25s. You will also be required to pay a deposit of two pounds (£2) which will be refundable at the termination of your tenancy provided the house is in good order.

A further letter dated May 10, 1951, states:—

It has always been the policy of the S.A. Housing Trust to keep its rents as low as possible, with the result that the income received by the Trust from rents is barely sufficient to meet the necessary expenditure of the Trust. The high increases in the basic wage granted in recent months have increased substantially, and will increase further, the outgoings of the Trust necessary to manage and maintain its houses. In order to meet these increased costs and in order to provide sufficient revenue to meet the necessary expenditure of the Trust it has become necessary to revise the existing rental scales. Accordingly, the rent of your house will be 27s. per week with effect from the rent week beginning on 26th May, 1951.

On July 4, 1953, he received another letter from the General Manager of the trust which stated:—

This letter is to inform you that as from 18th July, 1953, the rent of the house you occupy will be £1 13s per week—an increase of 6s. per week. The Trust regrets that it must increase your rent, but, unfortunately, factors over which it has no control make the increase necessary. It is now two years since the Trust changed the rents of its older houses, and during that time the living wage has increased by £2 17s. per week; this increase has of course, affected substantially the cost of the Trust's operations as it has affected

every undertaking in Australia. Although your rent is to be increased, the amount you will now have to pay is still well below that which the Trust must ask from its tenants of houses now being built. The cost of erecting a house has increased very rapidly in recent years, and in addition, the amount which the Trust must pay in interest on all the capital it invests in erecting rental houses has also increased steeply. The result of these two factors, namely, the increased cost of building and of interest, is that the *very least* the Trust can charge for one of its three-bedroomed brick double-unit houses built in Adelaide is £2 8s. 6d. per week.

Subsequently, the recipient of those letters wrote me as follows:—

Further to our discussion of last week in respect to Housing Trust rentals, please find enclosed copies of correspondence as received from the trust in connection with the trust house occupied by myself. Regarding the basic wage increases as mentioned therein, the position is as follows:—

| | Basic wage. | | | Rent. | | |
|------------------------|-------------|----|----|-------|----|----|
| | £ | s. | d. | £ | s. | d. |
| February, 1949 | 5 | 19 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 |
| May, 1951 | 8 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0 |
| Today | 11 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 0 |

It will be noted that by applying the formula as used by the trust from 1949-1951, the latest increase should have been at the most 2s. 2d. per week and not 6s. as fixed by the trust.

The lack of a formula is creating concern and the figures I have quoted should, in fairness to the tenants, receive favourable consideration. I recently had a discussion with the general manager of the New South Wales Housing Commission and in reply to questions I put he subsequently wrote to me as follows:—

Rentals.—The economic rental fixed for each dwelling is calculated on the capital cost of the dwelling, *i.e.*, land, development, building construction costs and the annual charges to be met by the commission for items such as rates, taxes, interest, insurance, and repairs and maintenance. Provision is made, however, for a rebate of part of the economic rental under circumstances where the "family income" of the tenant entitles him to such a rebate.

The basis of assessment of "family income" is as follows:—

- The whole of the gross weekly income of either the tenant, his wife or related person in the dwelling, whichever is the highest;
- Two-thirds of the gross weekly income of either the tenant, his wife or related person resident in the dwelling, whichever is the next highest;
- One-third (but not more than 30s. for each person) of the gross weekly income of all other persons resident in the dwelling.

Maternity allowances and Commonwealth child endowment are not included in the weekly income. However, deductions for superannuation and taxation, etc., must be included as

income. Having regard to the "family income" as assessed, the rental payable by a tenant is calculated as under:—

When family income is—

- (1) Equal to the basic wage, the rental payable is one-fifth of the basic wage;
- (2) Above the basic wage, the rental payable is one-fifth of the basic wage plus one-third of the difference between the basic wage and "family income";
- (3) Below the basic wage, the rental payable is one-fifth of the basic wage less

one-quarter of the difference between the "family income" and the basic wage.

In no case may a tenant be charged less than 8s. per week or more than the economic rental fixed for the dwelling. Examples of the application of the rental rebate scheme in respect of the number of "family income" groups are set out hereunder, together with some idea of the rentals which would be actually payable on the basis of a basic wage of £11 18s. per week.

| Basic Wage. | Family Income. | Economic Rental. | Rental Rebate. | Rental Payable. |
|-------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| £ s. d. | £ s. d. | £ s. d. | £ s. d. | £ s. d. |
| 11 18 0 | 6 0 0 | 3 10 0 | 1 16 6 | 0 18 6 |
| 11 18 0 | 9 0 0 | 3 10 0 | 1 16 6 | 1 13 6 |
| 11 18 0 | 11 18 0 | 3 10 0 | 1 2 0 | 2 8 0 |
| 11 18 0 | 13 10 0 | 4 0 0 | 1 1 6 | 2 18 6 |
| 11 18 0 | 15 0 0 | 4 0 0 | 0 11 6 | 3 8 6 |
| 11 18 0 | 16 0 0 | 4 0 0 | 0 5 0 | 3 15 0 |

That formula should be examined as to the advisability of its adoption here in order that tenants might pay according to their means.

Mr. Riches—It will operate under the Commonwealth scheme.

Mr. HUTCHENS—It will apply to houses to be built but not to those completed prior to its adoption. One of the complaints of the Opposition is the lack of co-ordination in the services connected with the building of homes. One member asked the Premier whether he would arrange for closer co-ordination but he skilfully sidestepped the question and gave no assurance that anything would be done. I agree with the member for Torrens that the 17,300 homes erected by the Housing Trust is a creditable performance. Figures reveal that 8,824 homes were built during 1952, and it is the first time for many years that the number of homes built has exceeded the number of marriages. As the trust is still dealing with applications lodged in 1948, and there are 34,000 applications before it, the statement in the Governor's Speech relating to housing is somewhat misleading.

I am grateful to the member for Gawler for revealing the unsatisfactory attitude of the Government towards education. School committees have been most generous in their efforts to supply necessary amenities to children but I protest against the department's attitude on subsidies. I suggest that no parents subscribe more to school committees than the parents of children attending the Brompton school. At that school there is a shelter shed with one side exposed to the weather. When that was brought to the notice of the department and it was suggested that a partition of glass, asbestos or masonite be provided for protection the department advised

the school committee that if it would provide a certain sum, the matter would be considered on a subsidy basis.

Mr. O'Halloran—For a capital work?

