

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, August 4, 1954.

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

QUESTIONS.

BROADENING OF RAILWAY GAUGE TO MARREE.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Can the Premier say whether the Commonwealth Government has finally and firmly agreed to continue the standard gauge railway line from Telford to Marree after the line now in course of construction to Telford is completed? It has been pointed out by the Premier and others that this would be essential for the proper transport of cattle from the Northern Territory and Central Australia to the Adelaide market?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Under the Railways Standardization Agreement, which was approved by both the State and Commonwealth Parliaments, the Commonwealth agreed to pay certain costs of the standardization of South Australian railways and to provide a standard gauge railway, first to Alice Springs and ultimately to Darwin. As a first instalment towards the fulfilment of that agreement the Commonwealth first approved of the railway being broadened as far as Telford, and more recently Mr. McLeay, the Commonwealth Minister for Shipping and Transport, has had conversations with me on two occasions. He was strongly of the opinion that the line now being constructed to Telford should be carried on to Marree and he proposed taking it up with the Commonwealth Government. I have since then seen press reports indicating that the Commonwealth Government has agreed to that extension, and I believe it will be its policy to carry on progressively section after section. I was extremely interested quite recently to read the remarks of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Calwell) who had just returned from the Northern Territory. He said that he very strongly supported the move to take the railway right through. It would appear likely that that would be Commonwealth Parliament policy on both sides of the House. Under the agreement entered into it is part of the Commonwealth obligation to carry it out.

DAY LABOUR ON HOUSING TRUST HOMES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Yesterday I asked the Premier a question regarding the use of day labour on Housing Trust homes. I regret

that I gave him the impression that I was asking the trust to enter into a system of day labour. I realized at the time that the trust had always let its work to builders. In view of certain disabilities that have arisen from time to time, will the Premier make a firm request to the trust for its contractors to use a system of day labour on the construction of all its houses, similar to that used on the construction of houses for letting, as against the contract system entered into for houses for sale?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—As I understand the position, the trust enters into contracts with builders for the erection of a certain number of houses in specified localities. I believe the trust has always been very firm that the carrying out of the contracts shall be on proper terms and conditions as far as the employees are concerned. I shall take up the matter raised with the chairman of the trust and let the honourable member have a report as soon as possible.

HONEY MARKETING BOARD COSTS.

Mr. WHITE—Has the Minister of Agriculture the information he yesterday promised to get regarding the cost of operating the Honey Marketing Board?

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—I have obtained the latest figures as to the cost of the Honey Marketing Board operations. Administrative costs amounted to £2,945 18s. 10d., and there was an advertising account of £1,451 6s. 6d. These are purely administrative costs. There are other costs, such as storage £1,401 4s. 3d., handling £1,361 8s. and a small interest account, £24 16s. 4d. The whole of these costs combined total 1/2.716d. per tin, or .245d. per pound of honey.

TEN SHILLING NOTE QUIZ.

Mr. LAWN—Yesterday, I asked the Premier a question regarding a competition conducted by a local broadcasting station which had been banned, I understand, on the grounds that the element of chance was greater than the element of skill. The Premier in reply referred to legislation relating to lotteries and said that it became a matter for the police to decide. In view of the undoubtedly heavy gambling taking place on the Stock Exchange particularly on oil and uranium shares, where there is no doubt the element of chance is greater than the element of skill, have the police taken any action, if not do they propose to do so, and if not will the Premier make inquiries to see that some action is taken?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I congratulate the honourable member on his desire to keep the gambling spirit in its proper place. I will have the matter reported upon by the Crown Solicitor and advise the honourable member in due course of his opinion.

WATER FROM MANNUM PIPELINE.

Mr. TEUSNER—Portion of the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline passes through my electorate and I should like the Minister of Works to indicate to what extent water from that main will be made available to landowners who have land in its vicinity, and whether consideration has been given to the question of the rating for water consumed?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—This pipeline passes through much territory similar to that through which the Morgan-Whyalla main operates, and as the honourable member knows the area along that main was not rated because of the trunk main, but consumers on paying a connecting fee could obtain water at 2/6d. a thousand gallons. No water district had been declared, and therefore rating was not involved. The question will be resolved by Cabinet whether the same system will apply to the line from Mannum to Adelaide. In due course from that line there will be some mains projected into other areas and then the land will come into the ratable area. I should think that the areas reticulated must be charged rates, and in those areas not reticulated but where there is only an individual service, the position will be treated along similar lines to the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline.

SEARCH FOR COPPER.

Mr. McALEES—I understand that a diamond drill has been used about six miles from Kadina and four miles from Wallaroo in search for minerals, but I have never heard of any uranium, coal, copper or other minerals being discovered, although it is known there is an abundance of copper in the Moonta mining area. Can the Premier say whether it would be possible for the Mines Department to shift its drill to a spot where local miners consider copper deposits exist?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Since the mines at Kadina, Wallaroo and Moonta were closed, the Mines Department has been engaged almost continuously on prospecting and drilling in the hope of discovering a new lode in sufficient quantity to warrant large scale operations. For several years the drills were operating in the Moonta area at places recommended not only by the Mines Department, but

also by persons with previous knowledge of the Moonta Mines. Unfortunately, however, the department did not discover a lode sufficient to justify the large scale expenditure entailed in opening up and de-watering the mines, which would be necessary if activities were re-started. It would be rather strange if, in an area where so much copper had been found, the occurrence of the lode were not found to extend outside the immediate bounds of the old mining area, therefore the department has, by every known prospecting device, continued to work on the assumption that there is another lode in that area. A geophysical survey undertaken by the Commonwealth Government disclosed two important anomalies on Yorke Peninsula: one in the area referred to by the honourable member, where drilling has already taken place, and the other on the mainland not far from Wardang Island. The anomaly arose because of the magnetic iron-stone which had no great commercial value, but it disclosed some interesting geological information about a vital line extending through an area that could have mineral potentialities associated with it; therefore Cabinet has approved of an additional boring programme to deal with the anomaly disclosed by the first drilling. Everything practicable will be done to see if additional ore deposits can be located in the area, for such deposits would be of immense benefit not only to miners and the local population, but also to the State.

REDEX TRIAL SPEED.

Mr. HEASLIP—Has the Premier a reply to my question of last week regarding the alleged speeding over roads by Redex trial drivers?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Acting Commissioner of Police, Mr. Walsh, reports:—

It is denied that Redex trial drivers were permitted or assisted by police to break traffic laws whilst proceeding to their control point at Morphettville on Sunday, July 18. Members on duty were specifically instructed in this regard prior to the arrival of the competing vehicles. Traffic was particularly congested on the trial route during the whole of the day and again in the evening and it would have been a physical impossibility for any vehicle to have been driven from the city to Morphettville on the Anzac Highway at 70 miles per hour as reported in the press. In most instances the average speed of cars on this road was down to between 10 and 15 miles per hour and the Trial drivers were forced to conform accordingly. At no time during the day was police assistance given to Redex competitors to enable them to drive at

an excessive speed. All intersections were controlled and the route was under continual patrol by motor traffic constables. I am not aware of any case of discriminatory treatment in favour of Redex drivers and to the detriment of other road users by police on the occasion referred to.

