

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, August 11, 1953.

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

QUESTIONS.**BROKEN HILL ROAD.**

Mr. O'HALLORAN—The Minister of Works will remember that towards the end of last year a very influential deputation from district councils adjacent to the Main North Road through Peterborough from Marrabel waited on him, supported by some influential people from Broken Hill. They asked that the sealing of the road from Marrabel through Burra and thence in the general direction of Peterborough and Broken Hill should be begun without delay. The Minister did not hold out much hope that it could be begun in the near future, but he promised that the road would be kept in as good an order as possible. Since I returned from overseas I heard a rumour that the sealing is to commence. I do not expect the Minister to reply today, but will he make inquiries and advise the House of the present position regarding the improvement of that road?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Following on that deputation and in accordance, too, with the requirements of the situation full investigations were made into the probable cost and to what degree money could be expended out of the highways fund without detriment to other equally valuable roads. The net result so far has been that further maintenance men and gangs are employed in keeping the road in better order than it has been but the question of bituminizing the section which carries the most traffic is involved in the realignment of the road. The Highways Commissioner has been going thoroughly into that matter. Peculiarly enough, the Broken Hill Better Roads Association asked that Broken Hill be attached to South Australia because of the far better road on this side of the border. We can take that as a token and a compliment. I will get a further report on the progress made, but I am sure the maintenance work will be stepped up.

JUDGES' RETIRING ALLOWANCES.

Mr. TRAVERS—Prior to the Supreme Court Act Amendment Act of 1944 all Supreme Court judges held their appointments for life. In 1944 provision was made for compulsory retirement at the age of 70 of all judges appointed thereafter, and the same Act gave

to those then in office the option to hold office for life or retire at 70. The same Act provided for a retiring allowance of half salary and expressly stated it would be half the salary being paid at the date of retirement. I understand that some judges, relying upon what the Act stated, exercised that option. Three years later, however, the Act was so amended, after they had exercised the option, that those who exercised it will, on the present state of the law, receive on retirement only 32 per cent of their salary and not 50 per cent as promised by the Act when the option was exercised. Can the Acting Leader of the Government say: (1) how many judges are so affected; (2) whether the Government intends that the Act be again amended to keep faith with those who exercised the option; (3) why, if 50 per cent of the salary was a just retiring allowance in 1944, should all judges appointed since 1947 have to be content with 32 per cent; and (4) whether, in view of the fact that every judge has to spend approximately a whole year's salary to equip himself with a sufficient library to enable him to perform his duties, the Government will consider making some adequate allowance for each judge, over and above his salary, for that purpose?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I will take up with the appropriate Minister the points raised by the honourable member and bring down a reply.

REGISTRATION OF MOTOR FLEETS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Some firms have fleets of vehicles, the current registrations of which expire on different dates. Has the Government considered a scheme whereby the registration fees on all vehicles in the one fleet would fall due on the same date?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—No, but I will take up the matter with my colleagues and let the honourable member have a further report.

CONTROL OF THALLIUM SALES.

Mr. WILLIAM JENKINS—Under the Food and Drugs Act the persons authorized to sell thallium poison are:—

1. An authorized seller if the sale is effected by or under supervision of a registered pharmacist;
2. A licensed wholesale dealer;
3. A person specially authorized who may be—
 - (a) the holder of a medicine seller's permit,
 - (b) the holder of a photographic dealer's permit,
 - (c) the holder of a seedman's permit.

In view of the prevalence of thallium poisoning in other States can the Minister representing the Minister of Health say whether the Act affords sufficient protection to the public against the misuse of this poison; and if it is considered adequate is he satisfied that the policing is sufficiently strict to ensure its observance?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I will take up the points raised with the Minister of Health.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Last year I inquired of the Premier the position in regard to what seemed to be the non-control of the sales of thallium to the general public. He obtained a report from the Director-General of Public Health, part of which stated:—

The matter will be referred to the advisory committee appointed under the Food and Drugs Act with a view to considering whether any further restrictions on the sale of thallium compounds are necessary or desirable.

In view of the exceptionally large number of cases of thallium poisoning detected—particularly in New South Wales—the question is most important. Can the Minister representing the Premier advise the House of the nature of the report made by the advisory committee or, if not, will he obtain a copy of its findings?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I will obtain the information.

TYPHOID BACTERIA IN DESICCATED COCONUT.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—As South Australia is now the only mainland State which has not introduced some prohibitive measures regarding the sales of possibly contaminated desiccated coconut, can the Minister representing the Minister of Health say if it is intended to rely indefinitely on the good sense of vendors of supplies to customers, allied with commendable newspaper efforts to publicize the matter, or will some action be taken soon?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—This question has been raised previously and I understand the Minister of Health is now actively engaged in trying to trace the source of supplies of coconut which it is claimed contains germs. I will obtain a reply from the Minister of Health.

Mr. DUNKS—About a fortnight ago it was reported in the press that desiccated coconut was under suspicion in this and other States as being responsible for cases of typhoid fever, particularly in Victoria. It has been proved that one brand of coconut is impure. The greater proportion of coconut used in South Australia is from Ceylon but many people have panicked and that has been detrimental to the manufacturers of confectionery and cakes. I

understand the matter has been referred to the authorities for examination but it has been stated that a report of the findings will not be available until the end of next week. Can the Minister representing the Minister of Health say why it takes so long to ascertain whether typhoid germs are contained in the coconut submitted for examination?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I believe that in reply to a similar question last week the Premier said it would take a considerable time for the germs to incubate to prove whether they were the type causing typhoid. I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

MOONTA ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES.