Mr. HUTCHENS—Yes. The money is not required for amenities but will be used to assist in carrying out the Government's building programme. That is beyond the limits of reasonableness. It is a most ungrateful attitude to adopt toward noble people who have made sacrifices in serving on school committees. I congratulate the officers of the School Committees' Association Executive. The President, Mr. Bruse, received an honour during the coronation and that honour reflects to the credit of the Association. Many have preceded him and performed great work and among them was the late Mr. D. L. Stevens. I pay special praise to a lady who served as President—Mrs. Colquhoun—who is possibly the only woman in Australia to have held such a position. I understand that Mr. Bleckly, who has been secretary for many years and carried out his duties in an untiring, efficient and conscientious manner, is to retire at the end of this year. He should receive public recognition for his work. I hope the vacancy caused by his retirement will be filled by a man of equal efficiency.

Members have complained of many deficiencies in the Government—lack of details supplied to the House, a poor education policy, lack of homes for the aged and inability to increase rural production to meet the needs of our growing population and to obtain export markets. They are alarming in their numbers. For many years we have enjoyed a state of economic prosperity and there is a reason for that. It has been most noticeable during the debate that Government supporters have

been alarmed and moved from a state of calm to one of panic. The member for Flinders last night tried to be a hero, but was in a state of panic and tried to keep from the people knowledge of the undemocratic electoral system operating in the State. He protested about what he called compulsion. I was pleased to hear the member for Wallaroo this afternoon asking him to declare whether he subscribed to compulsory education and compulsory military training. I feel that the member for Flinders has no objection to the union of manufacturers and the union of members of the Chamber of Commerce but in common with those who subscribe to his political ideas he desires to distract the attention of the people from an issue all-important in South Australia at the moment—an issue on which the people have expressed keen resentment.

Mr. John Clark—It was just a red herring!

Mr. HUTCHENS—Yes. The member for Burnside is usually calm and logical, but during the debate he was concerned about the case the Labor Party had been making, and he descended to what I consider abusive tactics and carried on like the boy who whistles in the cemetery to keep up his courage. I draw members' attention to the ridiculous claims made when the Constitution Act Amendment Bill of 1936 was introduced and resulted in the present single electorate system. Mr. (now Sir Shirley) Jeffries was Attorney-General at the time and said:—

I am carrying out the promise made by my Party. For some time the officials of the Electoral Department, at the request of the Government, have been engaged in preparing a re-division of the State into 39 single electorates. This scheme was referred by Cabinet to a committee consisting of His Honor Judge Paine, the Commonwealth Deputy Returning Officer for the State (Mr. N. V. Jeffreys), and the Surveyor-General (Mr. J. H. McNamara). The Government issued the following terms of reference to the committee:—

The Government policy is to reduce the numbers of the members of the House of Assembly by seven, and to divide the State into single electorates, preserving the present ratio of representation between the metropolitan and the extra-metropolitan districts, bearing in mind always the desirableness of electoral districts having a community of interest as far as possible.

There can be no reflection upon the gentlemen of the committee. They carried out a duty dictated to them by a Government which desired a jerrymander, and the position has grown progressively worse over the years.

Mr. Dunks—Did you say that they carried out the dictates of the Government?

Mr. HUTCHENS—The honourable member heard me clearly. In 1938 the ratio of electors represented by a metropolitan member as against those represented by a country member was 276 to 100 and at subsequent elections they were as follows:—1941—285 to 100; 1944—307 to 100; 1947—320 to 100; 1950—325 to 100; and 1953 (estimated)—327 to 100. In the most recent election the Premier represented 6,430 electors, the Minister of Works 6,125, the Minister of Lands 6,395, the Minister of Agriculture 3,989, and the Speaker 4,218, making a total of 27,157 electors for five seats, this number being 3,222 less than for Port Adelaide with 30,379. The story does not end there. For Onkaparinga there were 7,995 electors, Rock River 4,719, Angas 6,391, and Gouger 6,640, a total of 25,745 for four seats, being 45 less than for Goodwood with 25,790. For Stirling the number was 7,004, Light 5,430, Burra 4,336, and Eyre 5,084, a total of 21,854 for four seats, or 2,390 less than for Semaphore with 24,244. These figures show that 13 almost assured Liberal and Country League seats representing 74,756 electors, which number is 5,657 less than for three Australian Labor Party members who represent 80,413 electors, and have only three votes. That leaves the Government with an advantage of 10 votes, and yet Government members say "There is no jerrymander."

Mr. John Clark—They call it democracy.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Yes, but with what audacity! The total number of votes cast at the last election was Labor 166,526 and Liberal and Country League 119,003, a majority for Labor of 47,523; and yet Labor is in Opposition, although it represents the majority of the people. The number of seats held by the Parties and groups in the House of Assembly for the present Parliament and the electors represented by each are as follows:—Labor 14 seats, 220,987 electors; Liberal and Country League 21 seats, 201,256; and Independents 4 seats, 27,387. Although Labor has only 14 seats as against the 21 held by the Government, more than 19,000 electors voted for it than for the Government Party, and yet members opposite say we have no right to complain and that the people have no right to look upon it as an injustice. It cannot be denied that the odds have been laid against any Party other than the Government Party. It is strange, and not a coincidence, that of the 13 seats in the metropolitan area eight representing 175,544 electors or an average of 21,943 are held by Labor and five

representing 103,658 electors or an average of 20,731 are held by the Liberal and Country League. In the 1953 elections there were nine uncontested seats, and they give a definite illustration of the jerrymander system in operation. Five Liberal and Country League members represented 43,695 electors, whereas four Labor members represented 51,426, and despite those figures the member for Burnside tried to convince the House that the position was not as claimed by the Labor Party. Of the 39 electorates 17 are considered assured Liberal seats, whereas 11 can be reasonably assured to Labor. There are 11 swinging seats and the fact remains that the Labor Party must secure eight of them in order to form a government. By no stretch of the imagination could anyone claim that that is democracy. It is beyond the understanding of any reasonable or intelligent person.