LEVELS IN HUME WEIR AND LOCK 4.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Recently a great deal of publicity has been given to the fact that the Hume Weir is to be raised to enable more water to be conserved in that area. Can the Minister of Works inform the House how the cost of this work will be allocated between the Commonwealth and the States concerned, and provide any information on the result of a deputation he received some time ago pointing out the necessity for raising the water level of Lock 4?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—At a conference held in Melbourne recently it was resolved that each Minister would recommend to his Government the introduction of legislation to authorise the raising of the capacity of the Hume Weir from 2,000,000 to 2,500,000 acre feet at a cost of £3,200,000, the contributing parties to be New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia and the Commonwealth, each paying equal shares. On the face of it the cost to this State, spread over a period of years, would be £800,000. Surely it would be the cheapest drought reserve we could have. The Snowy River authority is interested because it might derive power from it. The decision was without prejudice to the States' rights to claim from the Snowy River authority half the cost if this authority derives electric power therefrom, or uses it in lieu of an alternative storage, so the amount involved could be between £400,000 and £800,000 to each State, spread over a period of years.

The amount involved in raising the level at Lock 4 is only from £15,000 to £20,000, but that would need the authority of the River Murray Commission and the cost would be contributed in equal shares by each of the constructing authorities. Mr. Dridan's opinion is that the scheme is well worth while, and he is preparing a report for the Government thereon. Although the scheme is a good one, in that it will assist in keeping up the River level around Berri, it will not remove all the difficulties that have occurred in the past.

CHURCH LAND AT RADIUM HILL.

Mr. PEARSON—At my home at Yeelanna over the weekend I was advised that a visiting clergyman had complained that the Government had failed to make available sites at Radium

Hill on which buildings for religious purposes could be constructed. Can the Premier inform the House whether applications have been received for grants of land for this purpose; if so, with what result, and on what terms is the land available?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The statement made by the honourable member is quite contrary to fact. When Radium Hill was first surveyed an area of land was specifically set aside for church purposes, to be made available to the various denominations requiring land for churches. An application was received from the Roman Catholic Church, which was told of the area that was available. This area was inspected by the church, and the church suggested that building costs might be somewhat cheaper and they believed a more suitable area should be available closer to the centre of the town than that originally planned for church occupation. Cabinet approved of that application, but for the information of members I shall read what the recommendations of the advisory committee were. This matter was dealt with on March 29, the recommendations being:—

(1) That the Roman Catholic Church be allocated half an acre adjoining the roadway and still to be defined, at the northern end of the parklands area within the most suitable part between blocks G and H.

(2) That the Anglican and other Non-conformist churches each be allotted on application, blocks of appropriate size, not exceeding half an acre, in the area originally allocated for the purpose, or adjacent.

(3) That a nominal rental of £1 per annum be charged for each site.

(4) That the tenure be by lease for a term of 21 years.

(5) That the department's approval be required for the erection of any building, plans of which must be submitted prior to erection.

(6) No Government contribution to be made towards the cost of any church buildings.

Cabinet approved recommendations Nos. (1), (3), (4), (5) and (6), and it was decided to defer dealing with recommendation No. (2) until applications were received, because it was felt that other churches might desire to come closer to the town than the original block set aside for church purposes. They would then be given the choice of going to the new area or building a church on the old site, but so far no other applications have been received.

HOMES FOR PENSIONERS.

Mr. TAPPING—Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on July 28 about the Housing Trust's programme for erecting homes for pensioners?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The chairman of the trust reports:—

The Housing Trust has under consideration the building of further houses for pensioners in addition to the present contract for 108 houses. However, the first of the houses now being built are some time off completion, and, before proceeding with a further contract, the trust desires to see whether the design of the houses under construction is suitable or in need of alteration.

The honourable member can take it that when the 108 houses have been completed the Housing Trust will extend the programme. However, the matter will not be finalized until some of the houses are occupied because we have found from experience that if accommodation is not suitable for the purposes for which it was erected it is shown up when people are in occupation.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—Can the Premier say whether the Housing Trust will consider extending its programme of special homes for aged people to country towns provided it can be shown that it is desirable to do so and that there are sufficient aged people requiring housing in those localities?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—These homes are being built by the trust for the purpose of providing good accommodation as cheaply as possible. In housing for pensioners one cannot enter the high rental field or the scheme breaks down because pensioners cannot afford high charges. I am certain the trust will not embark on building houses for pensioners except where they can be provided at a reasonable rent and at a reasonable cost of construction. If, by building in the country, the costs of construction increase, obviously building of this type of housing could not be considered. Subject to that limitation, I have no doubt the trust will review the requirements of towns on the same basis as it considers its other building schemes and will plan its programme accordingly.

MYPONGA URANIUM DEPOSIT.

Mr. STOTT—I think the Government paid certain men £5,000 for the discovery of uranium near Myponga. What has happened at the mine, will the Government provide any of the capital to exploit the mine, or is it proposed to form a private company to arrange finance to exploit it? If a company is to be formed will the shares be listed on the Stock Exchange, has the Government entered into any contract with any company or individuals to purchase the uranium produced at a guaranteed price and, if so, what is the price?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The discovery at Myponga was significant because it was an entirely new area and the ore was of an exceedingly rich grade of pitchblende origin which opened up a new field for research by the Mines Department and the Government. Actually, when the ore was discovered, applications to take over the area were received from two large mining companies—one an international company from Great Britain, the other an interstate concern—both possessed of large capital. Cabinet felt that it should ascertain the size and value of the mine before considering any possible allotment. The ore which will be won from the investigation is of a quality eminently suitable for treatment at the small plant already established at Thebarton. The cost of developing the mine will be paid from the results of using that ore. Development is still proceeding but it is too early to estimate the extent of the mine. It would appear, however, that the amount of ore available is limited, although of a high grade. Work is proceeding in drilling and extending the shaft downwards to ascertain at what depth the ore is located.

BRIDGES OVER RIVER MURRAY.