Mr. McALEES—Has the Minister representing the Premier a reply to the question I asked on August 4 relating to the extension of electricity to Cross Roads, a suburb of Moonta?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—The chairman of the Electricity Trust reports:—

The group referred to comprises approximately 60 connections, and is located adjacent to the line from Moonta to Kadina. The conditions of supply will be sent to these people within the next three weeks. If the conditions are accepted promptly the trust will commence the extension within two months of acceptance, and will hope to complete it within a further two months.

SCHOOL-LEAVING AGE.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—About the year 1940 there was much agitation in South Australia to have the school-leaving age raised from 14 to 16 years. The then Minister of Education rightly pointed out that because of the exigencies of the war it was impracticable to raise the age at that time, but said that it was the Government's intention when the war ended and things returned to normal to raise the school-leaving age in two stages—first, from 14 to 15 years, and eventually to 16 years. Will the Minister representing the Premier get a report from the Minister of Education as to when the first step in raising the school-leaving age is likely to be taken?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Yes, I will have that done straight away.

SHARE FARMERS' MOTOR VEHICLES.

Mr. STOTT—Share farmers are unable to get a primary producer's licence for their utilities and other motor vehicles, the Motor Vehicles Department contending that they are not primary producers within the meaning of the Act. It is difficult to draw a line between a share farmer and a primary producer; in

my opinion, both come within the same category. Will the Minister representing the Premier take this matter up with the department to see whether what is necessary is an amendment of the Act, or an instruction to the Registrar of Motor Vehicles, to enable share farmers to obtain licences on the same basis as other primary producers?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—Yes.

PETROL DELIVERIES AT NIGHT.

Mr. JENNINGS—I understand that one oil company has already started distributing petrol and oil to service stations at night and that other companies intend to do likewise. The staffs of these companies feel that it is extremely dangerous for petrol to be distributed at night because leaks and spillage could go unnoticed. Will the Minister representing the Premier investigate the matter and take any action necessary to protect the community from the fire hazard which may result from such distribution?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—Yes.

WATER PRESSURES.

Mr. HUTCHENS—During my speech on the Address in Reply I mentioned the poor water pressures during the summer months in the western districts, particularly the Hindmarsh area. The Minister asked me to supply him with the names of those who had complained, and I have now, in addition to the authors of the two letters I read, the names of 230 people in my electorate who have complained in writing of the poor pressure. Will the Minister give an assurance that, if these people are ordered by the department to renew the services within their boundaries and the pressure is subsequently found to be still unsatisfactory, the department will reimburse the cost of renewal?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—In the first place, the department does not order any renewal of services, but if the honourable member will give me the names of people who are particularly suffering, the department—which is generally recognized as one of the most efficient in the Public Service—will make investigations to see if there are any peculiar reasons why one part of the city should be worse favoured than others. If any particular reason is found I will do my best to have it rectified.

STREET ROUNDABOUTS.

Mr. DUNKS—The Burnside Council has erected on some of its main roads and streets what it is pleased to term roundabouts. These

structures are allegedly for the purpose of preventing accidents and the preserving of life, and although some are effective others are quite the reverse. The roundabout at the corner of Greenhill and Portrush roads takes up nearly the full width of the roadway and is a foot to 18in. high. Having driven past it, I have been confused to know what was road and what was not road, and several cars have been driven on top of it. Has the Government any authority over councils concerning the construction of roundabouts on streets, or can the Commissioner of Highways take action to see that they are in general conformity and likely to preserve life instead of having the opposite effect?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—As the honourable member was good enough to intimate that he proposed asking this question I obtained a report from the Commissioner of Highways, which is as follows:—

The traffic roundabout at the intersection of the Greenhill and Portrush roads was constructed by the corporation of the city of Burnside (in which body all public roads in the area are vested) approximately 12 months ago, with sandbag walls, and proved to be effective in segregating the traffic, and slowing it down to something approaching the statutory maximum speed of 25 miles per hour permitted in terms of section 132 of the Road Traffic Act. A temporary structure and its effect upon traffic was viewed by representatives of various interested bodies, including the National Safety Council, the Royal Automobile Association, the State Traffic Committee, the Road Transport Association and the Police Department early in October, 1952, and the proposal received the unanimous support of all. Following this the council constructed the central roundabout with a 12in. concrete wall and is now undertaking the provision of raised guidance strips as an additional aid to traffic approaching the intersection.

What the honourable member regarded as a danger was erected for safety purposes and received the endorsement of all the bodies I know of that claimed to represent the safety movement in South Australia.

STATE BANK ADVANCES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Has the Minister of Lands any reply to a question I asked the Treasurer on July 29 about State Bank advances?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I have received the following reply from the chairman of the board of management of the bank:—

Referring to the inquiry by Mr. Walsh, M.P., herein, the policy of the State Bank Board is that a successful applicant for assistance under the Advances for Homes Act is advised the

fate of his application by letter and is given a period of 14 days in which to accept the usual terms and conditions. The terms of approval which have been in existence for many years provide that the work shall be completed within nine months. This, of course, has been impracticable in recent years and has never been enforced. If, however, at the end of the nine months period the applicant has not availed himself of the whole or portion of the loan, or has not furnished any acceptable reason for the delay, he is advised that the approval has lapsed and, if assistance is again required, it must be the subject of a fresh application which, if approved, would be at the ruling rate of interest. It is necessary that some time limit be imposed, otherwise it would be impossible for the bank to accurately determine its commitments. So far as can be ascertained, there is no case where the interest rate has been increased whilst any applicant is in the process of erecting his home.