I feel very strongly about the existing electoral injustice in South Australia. Because of the property qualification about two-thirds of the people are disfranchised from voting for the Legislative Council; four-fifths of our women have no vote. The jerrymander also applies to that House. There are eight metropolitan members representing in round figures 105,000 electors, whereas the remaining country members represent 63,000. At the last Federal election the Labor Party in this State secured 219,628 votes, or 53 per cent of the total, whereas the Liberal Party received only 189,105 votes, representing 45 per cent. That clearly indicated that the people desired that Labor should govern, but due to the electoral system and the desire of the Government to retain power at all costs their wish was defeated. If this system continues it will be recorded in history that democracy was wrecked in this country by this lust for power, and I urge with all the sincerity at my command that the Government should admit to the people—and do it quickly—that they have a just cause or I fear the Parliamentary system of South Australia will go down in ridicule and a dictatorship take its place. It was interesting to read the remarks of a honourable member who predicted that the present system would lead to a dictatorship, and the situation will not improve while the present Government remains in office, and I am afraid that the deterioration evident by remarks made during this debate will continue if there is no change. The tragedy of a Liberal-Country Party Government retaining office under the gerrymander is made so very evident when we look at statistics and see the alarming decline

in the number of rural holdings. That decline is encouraged, to the detriment of the nation, merely for the purpose of securing for the Government an unfair chance of holding power. I regret that I have to express the opinion that unless an announcement of some electoral reform is made this year we shall have, during the forthcoming Royal visit, a demonstration unprecedented in the history of Australia against this unjust, undemocratic and inexplicable gerrymander.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY (Chaffey)—I join with other members in expressing my loyalty to our new Queen and I hope her reign may be long and enjoy a peace that was denied the reign of her immediate predecessor. I also join with others in congratulating you, Sir, and the Chairman of Committees on being re-elected to the very important positions you have occupied for a number of years. Although on occasions members may differ with both the Speaker and the Chairman we all know that you both act in accordance with the best and highest traditions of the offices you hold. I also join in congratulating the new members on the very excellent speeches they have delivered in this debate. It is a long time since some of us made our first speeches in this House, but we still remember the trepidation with which we approached that ordeal, and I could not help envying those who have joined our numbers this year in the excellent manner with which they overcame their first hurdle. I also express regret for those members who are no longer with us. In the rough and tumble of politics it is almost essential that we have new members to take the place of those who may fall by the wayside, and although I appreciate that necessity I cannot forget the personal friendships we have enjoyed with them. Like others I pay a tribute in particular to the ex-member for Torrens, The Honourable Sir Shirley Jeffries. He was not only a valuable member of this House who gave of his knowledge to Parliament, but he played a tremendously important part in building up the educational system of South Australia. I fear, however, that I shall have to try to prove later that some of the structure that the ex-minister of Education built up is now being frittered away by the present administration.

I feel, with some others, that the Government approached the recent elections without much confidence. Throughout the campaign I detected a fear complex never previously shown in the 15 years I have had contested my

district. Hitherto I have felt that the Government was prepared to state its case openly, frankly and above board, but I am afraid that was not the case in the recent election. The Government descended to a new level; a level of attack that I have never known in previous elections. I believe that had I been defeated I could have had the whole election upset because of certain statements which practically amounted to bribery, if not corruption, made by the Minister for Lands. In order that I shall not have to say, "It was alleged" I will quote verbatim a report in the *Murray Pioneer* of the Minister's speech at Renmark so that honourable members may see for themselves whether or not my statement is correct. It is as follows:—

Speaking in support of the candidature of Mr. Story at the opening meeting of the campaign at Renmark last Friday night the Minister of Lands and Irrigation (Hon. C. S. Hincks), said that the Government was anxious to have direct representation from the upper Murray districts in its ranks. "If you elect a Liberal member you will be in touch with the Ministers," he said, "you will get somewhere." With a Government member the Government would be in closer touch with the district, and while these areas had received quite a good spin, under these conditions they could be better served. The Minister said that irrigation was carried on principally in Chaffey and Ridley, but the Government did not have direct representation in either district. . . . Referring to Mr. Story's qualifications, Mr. Hincks said that when he had visited these areas some years ago he had been on the look-out for a suitable man to represent the Party in this district, and when he met Ross Story he decided he would be an admirable man for the job. He looked forward to the day when a man with practical experience in the irrigation districts would take over the irrigation portfolio, and he knew of no-one better suited for the job than Mr. Story who had also been very actively associated with soldier settlement matters.

That comes very close to bribery of the electors because, in the first place it says, "If you elect a Liberal member who will be in touch with the Ministers you will get somewhere." In other words, that an Independent member or a Labor member would not get the same service from the Minister that a Liberal man would get. That is a very unfortunate statement from one who is assumed to be a responsible Minister of the Crown. The Minister tried to get the electors of Chaffey to believe in a policy of spoils for the victor. I can well understand that the Government is anxious to get rid of the present representation and I take no exception to that. They have been anxious to get rid of the present member for 15 years because I have fallen foul of the Minister, and especially of his

department, over what I consider to be the betrayal of our ex-servicemen. The Minister is largely responsible for this situation because he has been the mouthpiece of this irresponsible department for a number of years and on no occasion has he taken heed of the member for the district. Every concession the settlers have got has been gained because I have forced it by proving conclusively what other States have done. I take no exception to the Minister's statements about Mr. Story's qualifications. He is an excellent young man; a member of the 2nd A.I.F. who has held a number of responsible positions in the town and district of Renmark. The truth is that neither Mr. Story nor anyone else could carry the sins of the present so-called Liberal Government, including the Minister of Lands, in our irrigation areas. Mr. Story was murdered politically by the support he got from the Minister of the Crown. In a conservative centre like Renmark that is by tradition essentially Liberal, the Liberal cause lost over 700 votes; if that is not a landslide I should like to know what is. Furthermore, over the whole electorate my majority was more than the total of Liberal votes cast, despite the actions of the Minister, because the electors stand for certain basic principles, the first of which is the rights and responsibilities of private enterprise.

Mr Stott—And British fair play.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—A reasonable amount of fair play, and this stabbing in the back took place because of the Government's fear complex; because it knew that its sins of socialism were catching up with it and that the people were sick and tired of the whole set-up.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—It is a reasonable assumption that as the report I quoted of the Minister's speech was written over three months ago and has not been refuted in any way it was substantially correct. There is no doubt in the minds of the people living in the district about its correctness, because following on the statement by the Minister a public meeting was held in Berri, and a motion was moved by a gentlemen who I believe had voted all his life for the Liberal Party. He is one of those old fashioned Liberals who believe in certain principles and is not prepared to give them away under any circumstances. I believe that this type of Liberal is becoming more extinct every day. He voiced his indignation about the speech by the Minister and said that although he had been interested in politics for 40 years

he had never heard a similar statement made by a responsible person. He moved:—

That this meeting is of opinion that a Minister of the Crown who makes such an irresponsible statement as that attributed to Mr. Hincks is no longer fit to hold a Ministerial position in Her Majesty's Government.