Mr. DUNKS—During my speech on the Address in Reply I referred to bridges over the River Murray, particularly the one at Blanchetown, and I believe that one of the main obstacles is the expense. Today a gentleman just returned from Hobart told me about the concrete pontoon bridge there. It is 40ft. wide and although the tide rises by as much as 6 ft. the bridge is not affected, and he said that it was a very good method of construction. Will the Minister of Works ascertain if that type of bridge would be suitable at Blanchetown?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The Government has appointed a committee consisting of some of our best engineers to advise on the best type of bridge and its probable cost. I know the bridge referred to by the honourable member, but I am afraid there is no prospect of that type being used on the River Murray which sometimes is a very slow-moving stream and at other times carries an immense volume of water. I have seen the time when probably a bridge of such a nature would be floating miles out from Blanchetown.

BASIC WAGE EARNERS, TRAINEE TEACHERS AND EDUCATION LOAN.

Mr. RICHES—Speaking on July 29 the Premier said, "I will give the Leader of the Opposition a garden party if he can find one

basic wage earner in this State today." Last evening the member for Torrens, Mr. Travers, said that many fully qualified lawyers employed by legal firms are being paid less than £11 11s., the basic wage for labourers, because the profession could not afford to pay more. Is the Premier prepared to accept Mr. Traver's statement and, if so, can he give any indication when the garden party will be held and whether the member for Torrens will be invited?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—According to the honourable member's own words the member for Torrens stated that they were not getting the basic wage which, of course, is my own contention. My offer to the Leader of the Opposition is still open.

Mr. PEARSON—During the debate on the Address in Reply last night the member for Norwood disputed the Premier's statement that the average wage of South Australian wage earners is £16 a week. He also criticized the allowances for trainee teachers and recommended raising a special education loan. As these are questions of considerable importance to this Parliament will the Premier say what are the actual facts?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I was not privileged to hear the remarks of the honourable member for Norwood and can only answer the question on the assumption that the reports I have heard of his speech are accurate. Firstly, his proposal for the raising of educational loans is impracticable because under the Financial Agreement, entered into in 1927, all loans for Government authorities in Australia—with the exception of defence loans—have to be raised through the Loan Council and no State has any right whatever to raise a private loan for any purpose. The second point related to the provision of higher allowances for trainee teachers in order to attract more to the Teachers Training College. Under existing financial arrangements South Australia is a claimant State and any expenditure that we propose upon education is the subject of examination by the Grants Commission. Queensland, however, is not a claimant State and has a much lower capital expenditure on education than other States, and this has a big bearing on the standard we are allowed. We are averaged out on the low standards provided in Queensland. It applies particularly in regard to trainee teachers. When I last examined the position a short time ago Queensland had a maximum of a two-year course, which makes it easy to turn out teachers quickly. We consider that a longer course of up to four

years in some instances is worth while, but, of course, it is much more expensive. In regard to the third point, the figures I gave in the House were furnished to me by Mr. Seaman, who is an economist with a reputation far outside this State. On a number of occasions Commonwealth authorities have written thanking me for the valuable and reliable information given to them by Mr. Seaman.

Mr. O'Halloran—Are you replying to the speech by Mr. Dunstan?

The SPEAKER—The honourable member for Flinders exceeded the scope of a question. He can ask the Premier a question in respect of figures, but not for a reply to the speech by Mr. Dunstan.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I am not discussing that speech. I have made it clear that I did not hear it, so cannot reply. I am replying to the question as to whether the £16 average wage was correct. Mr. Seaman was the authority for my statement that £16 was the average wage. I asked him for the source of his figures so that he could advise as to their correctness. I know this is a sore point with my friends opposite but I suggest that they can take this as a fairly accurate statement. Mr. Seaman has furnished the following report:—

The recorded average wages in South Australia as derived from the payroll tax data and released by the Commonwealth Statistician were June quarter, 1952, £13.90, or about £13 18s., and June quarter, 1953, £14.86, or about £14 17s. So far the official figures for June quarter, 1954, have not been released, as the returns are still being analyzed. The figure for December quarter, 1953, was £15.81, and such data as I have seen suggests a further small rise for the June quarter, 1954, thus indicating an average of closely £16 a week. This indication is, moreover, supported by unpublished data of salaries and wages paid, supplied by the Commonwealth Statistician in connection with the tax reimbursement formula. The recorded average wage naturally varies somewhat differently from the average of award wages for a standard week, for it includes overtime payments, all other "penalty" payments, over-award payments, incentive payments, etc., and includes salaries as well as wages. This, coupled with the increased economic activity and consequent shortage of labour over the past year, accounts for the substantial increase in average wages over a period when the basic wage and a wide range of margins in awards have been kept stable.

Mr. Pearson—It is a question of getting up to date.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I cannot refer to the speech of an honourable member because it would be out of order, but it is a matter of being up to date.

ST. JOHN AMBULANCE BRIGADE DRIVERS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I understand that the St. John Ambulance Brigade pays for drivers' licences for qualified transport drivers who do not possess a motor vehicle of their own. I believe that some of these people do as much as 300 hours a year in a voluntary capacity and are called upon to be on duty for fairly long periods on occasions. Will the Treasurer consider whether it is possible to put those who are giving a reasonable amount of time as transport drivers, and possess motor vehicles, on the same basis as those who have their licence fees paid by the Brigade?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—A co-ordinated ambulance service is provided through the St. John Ambulance Brigade with subsidies provided by the Government and voted by Parliament on the Estimates annually. The amounts provided are the subject of consultations between the St. John Ambulance authorities and the Chief Secretary's Department. Details of expenditure are controlled by the brigade itself and I think it would be unwise for the Government to interfere in its internal practices. I have no doubt whatever that the St. John Ambulance authorities will see that none of its members is treated unfairly. I assure the honourable member that the Government appreciates the services given and I know of no instance in which the Government has haggled about the amount to be put on the Estimates.

BUNGAMA RAILWAY SIDING.

Mr. DAVIS—Has the Minister of Works obtained a reply to the question I asked on July 29, regarding the policy of the Railways Department on the construction of shelters for school children boarding trains at Bungama?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Through the Minister of Railways I have received an intimation that it is not the policy of the Railways Department to construct shelters at sidings such as the one mentioned.

GLENELG SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS.

Mr. LAWN—Earlier this session the Minister of Works made it possible for me to visit the Glenelg Sewage Treatment Works. During the inspection I learned that between 6½ million and 7 million gallons of effluent passed into the sea each day. From the treatment works it is possible to view the new West Beach Airport and the proposed

recreation reserve, both of which when planted with trees and lawns will require much water. Some of the effluent is used at the works for watering lawns and trees. Can the Minister say if consideration has been given, and if not will he get a report, regarding using the effluent from the works for the watering of lawns and trees planted at West Beach Airport and the proposed recreation reserve, thus obviating taking a considerable quantity of water from our reservoirs?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—We have not yet reached the stage where the effluent will be required for the purposes mentioned, but I have not the slightest doubt that so long as there is not too much piping needed, and the levels are all right, it will be used in that way. I will use my best endeavours to see that that is done if practicable.