GAWLER ROAD.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—Has the Minister of Local Government anything further to report on the matter of widening or preferably duplicating the main road between Adelaide and Gawler, about which I questioned him on August 6?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The Commissioner of Highways reports as follows:—

On the Main North Road between Pooraka and Gawler the extra land was purchased some years ago for various reasons, among which were the future increase in traffic and possibility of planting trees. The necessity for securing this land, at the time of purchase, was due more to the possibility of buildings being erected on the required land rather than the immediate needs of traffic. While the advantages of a dual highway are well-known, construction costs are heavy and can only be justified when traffic has developed to a certain intensity. Apart from a few special occasions, the traffic on this section of road has not yet reached the stage when a dual highway can be economically justified. There are a number of roads on the outer metropolitan area carrying much more traffic and having a prior claim for attention. In respect to widening the pavement being practically up to two-lane standard, any expenditure on minor widening would not afford any material and lasting improvement, but would involve expenditure that could be more usefully applied to those locations where congestion is more evident. The matter, of course, is being constantly kept in mind and future developments in the Salisbury area will probably make a material alteration to the present position.

CONTROLLING MURRAY WATER.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—On July 29 I sought information from the Premier about the possibility of sending an engineer to the United

States to find out the best method of controlling water along the River Murray. The Premier informed me that an officer had been there recently and the department had full information on the latest methods. Is the information now available?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I have obtained a very lengthy report and will read the essence of it, letting the honourable member have the full report later. As stated it is not long since one of our officers went abroad to obtain the latest information on dams, weirs, and similar structures. Extracts from the report are as follows:—

The locks and weirs were built during the period 1916-1934 in accordance with designs prepared in 1915 based on common American practice at that time. Hundreds of locks and weirs of a similar pattern had been built on streams in America and, in fact, are still being constructed in America and other countries. Releasing water under, instead of over, the weirs would not possess any great advantages in regard to either salinity or silting. The total amount of salt in any lock pool depends upon the salinity of the water entering the pool from upstream, the degree of concentration of salts resulting from evaporation and the quantity of salt entering the pool in water seeping from the river banks. It is, therefore, quite immaterial whether the water flows under or over the weir. Silting problems have arisen at several of the weirs, but these difficulties occur when the weirs are open during flood periods and not when they are in normal operation. The cost of converting the present weirs to a type which released water at the bottom would, at the present time, be greater than the original cost of construction. The average cost of a lock and weir was approximately \$300,000 and the cost of building the same structures today would be in the vicinity of £1,000,000. Generally speaking, the present weirs provide an efficient form of control and any temporary lowering of the pool levels generally results from the fact that there is insufficient flow in the river to concurrently build all pools quickly to their full level. This applies particularly when flood conditions extend well into the irrigation season and the drop in natural flow occurs at a time when enormous quantities of water are being diverted for irrigation in Victoria and New South Wales. Under these conditions a type of weir that could be fully installed in a few hours would not have any advantages over the present type (taking about 10 days to install) as insufficient water would be available to build up the pool in a shorter period.

ELECTORAL MAPS.

Mr. JENNINGS—Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked the Premier on July 30 about the availability of electoral maps?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I have the following report from the Deputy Returning Officer for the State:—

Maps of individual State electorates have not been available for sale for the last 35 years. Maps are held for sale as follows:— (1) Map of county of Adelaide, showing metropolitan districts—price 2s.; (2) map of State of South Australia, showing country districts—price 2s. 6d.; (3) Assembly district rolls containing maps for all subdivisions in the district, the price of each district roll, including subdivision maps, is 1s. each.

FORT GLANVILLE.

Mr. Hutchens for Mr. TAPPING (on notice)—Is it the Government's intention to provide for the re-inclusion in the Estimates for 1953-54 of the amount of £2,000 voted for 1951-52 but not expended by the Publicity and Tourist Bureau on the renovation of buildings and installation of sanitary conveniences at Fort Glanville?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—This matter will be considered in connection with the Estimates.

ELECTIONEERING PAMPHLETS.

Mr. Hutchens for Mr. TAPPING (on notice)—Is it the Government's intention to amend the Electoral Act, 1929-1950, to prohibit any person or organization, prior to an election, from issuing literature which includes the name of a candidate without the authority of such candidate?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—Not in the general terms suggested by the honourable member.

SALE OF LIQUOR IN HOTELS.

Mr. CHRISTIAN (on notice)—Does any provision exist under the Licensing Act whereby licensees are empowered to sell and supply liquor in lounges, parlours, and beer gardens in hotels?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—Yes.

SOIL CONSERVATION COMMITTEES.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (on notice)—

1. How many soil conservation committees have been set up in South Australia?
2. In what districts have they been set up?
3. What is the total area they are intended to serve?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—Apart from the Advisory Committee on Soil Conservation, whose function is to advise the Minister

on matters pertaining to soil conservation, soil conservation district boards have been set up in the following areas:—

1. Murray Mallee Soil Conservation District, covering the district council districts of Loxton, Brown's Well, East Murray, Karoonda; those portions of Marne, Mobilong and Mannum lying east of River Murray; and the hundreds of Sherlock, Baker and Bonney. The total area is approximately 4,500 square miles.

2. Murray Plains Soil Conservation District, covering district council district of Truro; those portions of district council districts of Keyneton and Swan Reach, Marne and Mobilong (excepting western half hundred of Monarto), lying west of River Murray; and that portion of hundred of Dutton within the district council district of Eudunda. The total area is about 1,800 square miles.

3. Upper Eyre Peninsula Soil Conservation District, covering district council districts of Franklin Harbour (except small portion hundred of Hawker), Kimba and LeHunte; portion of hundreds of Campoona, Jamieson and Mann. The total area is about 3,500 square miles.