The Minister did a grave injustice to himself and to his fellow Ministers in making the statement. I have been in this place longer than the Minister and I can say that on no occasion has a Minister of the Crown treated me in other than exactly the same way, as far as administration is concerned, as members of his own Party. I have never felt that I have suffered an injustice from a Minister of the Crown in that way, but on the floor of the House I have felt that I have not always had the same consideration as Liberal and Country League members. Last session Mr. Shannon got a Bill through giving a barber extended hours of trading, although it cut across the basic principles accepted by this Parliament, but I was defeated when I tried to get an amendment through to the Road and Railway Transport Act, which would have allowed members of Her Majesty's forces to travel on a certain form of transport. Although I got the whole-hearted support of Opposition members, not one Liberal supported me. I made full use of this in my election campaign, because it is the responsibility of every member to tell the electors what happens in Parliament. I quoted the barber instance, and then said that men in uniform had been turned down flat. I was asked whether there was not enough returned soldiers in the Government Party to enable the Bill to be passed, and I was forced to say that when it came to politics in this House Government supporters forgot they were returned soldiers and became members of the Party machine. In their desire to defeat the Independent member, a man without any organization behind him and without any great financial backing, two other Ministers of the Crown, supported by two Legislative Council members, took part in the campaign. I considered that to be a high honour. I had no doubts about the result of the election. I told my committee that we did not have to worry about it; all we had to think about was how big the majority would be. We were successful and our majority was greater than the total number of votes cast for the Liberal and Country League candidate, despite the efforts of the Premier, Ministers of the Crown, and members of the Legislative Council.

In this House there are four Independents, and they express their views as they see fit, irrespective of what the Government thinks. We are the only members in this place who can do that. The Government was anxious about the campaign because its socialistic efforts were catching up with it. One thing which lost it more votes than anything else was what Mr. Fletcher referred to as the ghoulissh system of taxing—the robbing of the dead. We know that the Government has to get money from somewhere, and so it takes every penny it can from a person whilst he is alive, by means of sales tax, petrol tax, and many other taxes. The people are forced to put up with it, but it is the last thing when a so-called Liberal Government puts into practice the policy of Karl Marx, a policy which breaks up the home, the estate, and in fact everything. One of the Legislative Council members who came to my district was asked what he thought about it and he was honest enough and firm enough in his principles to say he was ashamed of the men coming into the Liberal Party—men who would vote for anything they were asked to support, even if it were against their principles. I agree with his remark, because it is a fact, and you, Mr. Speaker, must have noticed how the quality of supporters of the Government has declined during the last 18 to 20 years. I can speak with only 15 years' experience. When I first came here it was not unusual to see members of the Liberal Party vote against the Government, but we do not see it today because a good type of man will not offer his services to such a Government. He will not be associated with it. That might be strong language but it is necessary to tell the Government the way it is going. If there were an electoral system which would truly record the votes of the people the Liberal Government would be defeated because of its socialistic activities. I believe the Liberal Government could retain control of the Treasury benches if it did not give lip service to private enterprise and private individuals and then follow a directly opposite programme in Parliament.

Mr. Brookman this afternoon took the Labor Party to task because it advocates Socialism and seeks State enterprises instead of caring for the rights of private individuals. Whatever the Labor Party stands for, it is honest. Although I do not agree with all that it does, I admire its members for their honesty of purpose. They are elected on a socialistic policy. Do members of the Liberal Party say to the electors "If you return us we will see

that State monopolies get bigger and bigger, and that the Party behind the Government will hand over immense sums of money, extracted from the taxpayers by such vile methods as robbing the dead, to make up the losses on those State enterprises?" Is that Liberal policy when facing the electors? I would rather have the man who stands up for his views and fights for them than the one who by stealth and underhand methods tries to saddle us with the incubus of State enterprise at the expense of the taxpayers of South Australia. The Premier came to my district in support of the Liberal cause. Evidently he knew more about radium, uranium, isotopes, and various other things than he did about the intricate matter of controlling the waters of the River Murray. When he was asked about the bungling which takes place when the river cannot be crossed because of flood waters, and when within a week it cannot be crossed because there is not enough water in the river to float the punts he said it was beyond the control of South Australia, and that the matter was controlled by a commission comprising representatives of Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia. He said that South Australia was only a partner in the organization. I am sorry that the Premier was out of touch with the subject. This State has complete control of the waters within its borders. The other States gladly handed the matter over to South Australia. They knew that the power would not be abused and therefore they would not interfere.

I will support the Premier's efforts to develop our uranium deposits, in the same way as I supported him in the difficult times when he wanted to develop the Leigh Creek coalfield, but I suggest that he shows a little moderation in the development of the uranium field. The Premier is enthusiastic on the subject, but there are other people who know as much about it, if not more. There are world authorities who say it will be many years before uranium can be used commercially. At present it is essentially a question of defence, or offence, and if it were not for the great interest of military authorities in the United States, Great Britain and Australia development would not have taken place to the extent it has. It is not fair to restrict development in other directions in order to foster the production of uranium. The member for Gawler, who was a teacher in the Education Department, told us that our educational system is in a bad way, but we cannot spend money on developing uranium and at the same time improve our

educational system. I hope the Premier will use discretion and not put all our financial eggs in the one basket.

I congratulate the member for Glenelg, who is the Government Whip, on the success he achieved as the result of a motion he moved last year. I read from the Minister of Lands' speech that he would welcome into Parliament my opponent at the elections, Mr. Story, because he felt he could take over the office of Minister of Irrigation. Unfortunately, the Minister has not Mr. Story's support in this House, but at least he has the support of the Government Whip who has proved himself to be an efficient adviser on the control and development of irrigation areas. Last session Mr. Pattinson moved that in view of the losses that have occurred in our irrigation areas the settlers' water rates should be increased. He would be delighted to know that the Minister and his officers immediately acted, and the unfortunate settlers have had their rates increased, in some instances by 100 per cent., although their incomes have been greatly reduced. He probably knows that the price of dried fruits has dropped considerably and that wine-grape growers had to practically give away their crops rather than let them rot on the vines. Citrus fruits have dropped to a fraction of the price they brought previously. Some years ago a committee investigating the industry added a rider to their recommendations that if the income of the settlers dropped their water rates should be reviewed, but they have been increased. However, that is not the worst of it. Not only are the settlers forced to pay whatever rates the department thinks fit, but they are insulted as well. This is an addendum to a circular informing settlers of the increased water rates:—

Even with the additional revenue which the increased rates will provide, a considerable portion of the annual costs incurred in the operation and maintenance of the areas will have to be met from the general revenue of the State and it is therefore of great importance that settlers individually co-operate as far as practicable in keeping costs to a minimum by limiting the quantities of water used during the irrigation.