IRRIGATION AREA PLANTINGS.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Yesterday I asked the Minister of Irrigation a question regarding the total allocation of plantings in irrigation areas, and the acreage needed to settle all approved applicants. In his reply the Minister said:—

Assuming that all remaining classified applications for irrigation holdings, based on the survey made in June, 1953, still desire settlement, the planting of an additional 3,000 acres would be necessary.

Has the Minister any reason to assume that the classified applicants will not desire settlement and, if so, will he give the House any information he has on that aspect?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—It would be hard to give the exact numbers, as there are difficulties associated with allotments. Recently a number of blocks were available, one at Cooltong and 38 at Loxton. Forty-three applicants were asked to report at these places on June 28. Seven of those invited did not report and 20 inspected the one block at Cooltong and 31 the 38 blocks at Loxton. In the final analysis it was found that four blocks were not applied for at Loxton, which meant the notifying of another eight men in order to get the four required, and that has meant considerable delay. We have now sent out a circular to the remaining applicants, from memory 115, to ascertain whether they are still interested in an area we are now investigating. Probably, because of adverse reports of the industry, 20 to 30 per cent of those may not now be interested and it would therefore appear that the original 9,000 acres allotted to this State will be occupied and possibly only another 1,000 acres required.

HOSPITAL PLANNING.

Mr. DUNKS—In *The Advertiser* today appears an article regarding the appointment of hospital advisers, as suggested by an architect, the panel to consist of semi-Governmental experts to advise and direct on hospital planning in South Australia. Has the Premier anything further to report?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Government has already received advice from expert committees on the establishment of hospitals. One of the problems has not been a dearth of advice, but rather the opposite. Up to the present the Architect-in-Chief's Department has had no fewer than five sketch plans drawn up in an attempt to meet the advice of medical, architectural and other authorities, including the Public Works Committee, which has to be satisfied in this connection. A general advisory committee is provided under the Hospitals Act, but in addition the Government custom has been to consult hospital authorities, such as sisters, doctors, architects and anyone who could give useful advice. The original plans of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital were not approved by the advisory committee, which asked for additional plans. I assure the honourable members there is no lack of committees to advise the Government on these matters.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: EGG SALES IN ENGLAND.

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—In regard to the matter of egg sales in England raised by Sir George Jenkins yesterday, I said that contracts for the Australian quota of 10,000 tons of egg pulp had been arranged at £215 Australian a ton f.o.b., but I was quoting only from memory. The actual position is that we have arranged for the sale of 3,500 tons of that quota at the price indicated. The price for the balance has yet to be arranged.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption of Address in Reply.

(Continued from August 3. Page 235.)

Mr. JOHN CLARK (Gawler)—I was pleased to hear the very happy references by the mover and seconder of the motion to the recent visit of Queen Elizabeth. As a humble member of the Opposition I offer my sincere congratulations to those two gentlemen, even though I

could not find myself in complete agreement with everything they said. However, I did enjoy their able contributions. In listening to their references to Her Majesty I was reminded of some words I had read recently which I think are suitable to the present occasion. They were spoken by Mr. Clement Atlee, a former Prime Minister of Great Britain, and Deputy Leader of the Government throughout World War II during the coalition Government. He spoke these words on the unhappy occasion when references were made in the House of Commons to the death of King George V:—

It is the glory of our Constitution that under it great changes effected elsewhere by violence are brought about peaceably owing to its adaptability. All this requires that this same quality should be displayed by the King and this King George did. Equally important, I think, has been the power of the King to offer a point of stability in a distracted world. The movements of mass hysteria which have been witnessed elsewhere have passed this country by. One reason has been the presence of a king who commanded the respect and affection of his people and was beyond the spirit of faction. There was no need to elevate some individual Party leader into a national hero because the King was there to express the views of the people.

I believe that those qualities were again shown by his son, the late King George VI, in troublous times, and that his granddaughter, Queen Elizabeth II, showed us in her recent visit that she is also richly endowed with the same gifts. Of more importance than all the pomp and ceremony associated with her visit was the obvious fact that she represented something fundamental in the British way of life, and it is good to remember this. Our joy in welcoming her to our shores was shared by the nine self-governing realms, the 33 Crown colonies, the 12 protected States, and the four territories held in trusteeship for the United Nations. This joy was aroused in spite of differences of race, creed, colour, climate and language. All people see in her Royal person that symbol of individual responsibility and allegiance to a common purpose that makes the British Democracy so different from other types of Government. The British Crown has proved an enduring element in this troubled world: may it long remain so! Australians have welcomed their Queen, and they will welcome her return. Paragraph 5 of His Excellency's speech stated:—

The inflationary factors in our economy have been brought under control with the result that a large measure of stability of prices and costs has been achieved.

That stability has been achieved, however, only at a very great cost, and can only be a false stability fraught with dangers to the future, for it has been brought about only by someone's suffering for its introduction. As I listened to the Premier speak in this debate, I was reminded of an old saying that if you poke a venomous reptile with a stick or, perhaps, a shillelagh, it will try to cast its venom at you, and that, if it is poked hard enough, it will probably spray its venom wildly all over the place. The Premier's speech was an ample illustration of that saying. I have been interested to read recent press reports of this year's Liberal and Country League country convention held in Adelaide and of the many resolutions carried. I was delighted to see that many of the policies endorsed by that convention were policies for which the Labor Party has fought for many years.

Mr. Jennings—We lead and they follow!

Mr. JOHN CLARK—Yes. Are our opponents, as usual, realizing the justice of some of our claims? The *Advertiser* of July 20 contained the following report:—

The Federal Government will be urged to introduce legislation to subsidize the export of wines, and the State Government to increase facilities for the sale of wines.

I hope that is not merely a pious resolution. His Excellency's speech contained the following statement with regard to the marketing of wine grapes:—

A heavy wine grape harvest coincided with a restricted demand by winemakers, though practically all the grapes found a market.

The important words in that statement are "restricted demand by winemakers," and many South Australians have asked why the demand should be restricted. There are members in this Chamber who are able and willing to explain the difficulties in this regard much better than I can, but I believe that under present conditions we have no hope of competing in the overseas wine market. I understand from a friend who recently visited the United Kingdom that the service of Australian wines there is shocking. High tariffs must also be considered when one is trying to explain the reason for the fall in the quantity of wines exported. I am not particularly interested in the aspect of the production of wines, but I am concerned from the point of view of the grower of grapes.