4. Yorke Peninsula Soil Conservation District, covering the district council district of Yorke Peninsula. The area is approximately 600 square miles.

5. An additional board will shortly be set up in the West Broughton Soil Conservation District, covering an area of approximately 1,500 square miles centred around Gladstone.

Section 6f of the Soil Conservation Act, 1939-1947, allows for district boards to set up local committees within their districts. The Murray Plains Board has recently set up three local committees centred at Dutton, Truro and North ward, Mannum district council. The Murray Mallee Board expects to set up five shortly, and the Yorke Peninsula Board is at present considering two local committees. Altogether soil conservation districts at present cover about 11,900 square miles of country. Boards are operating in 10,400 square miles.

IMPORTATION OF CEMENT.

Mr. STEPHENS (on notice)—

1. What quantities of cement have been imported from overseas, including Japan—(a) by the Government, and (b) by other persons, for each of the years from 1948 to 1952?
2. What was the cost per ton?
3. What quantities were received and what prices paid for cement received from interstate for each of the abovementioned years?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—The replies are:—

1. Tonnages of cement imported from overseas (including Japan):—

Financial year.	(a) Government A/c S.A.	(b) persons. A/c other
1948-49	—	2,873
1949-50	—	24,645
1950-51	—	17,882
1951-52	27,122	35,708
1952-53 (to September 30)	—	2,468
	27,122	83,576

Total . . . 110,688 tons

Tonnages in respect to "other persons" provided by former Director of Building Materials (Mr. Pollnitz) from information supplied by Department of Trade and Customs.

2. Landed cost per ton:—(a) Imported by S.A. Government, *ex* U.K., 1,700 tons—£19 13s. 11d.; imported by S.A. Government, *ex* Japan, 25,422 tons—£18 7s. 5d. (b) Imported by other persons (see (b) above)—prices not known.

3. (a) Quantities received and prices paid by S.A. Government for supplies *ex* interstate:—

	1949-50.
<i>Ex</i> N.S.W.	1,084 tons at £12 10s. 2d.
<i>Ex</i> N.S.W.	1,094 tons at £11 8s. 6d.
<i>Ex</i> Tasmania	1,515 tons at £8 8s. 2d.
	3,693
	1950-51.
<i>Ex</i> N.S.W.	438 tons at £12 10s. 2d.
<i>Ex</i> N.S.W.	250 tons at £11 8s. 6d.
<i>Ex</i> Tasmania	2,107 tons at £8 8s. 2d.
	2,795

No S.A. Government interstate purchases in other years.

(b) Cannot supply cement prices and quantities received from interstate by other than S.A. Government.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

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

(Continued from August 6. Page 319.)

Mr. DAVIS (Port Pirie)—I oppose the motion for I consider the speech of His Excellency the Governor to be the weakest statement of Government policy I have ever heard. If the Government believes in democracy it should abide by the will of the people as expressed at the recent elections, when an overwhelming majority of voters rejected the policy submitted by the Liberal

Party. I join with members on both sides in welcoming Sir Robert and Lady George, and I feel sure our new Governor will be most popular with all South Australians. I also join in wishing Her Majesty the Queen a long and peaceful reign. Her Majesty has won the respect of member of all nations, so many of which were represented at her coronation. The peacefulness of her reign will have a big bearing on future peace throughout the world, and, if we, the peoples of Australia and the so-called free countries, desire peace, we must ensure the proper feeding and clothing of the millions in other countries who live in a state of semi-starvation and deserve a decent standard of living.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—They don't want the food when it is sent to them.

Mr. DAVIS—They do, but unfortunately they are unable to buy it.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—They refused a gift.

Mr. DAVIS—As a free people we should see that they are in a position to buy the necessities of life, but very little will be done for them if we are all of the same opinion as the members for Flinders and Mitcham who, not satisfied with keeping them in a state of submission, also desire to take from Australians the rights won over the years. Thinking more of profits than of citizens' rights, those two members will go to any lengths to take away the rights of those who produce the wealth of this country. They are more concerned with the interests of those making huge profits than with those of the great majority of Australians.

The member for Flinders abused the privileges of this House by castigating South Australian waterside workers, but they are doing a wonderful service for the State and cannot be accused of not playing their part in its economic development. The member for Flinders had the audacity to suggest, although not in so many words, that waterside workers were not entitled to the basic wage, and that they were overpaid because they received an hourly rate. He could not understand how their weekly wage was fixed. A tribunal assesses the number of hours worked and that is divided into the weekly wage. For many years the weekly wage was divided by 30 but it was then decided that as a greater number of hours were worked the figure should be 32. He claims that waterside workers should maintain an industry without being entitled to the basic wage. This morning's *Advertiser* stated that one of the shipping

firms forgot to order labour. If the waterside workers had refused to attend for work there would have been a hue and cry. The member for Flinders was born on a farm and I can visualize him as a child sitting on his nurse's knee and being told bedtime stories in which the bogeymen were waterside workers or other workers of this country. He has grown up with that thought in his mind and has not bothered to ascertain whether it is true. I remember him saying about two years ago that farm labourers enjoyed wonderful conditions and he particularly referred to an occasion when he took his employees into a town for a football match. He even paid for their admission, but that was probably because he did not pay them enough wages to enable them to pay their own fares. Has he, or the member for Mitcham, had to struggle as the men on the wharves have in order to rear their families? I doubt whether they know anything about rearing a family, or the struggle housewives have in budgeting for the maintenance of their families, or the standard of living of the masses. They are only concerned with trying to protect the employers.