Obviously, the intention was to put the responsibility on the settler. It seemed that the settler was wasting the water and therefore adding to the costs. I said, when speaking on Mr. Pattinson's motion last year, that if the water rates were increased to such an extent that every grower in the area was forced out of production the losses under the socialistic

system could not be met, and the honourable member probably realizes the truth of that. It is not the settlers who are wasting the water but the Irrigation Department. It is not only wasting water, but creating a menace in the area. At Loxton one farmer is growing acres of lucerne with surplus water from a channel from which water is running to waste. I am not condemning the farmer for his initiative, but the settlers in the Loxton area or the taxpayers are paying for that water which the farmer gets for nothing. There is also a lake measuring several acres created by water coming from the overflow at Cooltong because it cannot be properly controlled. The water is a menace to the settlement because it builds up underground water tables, so instead of blaming the settlers for wasting water the Minister and his department should prevent waste. Years ago I said irrigation water in open channels could not be controlled. If the pipe system I recommended had been installed no loss of water would have occurred. The capital cost of installing pipelines would be offset by the present waste of water. As a pipeline would probably last for up to 200 years the capital cost is nothing to be worried about. Following on certain changes in the department, at long last pipes are being laid in new areas of the Loxton scheme. New policies are being carried out. There has been a revolutionary change in the Loxton settlement, but it should have been implemented at the inception of the settlement.

Mr. Stott—Constant dripping wears away the hardest stone.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I do not know whether that is the reason, but shortly the chickens will come home to roost. The young settlers have tremendous liabilities and undoubtedly enormous sums will be written off against irrigation. History will repeat itself. The settlers of World War I. were charged with all the losses on soldier settlement and people said a tremendous amount of money had been spent by the Government in settling them, but it was not spent in settling soldiers but in maladministration and stupidity in Government departments. In spite of the warnings given by some members we shall have the same thing again. However, it will be difficult for the Ministers and their departments to shelve their responsibilities this time. My district depends largely on wine production and dried fruits. I am alarmed about the feeling of uncertainty, almost despair, that has

come over some young settlers. I am not now thinking of those in Government settlements, but of those who have seen no hope of getting a Government property and have had the initiative to purchase properties on the open market and shoulder the whole of the financial responsibility. They paid high prices for their land and are carrying high mortgages. With the price of wine, citrus, and dried fruits dropping they are in an unhappy position.

Mr. Stott—And their water rates have gone up.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Yes. I do not think there is any great need for despair, for I believe the wine industry is the most stable primary industry in the Commonwealth. Over the past few years we have been able to sell every gallon of wine we could produce on the home market. Other industries, like dried fruit, have to export large quantities—up to 80 per cent of the total yield—and accept world parity price. Here the basic wage is £11 11s. a week, against about £5 10s. in Britain. I do not know the working hours there, but here it is 40 a week. The fruit is grown under Australian conditions of labour but sold at the world price, but the wine-grape growers do not have to face that difficulty. Recently Mr. Ken Hardy, who at that time was chairman of the Australian Wine Board—and I think still is—said that the consumption of wine in Australia had grown to such an extent that it seemed likely that the winemakers would have to ration supplies to customers because they could not cope with the demand. That statement was made when the level of wine production in Australia was high. Between 1947 and 1950 Australia produced up to 35,000,000 gall. a year, of which about 11,000,000 was consumed in Australia, whereas before the war between 3,000,000 and 4,000,000 gall. was consumed in Australia.

I have always felt we did not have enough wine in bond in Australia to ensure a continuous supply of properly matured wine, and the official figures show no build-up of wine in bond despite the large post-war vintages. Since 1950 the position has changed, and after the last vintage the bottom fell out of the trade in grapes from the grower to the winemaker, owing not to any reluctance on the part of Australians to drink wine, but to the deliberate action of the Commonwealth, through its Treasurer, in imposing financial restrictions on the

winemaker so as to make it impossible for him to pay for his grapes. Winemakers buying grapes at an average price of £20 a ton had previously been able, by means of bank advances, to pay the growers by the end of the June following the vintage, but with the advent of bank credit restrictions, growers—many of them young men just starting in the industry—had to wait 12 months before being paid for their deliveries. Today the growers are financing the winemaking industry, for the winemaker is able to pay only about £4 10s. as a down payment on deliveries made by the growers; therefore, the growers must ask the banks to finance them so that they may meet their harvesting and crop-handling charges. Although the press frequently asks for an inquiry into the wine industry, I suggest that, if an inquiry were held into the financial aspect alone we could come to some conclusion which would be helpful in producing and maintaining stability in the industry.

It has been suggested that, because the growers are too lazy to dry their grapes, their crops are sent to the distillery, with consequent over-production of wines and spirits, but that is incorrect. The production of brandy is peculiarly a South Australian industry, for this is the only State in which brandy is produced in any quantity. During the years 1951 and 1952 this State sold, 22,615 gall. of brandy more than it produced, so how can there have been over-production? We drew on bonded supplies to keep our trade going, so obviously talk about over-production was false until that time. Then the Federal Treasurer imposed an extra excise duty of 6s. a bottle on the production of brandy, which made its price prohibitive to the ordinary consumer.

Mr. Quirk—He halved the brandy sales and did not increase his revenue.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—He actually reduced his revenue although the extra duty was designed as a revenue earner. This matter is serious for everyone living in the grape-growing districts. It has been said that Great Britain has been unfair in imposing such a high duty as to make it hard to market Australian brandy in the Old Country, but Britain has just finished financing one of the most expensive wars ever known. For two years she fought and financed it alone while other nations sat on the fence busily absorbing Britain's overseas credits. Today Great Britain, which started the war with unlimited

overseas credits with which to buy food for her 50,000,000 people, finds she has almost no overseas credits left. Can the British Government be blamed for saying, "We cannot afford to use our overseas credits to buy wine and spirits, for we want to buy wheat, mutton, wool, and other absolute necessities? Why keep on flogging the British people when the remedy lies within Australia? I am fully convinced that the truth of the saying, "The eyes of the fool are in the ends of the earth," is exemplified in this matter of wine duties. We should not worry about what the British Government is doing, but about what is happening in Australia.