Mr. Macgillivray—He is the foundation of the whole system.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—Obviously, and I am concerned with what will happen next year if the grower cannot sell his crop, on which he

depends for his living. It is pleasing, however, to know that some attempt is being made to help these people. Many people were surprised to read in paragraph 11 of His Excellency's speech the following statement:—

The Government adheres to its policy of improving the State railways which are still a vital factor in our transport.

Some members have concealed, with some difficulty, their surprise at that statement, but I will not try to do so. The words "still a vital factor" denote that the Government envisages the time when the railways will no longer be a vital factor in our transport. Frequently, we hear complaints both inside and outside this Chamber, of the losses incurred by our railways, but I believe that the losses incurred or gains made by such an enterprise cannot be measured in pounds, shillings and pence. I do not agree with that statement in His Excellency's speech, because over the years our railway services have not been improved very much. This year is an important one in the history of our railways, for it marks the centenary of the opening of the first South Australian railway—between Goolwa and Port Elliott. A horse-drawn train travelled along that line, and the first steam train used in this State travelled from Adelaide to Port Adelaide in 1856. The second steam train service was opened between Adelaide and Gawler in 1857. This journey in 1857 was very important, because it was the first step in the opening up of the rich farmlands of the north to rail transport. The first train from Adelaide to Gawler ran on October 5, 1857, and it was a gala day for Gawler: at each terminus thousands of people gathered and acclaimed the longest steam-powered train that had been run up to that time in Australia. Carriages were decorated with flowers and banners and the engine garlanded with flowers. There were 800 to 900 passengers aboard, and a brass band played the National Anthem before the trip commenced. Although I am not disloyal I am thankful that this course is not followed today, because it would lengthen an already over-long journey. The 25-mile trip took 1½ hours, including a 10 minute stop at Salisbury, although whether that was for refreshments or an official welcome I do not know.

Mr. Quirke—In 100 years the time has not improved.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—If the honourable member will give me the chance that is what I am trying to say. On this occasion one locomotive drew 13 first and second class and

four third class carriages, but a second engine gave assistance by pushing behind. When the train reached Gawler, horse-drawn buses met it and transported the people into the town, where a holiday was celebrated. On the return trip a speed of 33 miles per hour was reached between Smithfield and Salisbury. Apart from a few expresses the normal speed of trains on this line today is very much less than 33 miles an hour. I admit that there are many more stops, but surely the improvements made over the past 97 years should entitle the passengers to travel from one of the most important towns in South Australia to the city in a shorter time than they do. Last week I was unfortunate in having to catch a train leaving Adelaide at 11.30 p.m. and the trip took considerably more than an hour. I realize that there is a very good train leaving Gawler at 9.42 and arriving in Adelaide at 10.20.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—I had investigations made and found that in a similar area outside Melbourne a similar journey on electric trains takes longer than the trip to Gawler.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—People living in Gawler are not concerned with the performance of electric trains in the environs of Melbourne. I have received a letter from the present Minister of Railways stating what is considered to be good time for the trip, and I will mention that later. There has not been a great deal of improvement in the railways in the district which I represent. Recently at the Liberal and Country League country convention a resolution was passed in favour of speeding up country rail services, and I could not agree with it more. The difficulty is that Gawler is considered to be country for some things and metropolitan for others. Anyone wishing to travel from Gawler to Adelaide return must travel on the one day; in this respect Gawler is regarded as metropolitan, but in other ways as country. I am regarded as a country member in this Chamber. Often the trains running to Gawler are very crowded and a number of railway employees have spoken to me pointing out their concern about the position. They are doing a grand job in spite of the difficulties, but their work is made harder because of the crowd.

Very many workmen leave early and return late. A few days ago I was speaking to a member of the Legislative Council who was associated with an engineering business in Gawler some years ago which, unfortunately, has been transferred from that town. He mentioned by name several men that he once employed, asking if they still were travelling to

Adelaide to their employment, and I assured him that they were. These men are nearing retiring age; they have been doing this trip for years; surely they are entitled to a seat and reasonable comfort, but they do not always get it. Perhaps after leaving Salisbury they are able to obtain a seat, but I have found it impossible to convince senior railway officers and even Ministers of the difficulty that has been made for travellers from Adelaide to Gawler on trains other than expresses by the enormously increased growth in the town of Salisbury. Before long this difficulty will be aggravated if the foolish satellite town scheme is persisted with, and I am afraid it will be because usually it is very difficult in this place to deal with obstinacy. Although I believe that in some places the railways are being improved, in others obviously they are not.

The Hon. McIntosh—Wait until we get the new Budd cars going!

Mr. JOHN CLARK—I hope the Minister will be able to persuade his colleague in the Legislative Council of this when they come. I would like to see some in my district. When I have referred complaints to the railways officials I have always received a prompt and courteous answer but, unfortunately, it is invariably "No" and I must say they can usually back up these negative letters in a very nice way, but it does not help to get much done. I shall read extracts from a letter I recently wrote to the Minister of Railways after receiving continual complaints from various people. After an introductory paragraph I wrote:—

Recently I have had very many complaints about the service, particularly from workmen using the service daily to travel to and from their employment. I have also received a special request from the Gawler Corporation, seeking improvements. From my own experience of travelling on this line, almost daily, and from questions I have asked of those who normally travel on various trains, I believe that these complaints are fully justified. I would like to point out that well over 1,000 workmen (and women) in addition to many other passengers, travel to work by train from Gawler daily, some to Long Range Weapons Establishment, some to other factories and works en route, and many to the city. On numerous trains it is very difficult to obtain a seat, and I know you will readily agree that this is a necessity after and before a hard day's work. There are also numerous complaints about train alterations which have been made, and do not suit most travellers as well as the former schedules. In this respect I particularly request a return to the time tables operating before the June alteration. It was understood when these alterations were made that they were winter

alterations and that the summer trains would revert to time tables formerly operating. This has not happened. Passengers generally desire the two trains formerly leaving Adelaide at 4.07 and 4.15 instead of one only at present, leaving at 4.13. I feel certain that this would be of benefit not only to the passengers but to the Railways Department as well, as I know of many dissatisfied passengers who are grouping together to save time and are travelling together by car, thus saving well over an hour per day, a very big consideration after a day's work. It is felt also that some trains are particularly long on the journey, the 5.23 from Adelaide being a notable example of unreliability. Recently I have been in touch by telephone with Mr. Harvey, the Railways Traffic Superintendent seeking to find out why passengers to Gawler and North Gawler are either debarred from travelling on the 5.05 (Burra) train in the evenings or kept waiting until the last minute before being let on this train. I have had repeated queries from dissatisfied passengers about this. This train runs express to Gawler and is therefore very handy. As I expected this is done in the interests of Northern passengers, which I can understand, but is not very fair to Gawler and North Gawler passengers. May I point out that the previous train to this, the 4.42, does not go to North Gawler, and the next one, the 5.20 does not go to North Gawler. If they are not allowed to board the 5.05, North Gawler passengers are forced to catch the 5.23, a notoriously slow train, usually very full. Indeed several passengers have told me that they have not had a seat on this train until after Salisbury for months. I request that at least North Gawler passengers are allowed to board the 5.05.