The member for Flinders attacked the unions and said he was against compulsory unionism. Can he cite any Act which provides for compulsory unionism? Is there any difference between compelling a man to pay for privileges won for him by a union and compelling the honourable member to be a member of the wheat pool? A man should pay his contribution for the privileges and conditions he enjoys, earned by hard struggles. The man who first endeavoured to establish unionism in England as a protection against exploitation by the master class was deported to Australia, imprisoned and flogged because he had the courage to fight for the rights of his class; but the capitalistic class could not continue to resist the spirit and courage of such men. The Australian Labor Party and the Australian industrial movement have continued the struggle and the member for Flinders had to admit that good work had been done. I defy any Government member to say that the Labor Party is not responsible for the reforms that have been introduced and to cite any reforms the L.C.L. Government has introduced which have been of benefit to the working class.

The Shearers Accommodation Act, which relates to an almost forgotten class, has not been amended for years. It is alleged to provide decent conditions for men working in the shearing industry, but it makes certain

exemptions in regard to accommodation. I am not condemning all pastoralists. Many have done the right thing in providing suitable accommodation, some of it being superior to that demanded by the Act. However, many of the mess rooms and pantries are not fitted with fly-proof doors or windows. Some of the quarters provided have only earth floors, and sanitary conditions are very bad. It is no use amending the Act unless it is policed. At present, if a man wants to lay a complaint officially he approaches the local policeman who then makes an inspection, but a complainant is a marked man to some employers. Inspectors should be appointed to inspect the huts to see that the owners supply proper accommodation. Already some of the other States have such officials who travel throughout the year inspecting the properties.

The Landlord and Tenant (Control of Rents) Act has been amended with the support of members on this side, but it is no use our passing such laws if they are not effectively policed. In some cases rents have been raised 100 per cent without the permission of the authorities, and yet no action is taken. If the Government wants to make the Act effective, it must provide for it to be policed.

Recently £200,000 was allotted by the Government to repair foreshore storm damage. The Port Pirie Council applied for £5,000 to repair the embankments around that city, but was informed by the Minister of Local Government that the special committee handling this fund had no jurisdiction to grant the amount sought. The damage to this embankment is the Government's responsibility, and when it receives a further claim from the council for repairs I hope it will shoulder its responsibility.

The Governor's Speech mentioned the efficient manner in which our railways are conducted, but I consider that they have never been in a worse condition. Rolling stock and lines are in bad repair and it is not safe to travel at speed on some lines. Even between Port Pirie and Adelaide there is a limit of 45 miles an hour in certain parts, although this line is one of the most important in the State. Not only does it serve the people of Port Pirie, but also those from towns north and on part of the West Coast. People from Whyalla and Iron Knob and nearby towns travel to Port Pirie or Port Augusta to join the train for the city. The least the Government can do is to give them a decent passenger service. From the second best train in Australia it has deteriorated so much that it is now not a

decent third-class train. It is time the Government considered the matter. Also, the line between Port Pirie and Broken Hill is in a deplorable condition and in many places it is hardly safe for the trains and gives the engine crews a particularly rough ride. I have also been informed that the railway authorities will not allow trains to go into certain parts of the running sheds at Peterborough for fear the men will demand that they go into the workshops. I believe also that engines are transferred to other parts of the State and rarely receive any attention. If all this amounts to efficiency, as the Minister claims, I have a lot to learn. It is time the Minister assumed more control over the railways. The Commissioner is all-powerful, but at least the Minister could bring down reports so that Parliament would know what is going on and why the railways are in such a deplorable state. I do not know of one line, unless it be the newly completed line to Mount Gambier, that is in decent condition, and therefore I sincerely hope that the Government will give the railways more attention than they are receiving today.

For a number of years a sum of £150,000 has been placed on the Estimates annually for the remodelling of the Port Pirie hospital, but I regret to say that the job has not even been commenced and there appears to be no prospect of its being done in the near future. The population of the city is increasing daily and more hospital accommodation is essential. I understand that the Government has secured more land with the intention of spending even more than the £150,000 on the hospital, but it seems useless to promise the people something unless the Government is prepared to go on with the job. Like many other country members I am very anxious to see sewerage schemes in country districts. In Port Pirie our position is desperate because the existing sanitation system is most unpleasant. The Minister has informed me that Port Pirie will be given the highest priority—indeed, the first—but many of the people of Port Pirie will be very old by the time the system is installed. The Minister usually offers the excuse that the Government has neither the manpower nor the material available, but I do not think that excuse is valid today because both are becoming more plentiful; only recently the Minister told me that the Railways Department was training quite a number of men and in future would be able to offer better services, although I have failed to see any signs of it yet.

I listened with interest to the speech by the member for Gawler and was surprised to learn the position in respect to school teachers. I have not sufficient knowledge of the subject to deal with that aspect, but I would like to bring under the notice of the Government the position of children living in outback areas. Quite a number of small schools have been closed and I could appreciate this being a step in the right direction provided they were given opportunities of receiving decent education elsewhere. In some instances the Government has provided transport facilities to larger schools, but in many localities this service has not been provided. If the Government desires people to go into the outback country with a view to increasing production it must provide educational facilities for their children. When I have raised this question with the Minister previously his reply has usually been that it is too expensive to provide transport facilities in certain localities. If that is so the only solution is to re-open the smaller schools in those areas. If people are prepared to live and work in the back country they should receive more consideration than is shown them today. I sincerely hope that what I have brought under notice today will be considered on its merits and that we will see some improvement in the directions I have indicated. I oppose the motion.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River)—I join with previous speakers in expressing loyalty to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen. The coronation ceremonies just concluded could not but impress all nations and countries represented with the solidarity and loyalty of the British Commonwealth of Nations. We are to have the pleasure of a personal visit from Her Majesty early next year, and that again will further cement the good feeling of Australians towards the Throne. I extend a welcome to His Excellency the Governor, Sir Robert George, who is the Queen's direct representative. I am sure he will ably represent Her Majesty, and, following on Her visit, will ably play his part for South Australia. I trust that both the Governor and Lady George will have many years' pleasant sojourn in South Australia. I congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion, both new members, who made excellent speeches. I do not recall having heard the Address in Reply motion moved and seconded more ably than on this occasion. Their speeches lead me to believe that they will make very useful contributions to our debates.