Mr. O'Halloran—We should not deal with Sir Arthur Fadden by sending deputations to Mr. Butler.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Instead of working up agitation against Mr. Butler, the British Chancellor of the Exchequer, we should work on our own Federal Treasurer, who imposed the extra excise duty of 6s. a bottle on brandy. His action showed no commonsense, for every salesman knows that you can gradually increase your price and maintain sales, but if you suddenly increase the price, even of a necessity, you immediately meet buyer resistance and defeat your object: you lose rather than gain revenue. Sir Arthur Fadden might have got away with an extra 2s., but the extra 6s. killed the South Australian brandy industry; yet so far no one has pinned that crime on him. Responsible people inside and outside Parliament, including speakers on behalf of the wine industry, give lip service at least to the attack on the British Government, which is financially helpless. Young growers who have only recently entered the industry should not be frightened, for their industry is secure and one of the oldest of our primary industries. In spite of recent attacks on it, it will survive, for our wines and brandies are second to none in the world today.

A man associated with the wine industry has taken out figures to show how the Government and the grower share in the revenue earned from the production and sale of brandy. This man assumes that a grower produces a hundred tons of grapes on 10 acres, which is a fair average figure. Processed for brandy spirit, one ton makes 30 proof gallons of brandy and six gallons of S.V.R., which is more or less the residue of the brandy spirit. This gives a total production from the crop of 3,000 proof gallons of brandy and 600 gallons of S.V.R. spirit. The duty on the brandy at £4 4s. 6d. a gallon yields £12,675

in duty and on the S.V.R. at 4s. a gallon £120, giving the Government a total of £12,795 in duty. Although last year many crops were sold at a price as low as £8 a ton, it is assumed that the grower receives £18 a ton for his crop.

Mr. O'Halloran—Is that the gross or net return?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—The gross return. The grower receives a return of £1,800 as against the Government's £12,795.

Mr. O'Halloran—Out of that the grower must pay his working expenses?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Yes, his water rates, labour and pruning. By imposing these duties the Federal Treasurer is killing the goose that lays the golden egg. When he imposed an additional 6s. excise on each bottle of brandy he made a free gift of 6s. on every bottle held by merchants and agents throughout Australia. The merchants in capital cities hold large stocks of brandy and immediately the increased excise was imposed they stopped purchasing brandy and sold their stocks. They will not purchase any more brandy until the Federal Treasurer reduces the excise.

Mr. O'Halloran—Has he promised to reduce it?

Mr. Quirke—He said he would reduce it in the next Budget.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I assume he will. It reveals the tremendous impact a financial policy can have on workers. If I was speaking on financial reform I would point out the futility of a person producing something if it was going to be ruined by a financial policy. The Commonwealth Government, hundreds of miles from the South Australian growers, without consulting anyone imposes duties which will kill the industry. Members of the prohibition party will probably endorse everything that has been done, but the growers do not. Recently I received a letter from the Australian Dried Fruits Association in which it was suggested that I use all my endeavours to prevent a further expansion of the dried fruit industry. I said I could not do anything to prevent the Government expanding that industry until all ex-servicemen who were approved for settlement were settled on the land. I also said that I did not think any member of a State or Federal Parliament could do anything to prevent expansion. We cannot develop Australia unless we develop it. That sounds like a truism, but it is futile for people to suggest we should develop the River Murray Valley when they oppose any development. This organization has ignored the advice tendered it by the growers.

Years ago when I was actively engaged in the industry and addressing meetings along the Murray from Waikerie to Renmark I foreshadowed the danger which might arise if the inflation which had started then continued. I suggested that we favour an expansion of the industry so as to absorb all qualified ex-servicemen and endeavour to safeguard our position by asking the Commonwealth Government, if the price received for dried fruits dropped below the cost of production price, to subsidize the dried fruit which was exported. However, so far as I know, no steps have been taken in that direction. The Australian Dried Fruits Association has adopted a self-righteous attitude and has said in effect, "We would not condescend to ask for assistance." Practically every industry, both secondary and primary, requires assistance. One of our major secondary industries is assisted by the Commonwealth. A report from Canberra recently revealed that the manufacturers of tractors receive a direct subsidy of between £80 to £240 for every tractor produced. In addition they are enabled to pay 5 per cent on the invested capital. Primary producers in South Australia would be happy if they were allowed to receive 5 per cent on invested capital and then obtain a subsidy. The Commonwealth Government has also promised to subsidize wheat and is subsidizing export butter. I hope that in the not far distant future the dried fruits industry will recognize the wisdom of following the steps I suggested and which were supported by practically all growers on the Murray some years ago.

I have no doubt that the present potato shortage is due to Government action. A producer will not tolerate unnecessary interference. Boards have been established to regulate the marketing of potatoes and other commodities and they issue such instructions as:—"Growers whose names begin with letters between A and M will be permitted to dig a quota of potatoes during a certain week and growers in the M to Z group the following week." During those periods it may rain heavily and only an infinitesimal quantity may be dug, whilst worms and other pests destroy the crops. Such restrictions aggravate our problems. The Premier has repeatedly said that one of the principal reasons for the present fiasco is that the New South Wales Socialist Government has refused to impose controls on potatoes. I always thought the Liberal policy was to permit open competition and not to impose controls and it is novel to

hear a Liberal Premier blaming a Labor Government for not implementing Labor's policy. I wonder what would be the effect of a Labor Government in South Australia. I would not be surprised if a number of the restrictions foisted on primary producers during recent years were not abolished. In New South Wales the soldier settler enjoys greater freedom than exists in South Australia. Here the settler has to take the house supplied by the Government, but in New South Wales he is permitted to build his own house as he desires. The Government supplies him with plans and assists him in obtaining materials, but it does not prevent him from building the house he wants.

A short time ago we experienced an onion shortage. This is a primary-producing State and yet the Minister of Agriculture and his department have not been able to keep the supply of produce up to the general public. Surely there is something wrong in our primary industries when they cannot carry out the functions which have operated almost since the foundation of the State. There is something wrong when the humble onion and potato disappear. It has been suggested we will soon be paying over £100 a ton for potatoes. The sooner the Government realizes that primary producers will not be pushed around by Government officials, no matter how sincere they be, the better it will be for this State. I have always fought for the rights of private individuals, but I am horrified at events of the last 10 years. There has been the growing menace of socialism and the destruction of individual rights in favour of the all-powerful State. When farmers are to be regimented to planting according to the directions of some bureaucrat, that comes pretty close to the end of freedom-loving democracy.