I received a lengthy reply from the Minister, who said:—

The Commissioner has informed me that this service has been the subject of a number of complaints during the past few months, but after going into the matter very carefully he feels that a reasonably good service is being provided for the majority of train travellers on this line.

I maintain that it is the duty of the Railways Commissioner to provide a reasonably good service for everybody, though I know that is not easy. I was to some extent put in my place by the Minister's next paragraph:—

Although you state that over 1,000 working people travel by train from Gawler daily, a check of ticket issues at North Gawler and Gawler from 1/10/53 to 7/2/54 shows that the average number is about 600.

I attempted to check the number myself, and thought that the average would be much higher, though I will not argue the point. The letter continues:—

The total seating accommodation provided on the seven morning trains leaving North Gawler between 5.34 a.m. and 7.55 a.m. is 1,470. In the evening, six trains depart from Adelaide between 4.13 p.m. and 5.47 p.m., with seating

accommodation for 1,320 passengers, which is surely a reasonable service for Salisbury, Smithfield and Gawler.

That is not a reasonable service. Again no allowance has been made for the growth of Salisbury. The letter continues later:—

The journey from Adelaide to Gawler on the 5.23 p.m. railcar takes 59 minutes, but as this is a train which stops at all ten intermediate places from Dry Creek to Gawler, the time cannot be regarded as excessive.

Fifty-nine minutes for an evening train carrying tired workers is too long, so I regard it as excessive. Perhaps the Minister's letter conveys that we have a 'good service, but travellers between Gawler and Adelaide knew that I was trying to get an improvement, so I received many letters from men and women often travelling on this route. I shall quote some extracts that should be of value to Parliament. They were written by people that are not habitual grumblers or irresponsible, but who want an improved service. One letter states:—

Tonight, Thursday, 21/1/54, on missing the 5.05 p.m., Burra train, I attempted to pass through the barrier and board the 5.20 p.m. Eudunda train but was refused admittance on the grounds that it was reserved for country travellers. Myself, several Salisbury mates, and Gawler mates, together with dozens of north line travellers, were refused entry to the platform, and told to board the 5.23 Gawler train. The 5.23 p.m. train was packed to such an extent that it was impossible to set foot on the train. We were then impelled to board the 5.47 p.m. train to Gawler. I point out, and there were many witnesses, that the Eudunda 5.20 p.m. train left Adelaide station with the first carriage fully seated, second three parts, and a long Tom carriage with ten passengers seated. Why were we debarred?

Does that letter indicate that the railways have improved this service? Another letter states:—

I am one of the workers affected by the evening train disputes. As a North Gawler passenger on the Angaston line, sometimes I am permitted on before 5, and at other times not, and yet other Angaston line passengers are permitted on. I should like to point out that if I do get on, it usually means standing all the way home after standing for eight hours at a machine as well as walking over half a mile every morning and evening. If I get the 5.20 it also means standing to Salisbury since the steam train was taken off. I think anyone should be permitted to get home from work before 6.30 when trains are running. If another car was put on the trouble would not be so bad.

Every person should be enabled to reach his home before 6.30 p.m. after working hard all day. Does that letter indicate an improvement in railway services? It certainly does not in this area. The third letter is from a young

lady who offers some sensible suggestions. She writes:—

I am confident that I am expressing the opinion of numerous fellow travellers. The following are my observations and suggestions. 8.05 a.m. Gawler to Adelaide—There is an antiquated carriage and two rail cars supplied to accommodate an ever-increasing crowd to the city. On Monday mornings at least 20 travellers are forced to stand, and this is a very trying experience for a 25-mile run. No provision was made for Christmas shoppers, Royal Show, or school holidays. 3.55 p.m. express to Angaston—No passengers to Gawler are permitted on this train. Could not a car be added to the rear of the car for Gawler people only? It could be detached at Gawler with very little delay and no inconvenience to the Angaston people. This suggestion also applies to the 5.5 p.m. Adelaide-Burra train.

These suggestions, if adopted, could lead to a great improvement. I received another interesting letter which referred to a number of difficulties in the Gawler service, but as I do not want to prolong the debate unduly I shall not weary members by reading it. Gawler residents have been wondering when they would receive even a slightly improved service and some must have been either amused or annoyed when told that the railway services were being improved. May I again plead for another town in my district (Wasleys), which to a great extent, is being ruined because of the lack of an adequate rail service? I am afraid my plea will fall on deaf ears, but I do hope it will be heeded. The first morning train leaves Wasleys at 9.16 and runs express from Gawler and reaches Adelaide at 10.20. Many Wasleys residents are employed in the city, but because of the poorness of the service remain in the city during the week and only return to their homes at week-ends. As a result, business in Wasleys is affected because a large percentage of the population is not there except at week-ends. I communicated with the Minister of Railways some time ago about this and he pointed out by letter that a workman's train was not possible from Wasleys because, for one reason, there were no turning facilities at Wasleys and a train would have to come from Riverton, 126 miles from Adelaide. The use of Budd cars might answer the problem because I understand they run both backwards and forwards. The point that got under the skin of the people at Wasleys was that the Minister also said:—

Passengers from Wasleys, which is 6½ miles distant from Roseworthy, should make their own transport arrangements to Roseworthy.

In other words, they would have to provide their own transport to catch a train at 6.11 a.m. at Roseworthy. I have been wondering

whether, as a last resort, the railways could change their normal custom and run some type of bus service to assist these people to conveniently catch that early train.

Yesterday Mr. Hutchens referred to the extension of electricity into country areas. I was delighted to discover that a city member was alive to some of the disabilities under which country people are living. I noticed that the L.C.L. Country Convention passed a motion—and I hope it was not merely a pious resolution—that it favoured more uniform charges for electricity in the country. I agree whole-heartedly with that. Country members will recall that last session the Premier agreed to aid new electricity extensions by providing some assistance where surcharges were too high. It can be amply proved by checking the records of the Electricity Trust that many country towns are paying surcharges which are beyond their means and which are ridiculous when compared with the rates at which people in the metropolitan area and Gawler are supplied with electricity. I do not, for one moment, condemn the activities of the trust as I realize it is expected to make its services pay, but some formula should be worked out whereby country people could obtain this necessary amenity at a cheaper rate.