Paragraph 5 of His Excellency's Speech deals with primary production. It is strange, South Australia being a primary-producing State, that primary production has not been given much prominence in this debate. Except by one or two members, primary production has hardly been mentioned. Oddly enough, the acting Leader of the Opposition gave more time to it—and probably debated it more thoroughly—than any other member.

Mr. O'Halloran—That is not unusual; the Opposition is always interested in primary production.

Mr. HEASLIP—I agree, but he saw fit to condemn primary producers rather than commend or encourage them. It seems that the people of South Australia do not fully appreciate the important part played by primary producers.

Mr. Fred Walsh—And do primary producers appreciate the important part the rest of the community plays?

Mr. HEASLIP—I shall not go into that argument. I am endeavouring, as a representative of a primary-production electorate, to put the views of my constituents. The Minister of Agriculture has seen fit to introduce what is known as the rural youth movement. I have here a well-published and well-illustrated booklet called *Rural Youth*, portraying what the rural youth movement is today. Its objectives are to create love of the country and country life, to show the importance of rural industry and create an active interest in its affairs, to encourage self-education for the greater fulfilment of life and the proper enjoyment of leisure, to make known the benefits to health and character of good living and to bring young people together and demonstrate the advantages of social fellowship and exchange of ideas. The movement is a worthy one. It is a good thing to train our young people to realize the importance of rural industry and to create a love of the country and country life.

Mr. O'Halloran—How could you apply those principles to the land?

Mr. HEASLIP—The purpose of the rural youth movement is to instil into the minds of people, whether they come from the country or the city, a proper realization of the importance of primary production to the State. After all, but for primary industries we would be unable to create overseas credits whereby we can import the machinery essential for secondary industry. We want to instil into people's minds the objects of this rural youth movement,

but it seems to me that at present grown-ups do not appreciate it. The Minister has gone ahead with the next generation but something should be done for the present generation. It was not right for the member for Goodwood to condemn and pull to pieces what our primary producers are doing.

Mr. O'Halloran—Are you happy about the way some of them are handling their land?

Mr. HEASLIP—I think that primary producers as a whole are doing more towards the economy and well-being of South Australia than any other section. In every section there is somebody who falls down on his job, and nobody is perfect, but primary producers as a whole are contributing much towards the economy of the State.

Mr. O'Halloran—Does a man who pays £33 an acre for wheatgrowing land contribute towards the economy of the country?

Mr. HEASLIP—That is his own private affair and has nothing to do with me.

Mr. O'Halloran—We could cite a hundred other instances.

Mr. HEASLIP—Citing such small matters would merely be pinpricking. The first statement by Mr. Frank Walsh that I want to contradict is that the Government has made various services available to farmers. For example, he said, the Government contours their land without charge, or at a very nominal fee, which is definitely incorrect. It is true that the Department of Agriculture makes the services of its officers with their theodolites available to take levels, and also gives advice, but in contouring the land it is the individual farmer's job to supply the machinery and do the work; it is not done free. In the early stages of soil conservation the department did encourage farmers by buying a few graders and making them available to farmers, but the service was not free: it charged for their hire. The honourable member made it seem that the Government was doing everything for farmers to the detriment of other industries. He proceeded along those lines right through his speech. He quoted the years in which South Australia produced harvests of more than 40,000,000 bushels of wheat, but he did not mention that these big harvests occurred during the 1930's, when farmers wanted for their own sakes to get big crops. It was not done for the good of the country but because otherwise they would have had to walk off their farms and starve. They were forced by economic conditions to do it. Probably more

harm was done to South Australia at that time than during any other period in her history. Overcropping did more harm than anything else could have done to the country. Through cultivating bigger acreages we were unfortunately mining the land rather than farming it. Primary producers have increased production. Last year they cropped 1,500,000 acres of wheat and reaped 34,000,000bush., almost as much as during the 1930's, when they reaped 40,000,000bush. from 4,000,000 acres.

Mr. Hutchens—But last year was one of the best seasons on record.

Mr. HEASLIP—Yes, for the yield per acre, but not for rain. It was only because of the wider crop rotation, better farming methods, and better land cultivation and preservation that we were able to attain an all-time record of 23bush. In addition farmers cropped nearly 1,000,000 acres of barley, from which they produced a record crop of 26,000,000bush. The total yield of wheat and barley was 60,000,000bush. In the 1930's very little barley was grown and there was little crop rotation; certainly not more than 500,000bush. of barley were reaped and about one-fifth of the farmers went bankrupt. I do not think anyone desires that farmers go back to the methods of 1930. Although today we have only about 2,000,000 acres of land under crop, the other 2,000,000 are not lying idle, but are being used for grazing. The Acting Leader of the Opposition went on:—

We consider that producers owe something to the rest of the community and that their debt should be paid in the form of increased production.