I commend the member for Gawler for his sound address. Every honourable member must pay attention to his views on education because he has had years of practical experience as an important officer in charge of some of our bigger schools. I had obtained some figures on the subject, but it is not necessary to give them now because one more able to talk on the subject has already done so. It is a tragedy that such an important matter as the education of our young people has been so much neglected. I remember the time when members advocated a raising of the school-leaving age, but it would be futile to introduce that now because we cannot accommodate

and teach the children even up to a school-leaving age of 14 years. I have been informed that the leaving age in the United States of America is 18. Not only do we lack the necessary accommodation for the present number of children but we have not sufficient qualified teachers. It is scandalous that young people, after only a few weeks' training, are put into schools in charge of young children. At the beginning of World War II. the minimum training period was three years for a primary teacher and four years for a secondary teacher but now it has been considerably reduced. Surely this is something to which this House should pay attention. The department is not only employing young girls who are under trained but taking back teachers who left the department many years ago and who, in the meantime, have married and reared families. This has been done to help the department out of an impossible position. If they had not returned the whole educational structure must have fallen by the wayside.

Earlier in the session I mentioned that it was rather unwise for the Government to allot an additional £40,000 to the Adelaide University, that no other university in Australia had been more generously endowed by a State Government than our university and that I believed that no other had such adequate accommodation. I was taken to task for even questioning the wisdom of this £40,000 grant. It would have been far better to allot that money to our primary schools. I am not writing down our university. It is the coping stone of our education system, but our primary schools are the foundation: we cannot have a good building unless the foundation is sound. There is growing resentment against the standard of education of primary school children at the time they enter the secondary school. I was credibly informed that at one time children coming up from the primary schools could go straight ahead with their work in the secondary schools, but now the first year in the secondary school is spent by the teachers in bringing them up to the stage they should have reached in the primary schools. People in the district of Flinders have stated through the press that the abolition of the qualifying certificate has had something to do with this. I have been told that because primary schools had so much broken time for playing periods and outside exercises that the children had not sufficient time to concentrate on the essentials which used to be known as the "three R's." Our primary school educational system is not satisfactory and it

cannot be satisfactory if the department is to depend on unqualified teachers. I understand there is a large percentage of temporary teachers.

Mr. John Clark—Ninety per cent of the teachers in the infant departments are only temporary.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—That is astonishing and staggering.

Mr. Pattinson—What is the meaning of “qualified” teacher?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I suggest that no person trained for only a few weeks could be considered qualified to teach. At one time the department thought that three years’ training was necessary to make an efficient teacher, but now that time has been reduced to three months. We cannot expect to produce qualified teachers in that time. The shortage of nursing staff in our hospitals has been largely overcome by the granting of increased salaries, and if teachers’ salaries were increased we would probably improve the present position.

Legal members of the House have made certain suggestions for altering our State laws. I have no claim to legal knowledge, but I take strong exception to certain omissions in our laws. In recent years at harvest time I have employed native people from our missions, and have never had better employees in my 30 years’ fruitgrowing experience. They are not only good workers, but are civil and cheerful. Their work is entirely satisfactory until they get intoxicating liquor, and then the whole story is altered. I have in mind one case where the husband came home at the end of the season under the influence of liquor and his native wife, as many other wives had done before in similar circumstances, reprimanded him for his drinking habits. He struck her and as a result she was in hospital for more than six weeks.

There are men in all our river districts who fleece the native people of large sums. It is deliberate robbery, because they charge these unfortunate individuals 10s. for a bottle of wine for which they paid only 4s. 6d. There is not one hotelkeeper, wine maker, or wine grape grower who countenances this activity. It is objectionable and we want it stopped. However, it is a difficult practice to prevent because unless the police can catch red-handed the “poor white” who takes the money from these unfortunate people there is little chance of a conviction. Even when a conviction is obtained the justice of the peace who tries

the case usually cannot impose an adequate punishment, usually only a fine. I was told by a local policeman that he picked up one of these objectionable whites that hang around hotels on Saturday mornings, who after being arrested for drunkenness was kept in custody over the weekend because he had no money for bail. On the Monday he was taken before the justice of the peace and because he had been in custody over the weekend was discharged, and yet the same afternoon was back in the cells with approximately £4 in his pocket, which the police have not the slightest doubt was obtained from the sale of wines and other liquors to unfortunate native people. I should like the Government to take steps to alter the present law. I have kept a record of some of the cases which have been reported from the courts. An aboriginal father and son were awarded the maximum penalty for drinking intoxicating liquor. There had been several previous convictions for a similar offence. They were sent to gaol for 28 days; and yet the offender who supplied the liquor got off with a fine. One white man who pleaded guilty to supplying an aborigine with liquor was fined £20 and costs and in another case at Renmark a person who supplied liquor to an aborigine was fined £10 with 7s. 6d. costs. Another, being an aborigine, was sentenced to 14 days imprisonment. Imagine the injustice of that; a man who may have fallen to the temptation of having a drink is put into gaol for 14 or 28 days, whereas the man who, for miserable gain, supplies the aborigine with liquor escapes with a nominal fine. I remember reading a report of a case where one aboriginal killed another. It was to be assumed that both were drunk, but the judge in sentencing the killer to 18 months’ imprisonment said that this man was only a few years removed from his native state and that he could not possibly know the white man’s laws or the temptation he was faced with, and that the man responsible for the murder was he who had supplied the liquor. This illicit trade is growing wherever there is an aboriginal settlement. I have every reason to believe that there are men who go around with cars loaded with liquor and leave them under trees and bushes, and what I am asking the Government to do is to alter the Act. Section 172 reads:—

Any person who sells, gives, or supplies, or permits to be sold, given, or supplied, any liquor to any aboriginal native of Australia, or half-caste of that race, shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty of not less than £5 or not more than £25.