Mr. Quirke—Some surcharges are over 90 per cent.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—Yes. One projected extension in my district, within 30 miles of Adelaide, will pay a surcharge of slightly over 90 per cent. Not long ago I was present at a meeting in the company of a Government member at which in all good faith I suggested what I have been saying this afternoon, that country people are expected to pay too much for electricity and that they should be afforded some relief. When my friend spoke, he did not support my suggestions because he believed they were too Socialistic. I do not think there is any Socialism in my suggestion, although I certainly would not be ashamed of it if there were; it is a matter of plain common-sense that country people are being asked to pay more than they should, and it makes me wonder just how much the cry we hear so often about decentralization really means.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—Don't you think decentralization has been shown at Port Augusta?

Mr. JOHN CLARK—I think the electricity extensions are one of the finest thing we have.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—Then why scoff?

Mr. JOHN CLARK—I am not making any attempt at scoffing.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—The sum of £7,000,000 has been spent in one area on decentralization.

Mr. Quirke—But most of the power is being brought 300 miles to Adelaide, where it is consumed.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—I am not for one moment suggesting that the Electricity Trust and electricity extensions are not good things; I believe they are among the best means of decentralizing industry and effecting settlement in the country. I am simply saying that country people are being asked to pay too much. If the Minister will examine figures I am prepared to show him I think he must agree that too much is being charged for country electricity services, yet we find in paragraph 14 of His Excellency's speech the statement that "Country extensions are facilitated by arrangements under which the trust supplies electricity to sparsely settled areas with the aid of Government subsidies." I think that in preparation of that sentence the word "slightly" was omitted before "facilitated." This is one of the reasons why the cities are overflowing. It was a great pleasure to visit Port Augusta recently to see the new powerhouse and to realize the great possibilities of this work, but thinking about it on my way home I wondered whether it would result in an increase or a decrease in the charges for electricity throughout the country. I hope that the Minister does not think I am taking either the Government or the trust to task for building this powerhouse.

Now I should like to say something on a matter which I know concerns many country members, namely, country sewerage. One of the hardest annuals in the beautiful garden of opening speeches for years has been the reference to country sewerage schemes, but if members can find any reference to it in the Governor's speech on this occasion they have better eyesight than I have. Members have heard in the last couple of years constant references by me and other members to the possibilities of country sewerage, and earlier this session, in reply to a question, information was conveyed to me by the Minister of Works with regard to the Gawler scheme. He told me that it had been referred to the Public Works Standing Committee in 1949, but that no report had been submitted. Naturally, I sought further information, but have been unable to get anything very satisfactory.

Yesterday I obtained from the Minister an interesting reply to a question regarding sewerage schemes. He said that 13 schemes for country sewerage had been referred to the Public Works Standing Committee, that interim reports had been given on four of them and one final report had been received. It is interesting to note that this was the Salisbury scheme which was referred to the committee on March 5, 1953, and its report was submitted on June 10 of the same year, whereas eight of the schemes submitted as far back as December, 1949, have not yet been reported on. I am not blaming the present chairman of the committee or the former chairman. I am not even blaming the Minister or the Engineering and Water Supply Department, but it appears to me that the Government does not desire to get reports on country schemes.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—The Government has not the slightest influence on a non-Party committee. The honourable member should address his own colleagues who are on the committee.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—Before any report can be made details of the scheme must be submitted to the committee by the department concerned. I believe that details will not be submitted to the committee unless they are asked for, and I am suggesting that the department has not been instructed to submit those details.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—In point of fact evidence has been tendered by the department; the interim reports indicate that.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—I am not referring to those, but to schemes referred to the committee in 1949, such as the scheme for Gawler, and apparently forgotten. I am seeking information in order that I may give a satisfactory answer to my constituents who want to know why there is this delay. Why is Gawler considered to be a pariah amongst country towns? The effect on Gawler of the lack of sewerage is completely damning that town. It is not only the fact that we want to get rid of the out-of-date pan system that no town wants or should be expected to have in this day and age, let alone a town as close to the city as Gawler; but the unsatisfactory disposal of waste is keeping industries away from the town and affecting others already there, as I am prepared to prove. To this end I wish to quote briefly the case of the Gawler Manufacturing Company, which is in great difficulties on account of lack of sewerage. This is one of Gawler's greatest assets. It should be helped instead of hindered and I would like to

quote briefly from correspondence on the subject; firstly, from a letter received by the Gawler Local Board of Health from the Department of Public Health:—

The Gawler Manufacturing Company Ltd. is a clothing manufacturing firm which has a staff of 175 persons and which it is anticipated will reach a maximum of 250 persons in the near future. The waste from the lavatories gravitates into an existing septic tank of a capacity sufficient for 35 persons only, the effluent then passing, together with ablation and canteen wastes, to a soakage pit, coke filter and bore in the plantation opposite. This treatment has proved most inadequate—so much so that during the winter season of last year a water ejector was employed to discharge the effluent into the South Para River. It is due to this that the matter finally came to a head. The present septic tank is situated in a basement of the factory and only a few yards from a boiler. This presents at least two hazards. Firstly, the cleaning operations, when required, must be done through the main entrance foyer of the factory and, secondly, should there be an escape of sewage sludge gas so as to accumulate an explosive mixture with air, serious trouble could result.

The next is a paragraph from a letter from the Gawler Manufacturing Company to the Public Health Department dated March 8, 1954:—

The function of this business is that of a clothing manufacturing unit originally promoted and sponsored by the Commonwealth Government during the war. The venture has been a successful one and the development has extended to original expectations. We have installed equipment sufficient to occupy a minimum of 60 additional staff but we cannot engage these people until we overcome the problem of the disposal of the effluent.

In other words, this business is being prevented from expanding simply because sewerage facilities are lacking.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—If the honourable member wishes it I will get one of my engineers to visit Gawler to see if he can assist them.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—I understand that that has already been done, as I was about to show. The next letter I wish to quote from is one from the company to the Chief Inspector, Factories and Steam Boilers Department, touching on that point:—

The matter has been referred to the engineer of the Water Works Department by the Board of Health. Careful investigations have been made by the Water Works Department at Gawler but at this stage have still not been able to tell us what can be done to handle the amount of effluent that discharges from the septic tank. The matter has been continually in hand and a request has been made for us to sink a test hole for the department to inspect as to the nature of the soil in

relation to the scheme they have in mind, the nature of which has not been conveyed to us.

I am not anxious to deliberately delay proceedings but I want to make as effective as possible my plea in regard to sewerage so I shall read in full a letter brought to my notice towards the end of last year by the Town Clerk of Gawler to whom it was addressed. It was sent to him by the secretary of the Gawler Manufacturing Company. It was as follows:—

As you are aware we are encountering considerable difficulty in operating the septic tank system installed at the factory. To set up a large industrial unit in an area which is not installed with sewer facilities is a big problem. We did seek advice on this matter before commencing operations in Gawler and at the time there was some talk of a project in the not too far distant future that sewer installations would be available.