In March, 1952, South Australia had 11,500,000 sheep, then a record, but I believe we would now have 12,500,000. During 1952-53 about 3,000,000 lambs were dropped, and although our export was a record, I believe there would be now about 1,000,000 sheep more in our flocks than 12 months ago. Only five times in the history of South Australia has the 10,000,000 mark been exceeded. The South Australian lamb exports in 1951 were 130,000, but last year they were 440,000. The Australian wool exports last year were 983,000,000 lb., worth £356,000,000, an increase of 159,000,000 lbs. I do not think many people realize that almost 80 per cent of Australian exports are from primary industries. The total value of exports last year was £832,000,000, of which £650,000,000 was from primary production. In addition, farmers fed the increased population. Evidently the Acting Leader of the Opposition did not realize

that during the last four years farmers have been subsidizing Australian consumers to the extent of 10s. a bushel for wheat. In 1949 they made available wheat for human and stock consumption at 6s. 8d. a bushel when the export price was 16s. In 1950 the price for home consumption was still 6s. 8d., but the free wheat export price was nearly 17s. In 1951 the home consumption price rose to 7s. but the export price rose to nearly 18s. In 1952 the home consumption price was 10s., and the export price 21s. This year farmers are still supplying human consumption requirements for 11s. 11d., but the export price is 19s. Mr. Frank Walsh said the farmer owes a debt to the community, but perhaps the consuming public owes a debt to the farmer, for he has more than played his part. Evidently the public does not understand what the farmer is doing. How can he continue to subsidize the public and still carry on? He works much more than a 40-hour week, and he does not get three weeks' paid holiday each year. Perhaps the workers do not realize that they have to pay for these benefits in the end. Nothing is free; the cost of free medicine and annual holidays must be paid for ultimately. Mr. Walsh also said:—

Primary producers have been left free to produce whatever they please, just as if they were contributing everything to production—as they might well have been regarded as doing in the old pioneering days, when rugged individuality and independence were the outstanding characteristics of primary producers. The Government, however, by making large sums of money available to producers is merely assisting producers to become wealthy and encouraging them to plant less acreages and to do less work, while all the time there is a greater and greater need for increased production to meet the demands not only at home but overseas.

Mr. Pearson—Do you think he believes in democracy and the freedom of the individual?

Mr. HEASLIP—He say so, but I cannot reconcile that with his other statements. As a primary producer I do not know what large sums of money are being made available by the Government.

Mr. Lawn—Doesn't the public subsidize rail carriage of wheat and wool?

Mr. HEASLIP—No more than the primary producer subsidizes the carriage of city passengers, but country people are prepared to give and take in that regard for all taxpayers, both city and country, must subscribe to the upkeep of public utilities.

Mr. Lawn—How do country people subsidize the carriage of city passengers?

Mr. HEASLIP—The railways were constructed for the development of South Australia and, although they may have shown a loss on paper, indirectly they have shown a profit because of the developmental benefit South Australia has enjoyed from their use. They have made possible larger incomes, on which taxes have been paid, and the transport of agricultural plant from the city to the country. The railways were built for the benefit of the State as a whole and not only for that of the primary producer. The member for Goodwood drew attention to the danger of a shortage of wheat for home consumption, but I do not agree with him. Last year's Australian wheat crop totalled 178,000,000 bushels, of which 38,500,000 bushels was made into flour for home consumption, an estimated 20,000,000 bushels used as stock feed, and 2,500,000 bushels used for other purposes such as breakfast cereals. Therefore, only 61,000,000 bushels was used for home consumption out of a total of 178,000,000 bushels—and that in a year of low acreages. Although I concede a possible shortage of wheat for export and consequent shortage of income, I cannot see why producers should be condemned for exporting something which is in greater demand, more valuable and which will give us larger overseas credits than wheat.

The member for Goodwood condemned the farmer for producing wool, meat and barley, all of which pay better than wheat, but why should he be condemned, for we are in no danger of being short of wheat for home consumption?

Mr. Lawn—Is there not a danger of losing our wheat markets?

Mr. HEASLIP—The time is coming when we will want to export more wheat, and then, because the fertility of the soil has been built up by giving it a longer period without cropping, grazing it, and building it up with nitrogen, we will produce better wheat. That was the factor underlying the increased yield per acre last year.

Mr. Lawn—Is there no danger of losing our wheat markets?

Mr. HEASLIP—No. Of the 178,000,000 bushels produced, only 61,000,000 was used for home consumption, between 40,000,000 and 50,000,000 being exported as flour and 70,000,000 as wheat. Recent press reports that country mills are closing down, are, unfortunately, true, for the Australian milling industry cannot compete with that in other countries.

Mr. Dunks—What has forced up its costs?

Mr. HEASLIP—One reason is the 40-hour week, for no man can produce as much in 40 as in 44 hours.

Mr. Hutchens—Apparently the statistician is wrong.

Mr. HEASLIP—In spite of what the statistician may say men cannot produce more by working four hours less.

Mr. Lawn—You go to a doctor when you are sick because, as a medical man, he is an authority on sickness, yet you claim to be a greater authority on figures than a statistician.

Mr. HEASLIP—The doctor has spent years training at a university and in practice, whereas a statistician is merely a clerk who collates figures collected from various people. As a practical man I know that the 40-hour week has meant decreased production.

Mr. Dunks—If it has not, the men must have been loafing whilst on a 44-hour week.

Mr. HEASLIP—Besides the 40-hour week, longer holidays for workers have forced up production costs in the milling industry. The *International Labor Review* shows that the following hours are worked in various countries whose industries compete with those of Australia:—Egypt 50.5, Holland 49, Czechoslovakia 48, Sweden and Argentina 47, Germany 46, United Kingdom and Finland 45, France 44, Canada 42.7, Norway 41, New Zealand 40.06, Australia 39.96, U.S.A. 39.6.