That is not enough. It is too difficult for the police to catch these persons who evade the law and I suggest that the minimum penalty should be at least one year's hard labour for the first offence, five years' hard labour for the second, and for the third the offender should be declared an habitual criminal. There is nothing much lower in human society than the person who will wilfully degrade another. We read of the degradation of white people by the bringing in of opium and other drugs, and we hold up our hands in holy horror at people who force drugs like that on white people. A close parallel is this supplying of liquor to a race never brought up to it. My suggested amendment would not in any way affect those members of the aboriginal race who have been freed of the control of the Aborigines Act, particularly certain men who have been long enough associated with white people and who are not affected detrimentally by liquor. I am not worried on their behalf, but am only concerned with those controlled by this Act. I sincerely hope that the Government will get a report from the police and the Aborigines Department to see whether we cannot impose such a punishment on this illegal supplying of liquor as to make it not worth while.

There are other things on which I should like to have expressed an opinion, but I will have other opportunities as they come before the House. I hope that this continual attempt by the Government to socialize the State of South Australia will be brought to a halt. It is the responsibility of all members who keep the Government in office, and I think that the philosophy of the Liberal Party is such that they will not be in a position to support many of the enactments suggested in the Governor's Speech, as for instance, the control of transport.

Mr. GOLDNEY (Gouger)—I add my congratulations to you, Mr. Speaker, on your re-election to your high office and also to the member for Mitcham on again being elected Chairman of Committees. I would also mention the happy consummation of the coronation ceremonies in England, and in common with other members I wish Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II., a long and happy reign and trust that it will be free from war and strife. There is no more loyal section of the British Empire than South Australia and when we say that we hope Her Majesty will have a long and successful reign we sincerely mean it. I join with other speakers in congratulating our new Governor, Sir Robert George, and

hope that his stay in South Australia will be happy in every way.

Much has been said about primary production and particularly about the high figures attained last season. I sometimes think that rather too much has been made of this aspect. Certainly the figures for last season were very high indeed, both as regards cereals and live-stock, but we sometimes seem to forget that these figures were attained by the beneficence of a very kindly Providence. This happy state of affairs will not be always with us, for just as surely as we have a run of good seasons we must expect a run of leaner seasons. I would draw the attention of members who are perhaps not so vitally interested in primary production as those engaged in it to the fact that during the last 20 or 30 years very great improvement has been made in farming methods. Producers generally, by rotation of crops and careful husbandry, have been able to increase the yields very considerably and have thus been able to overcome to some extent the handicaps imposed by nature. The system of fallowing in the lower rainfall areas, and scientific cultivation has enabled farmers to grow crops in such seasons as would have rendered it impossible some years ago. Much has also been said about the damage caused by wind and water erosion and although I know there is much truth in those statements in some cases they have been exaggerated. My electorate is a district where, generally speaking, there is not a great amount of water or wind erosion, but many primary producers in districts which have been settled for 60 or 80 years, or even more have, by the careful methods employed made their land more productive than it has ever been.

Recently a happy event took place in the South-East with the completion of the broadening of the railway gauge to Mount Gambier. The only observation I wish to make on that is that had it been done 30 years ago our railways would have been in a much happier position today. One of the most important things in South Australia is water conservation and reticulation. I know that the Minister of Works sometimes claims that water reticulation in South Australia is much more widespread than in other States. Nevertheless, there are still isolated pockets even in closely settled areas without reticulated water. Some places have underground supplies, though not always of the best quality, and they do not provide that amenity for the homestead people because the water is not suitable for the growing of fruit trees or vegetables. I believe

that there are further schemes which could be undertaken for the conservation and reticulation of water, and when the several big schemes now in hand are completed I think the Government should look further afield to see what others can be brought into operation to serve the drier areas. We have been battling for years to get extensions of the electricity service in country areas. Some are being carried out, but there are still many of the smaller townships and even farmhouses along power line routes, that are still without electric power. Although the work already done has been of value, there is still more to be done. During the last few years much attention has been given to constructing high power transmission lines to connect the city with the new powerhouse at Port Augusta, but when this work is completed greater consideration should be given to distributing electricity to the more sparsely populated areas.

Much criticism has been levelled at many of our country roads. Mr. Pearson told us about the roads in his area. Roads play an important part in our transport system, and I do not think we always get value for expenditure on them. We spend money on constructing new roads and repairing others, but there are many miles of roads which should be sealed with bitumen. Perhaps it would be better in the country areas where there is much traffic on gravel roads to seal a few miles each year instead of grading and regrading to keep them in proper condition, because in the wetter times it is almost a hopeless task. In my district there is a road which runs from Balaklava through Halbury and Auburn to Clare. From a point near Balaklava to one four or five miles to the north-east there is a piece of road which crosses the railway line four or five times. It has been a dangerous section for years. Recently the Highways Department purchased a piece of land about four miles long with a view to straightening out the road. The work should be commenced as soon as possible in order to get rid of the danger. I believe the local district council expects a Government grant for the purpose, but nothing definite is yet known.

The Premier has referred to the Royal visit next year and expects public bodies and individuals to undertake tree planting. I heartily agree, because we should have more trees planted than we have had in the past. I hope as much as possible will be done in this matter. I have been interested in it for

some time and occasionally I have tried to improve the appearance of my property by planting trees. I agree with those who suggest planting trees which will stand up to the climate in the particular area. We must be careful about the selection. I support those members who say that education is an important matter. We have had some criticism of our kindergarten system and local school committees. In my district there are two pre-school kindergartens which are doing good work. We are inclined to overlook that these pre-school kindergartens take from the mothers some of the responsibility of looking after their children, and enables them to rest for several hours each day. We are apt to forget that the more knowledge we acquire the greater are our responsibilities to ourselves, our fellows, our country and Empire. I urge on those who seek higher education to remember this.

We owe a duty to our sick people and our aged folk who have borne the heat and burden of the day, and who in many cases in their declining years cannot receive care in an institution. We have a few religious organizations which care for our aged people and which are doing excellent work, but we need more of these institutions because there is a long waiting list. In connection with pensions I feel that there should be some form of contributory system. Some system should have been implemented to meet the cost of pensions and necessary amenities.

I think that sometimes people get a wrong impression on social questions. Recently I heard a minister of religion talking about the tendency to indulge in social evils, such as drinking and gambling, and he said that many people cannot see any hope in the future because there is a threat of war or disaster hanging over their heads, so they take the easy way out. In other words, their motto is in "Eat, drink and be merry, for tomorrow we die." That is a wrong attitude. As responsible citizens we should not take refuge in things that are social evils. We should not shirk our responsibilities and drown our sorrows. We have been given much in this country; let us give something back in return. I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. HEASLIP secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.13 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 6, at 2 p.m.