Mr. Dunks—There is really no 40-hour week in Australia, for employers must pay penalty rates to men working longer hours.

Mr. HEASLIP—Yes, and the consumer must eventually pay. Recently the Premier said that wherever there was competitive selling the Government would sympathetically consider the decontrol of prices, as it had done in the past. I feel the time has come when many commodities could be decontrolled, for there is more competitive selling today. The price of potatoes is controlled at £35 a ton, but black market prices of between £70 and £80 are being paid under so-called price control.

Mr. Hutchens—It is a make-believe control.

Mr. HEASLIP—I do not see the point in controlling the price of potatoes, for people are willingly paying more than the legal price. South Australia is short of potatoes because of the high price paid in other States, and growers cannot be blamed for selling at that price. Price control has made the potato shortage more acute. We are importing potatoes and paying growers in other States more than we are prepared to pay our own

growers. The same thing happened in 1944, when the Hay Acquisition Bill was introduced and farmers' hay was seized and they received a price which in three months was doubled for American hay. We are only prepared to pay local potato producers £35 a ton but we pay far more to Western Australian and Tasmanian producers and the consumer does not get potatoes any more cheaply. There is no price fixing for lamb and it is the only meat in short supply. Its consumption has increased by 60 per cent since decontrol. On the other hand, mutton, which is plentiful, is controlled and the consumption has decreased by 30 per cent. I do not know who can explain that situation but it is an example of what has happened with price control. Why has mutton been controlled? The consumer is eating mutton and paying for lamb. Controls will not stop the black marketing of potatoes. There are even controls on the prices of meals in hotels but it cannot be suggested that there is no competition. Why is there price control on meals when food is in plentiful supply? In such conditions control should not be maintained, particularly seven years after the conclusion of the war. I hope the Premier will carry out his promise to give sympathetic consideration to decontrol when goods are in plentiful supply. I hope there will not be a recurrence of the periodical gluts at the abattoirs.

Mr. Stephens—From what the Minister has said, let those who supply sheep do the right thing.

Mr. HEASLIP—The producers have done the right thing and supplied sheep and lambs to the abattoirs. They have been kept in paddocks for as long as three weeks. On other occasions producers have been asked not to send them to the abattoirs because the slaughtermen would not kill more than a certain number a day and would not work overtime. The producers have done their job but the slaughtermen will not do theirs. If anyone should be asked to pull his weight it is the slaughterman, and not the producer. I regret that the Government has not seen fit to issue more licences for country abattoirs. There should be more competition. If the reason for not issuing more licences is that the Metropolitan Abattoirs might not receive sufficient meat for slaughtering, it would be better that it should experience a loss than that there should be a periodical loss of sheep and lambs because of the glut.

Mr. John Clark—Would you support the establishment of additional abattoirs in the country to be controlled by the State?

Mr. HEASLIP—No, I have had enough of State-run abattoirs. There is a monopoly at the Metropolitan Abattoirs from which we suffer each year.

Mr. Stephens—You would soon complain if the Metropolitan Abattoirs were closed.

Mr. HEASLIP—As we have paid over £1,000,000 into it I would complain. A matter of concern in my district is the Port Germein jetty. Many country people patronize Port Germein beach and although it is not a good beach it is the best of those offering. The beaches at Port Pirie and Port Augusta are already overcrowded. The jetty is in such a state of disrepair that I do not know whether the Harbors Board will repair it. If it is not repaired I hope the Harbors Board will arrange salvage. There are many railway rails which are already partially submerged in the sea and I saw similar rails sold at Wirrabara three weeks ago for as much as £10 each. Though I do not suggest that the Harbors Board can get as much as that for them, I believe they are valuable and if the jetty can be salvaged there are many people in surrounding districts who would be prepared to pay well for them and for the sleepers that comprise the jetty. I hope the jetty will not be allowed to fall to pieces and the steel sink to the bottom of the sea and the sleepers float away. I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

Motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply carried.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Members of the Opposition were not prepared for the closure of the debate at this stage—not that I criticize you, Mr. Speaker. If I call for a division I assume it will be on the question of whether the report be adopted and not whether the debate continue?

The SPEAKER—A division can only be as to whether or not the report be adopted. I think it might clearly be understood that I keep a list of names of members who desire to speak on the motion, and I have called everybody on the list and many members consulted me, but no additional names were listed. I did not hurry the motion—I put it and declared it. There can be a division on whether it be adopted but on nothing else.

PUBLIC SERVICE SUPERANNUATION FUND ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS obtained leave to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Service Superannuation Fund Act.

ADJOURNMENT.

On the motion "that the House do now adjourn,"

Mr. LAWN—May I speak on the motion, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER—There are certain things which cannot be debated and the adjournment of the House is one of them.

The House divided on the motion:—

Ayes (17).—Messrs. Christian, Geoffrey Clarke, Dunks, Dunnage, Goldney, Heaslip, and Hincks (teller), Sir George Jenkins, Messrs. Jenkins, McIntosh, Michael, Pattin-

son, Pearson, Shannon, Teusner, Travers, and White.

Noes (15).—Messrs. John Clark, Coreoran, Davis, Dunstan, Fletcher, Hutchens, Jennings, Lawn (teller), Macgillivray, McAlees, O'Halloran, Quirke, Stephens, Tapping, and Fred Walsh.

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Hawker and Brookman. Noes—Messrs. Frank Walsh and Riches.

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

At 4.21 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 12, at 2 p.m.