In other words the company had heard that a scheme had been referred to the Public Works Committee for investigation and report. The letter continued:—

We have now developed to a stage whereby the bore is incapable of handling the overflow and whereas we have installed sufficient equipment that could be the means of employing another 50 or so staff we cannot proceed with the engagement of these people until such time as the septic facilities can be satisfactorily met. We are fully cognizant of the fact that we are a private enterprise but at the same time we feel that in the project that has been undertaken a considerable benefit is enjoyed by Gawler generally. We pay in wages an average weekly amount of £2,000. We would like you to submit to your council a request as to whether we can be informed as to—(1) the projected installation of sewerage.

What an optimist this gentleman was! The letter continued:—

(2) Whether the council is prepared to take any steps to assist us in overcoming this problem. Your councillors will no doubt be interested to learn that this unit which started eight years ago with six people is now employing over 200 staff and the products are enjoying an Australia wide distribution.

The products of the factory are mostly garments sold by Myers particularly and other firms in this State and the rest of Australia. The letter continued:—

The demand is considerably in excess of our present output and from our point of view we have the problem to decide as to whether we will limit our activities to the facilities we can take advantage of in Gawler, or whether we should develop the functions of the business to its limit which will necessitate opening a unit in another area to look after the additional output.

The opening of a unit in another area would be an advantage to that area, but it would

be in the city, and the extension of the industry in Gawler is the sort of thing dearly needed in South Australia.

Mr. Macgillivray—Poor sanitation is a deterrent to decentralization of industry?

Mr. JOHN CLARK—It certainly is. The following is a copy of a letter I received from Mr. Burfield, the latter part of the first paragraph of which would apply to any member in this House:—

We wish to bring before your notice the difficulties we are now experiencing in connection with our workroom because of the lack of proper sewer arrangements in Gawler, and we know that as the member for the district of Gawler you are vitally interested in everything that is in this district and therefore we are taking the liberty of bringing all the facts before your notice with the hope that you can do something to assist us. When the building of this workroom was considered it was generally understood in Gawler that the installation of a sewerage system was something to be installed in the comparatively near future and based on this understanding we went ahead and from a very small beginning have now established an industry which is the largest in the district and which in total is now employing 215 people, 180 in the Julian Terrace workroom and 35 in the Murray Street workroom. Our particular problems are in relation to the Julian Terrace establishment.

For your information we are enclosing copies of the letters which we have sent to the Town Clerk of Gawler, the secretary of the Public Health Department, and the Chief Inspector of Factories and Steam Boilers Department, and we have no objection to you using the contents of these letters in any inquiries or statements you may make in connection with this matter. Also we enclose copy of a letter which was received by the Local Board of Health at Gawler, apparently this week, from the Department of Public Health. The factory at Gawler we believe to be one of the most outstanding of its type in Australia. Staff are provided with every amenity; precautions have been taken to ensure continuity of employment by the installation of auxiliary power generating equipment and fuel oil supply reserve. Some idea of the value that this industry means to Gawler is that for the last year ended we paid in wages £86,074; our wage bill for last week was £1,948. There is an area of 21,450 sq. ft. in the workroom. Most important of all we have installed the necessary machinery that will provide for the employment of an additional 60 people, but this cannot be done until some other arrangement is made regarding sewer. In fact at the present time we are committing a breach by not having sufficient closets as required by the Country Factories Act, 1945. We realize that the installation of additional closets would in no way affect the sewer problem but because of the circumstances which have made it impossible for us to solve the disposal of effluent we do not feel inclined to go to the additional expense of installing more closets unless we are assured of being able to handle

the effluent. If ultimately we have to accept the fact that the disposal of the effluent cannot be suitably dealt with then we will be forced to reduce the number of staff employed and either curtail our overall activities to the reduced number or establish a secondary workroom in another district. The negotiations with the Public Health Department have not come to any finality and the officers of that department have been very co-operative in the manner of receiving our approach, but in spite of this it does seem that because of the delay in the installing of the sewer system in Gawler the industry which has been established there will have to be curtailed and Gawler is likely to lose the benefit of any development. Whether this means a great deal to Gawler or not we do know.

I can assure members that it means a lot to Gawler and surrounding districts because people come from as far as Tanunda and I believe Angaston to work at the factory. The letter continued:—

Certainly it is contrary to the spirit in which we have approached our planning for the development of this decentralized industry, and in connection with this it is appropriate to say that originally when this industry commenced as a Commonwealth Government sponsored unit in the war years it started with a personnel of six people. The people being employed are new to the clothing industry and all have been trained. There would not be 10 of the staff who have ever worked in another clothing room. We submit these details to you with a request for help. Can you, in your capacity as Parliamentary member for this district, do anything to promote or expedite the installation of a suitable sewerage system.

I have done my duty in this matter because Gawler needs the Gawler Manufacturing Company and a sewerage system. I have no shares in the company. I am seeking and fighting for it in the interests of the people of Gawler. The industry wants to expand. There is no knowing how big it will become. It has the capital but no sewerage facilities, and it is being prevented from expanding because of the lack of them. It is a scandal that an industry like it should be hindered in this way. I appeal to the Government to consider extending sewerage facilities to Gawler as a matter of urgency.

Last night I was pleased to hear Mr. Dunstan quote interesting facts and figures about education. In the Address in Reply debate last year I spoke at length on this matter and I am delighted that other members are now interesting themselves in the subject. Like other members I was thrilled at the demonstration put on by the boys and girls for the entertainment of Her Majesty. A few weeks after the function I travelled down from Gawler with the former Minister of Education,

Mr. Rudall, and he said that when the scheme was first submitted to him by the Director of Education he felt that it could not be done, but the Director said he intended to carry it out as a military operation, and he did so. We know the result and the Director for his top planning, and those who helped him to carry it out, should receive the highest commendation. When the Queen made her entrance I was touched by the spontaneous ovation from the children, and tears came to my eyes, and when I looked amongst those in my company I was gratified to notice that the oldest and toughest of them were similarly affected. As a former teacher I congratulate the Director of Education and his colleagues on the wonderful performance. The following week Gawler was fortunate enough to have a visit from His Excellency the Governor and he informed me that Her Majesty returned from the show-grounds function to Government House with expressions of joy. The importance of education throughout the Commonwealth is something beyond politics. We have been told that some success has been achieved in the Education Department's building programme, and I believe that is so. I know the Minister of Education would be one of the first to admit that much remains to be done, but we can say that much has already been achieved, although we cannot say the same about the recruitment of teachers. As yet, there has been little success in obtaining increased numbers of fully-qualified teachers, and I believe that is the greatest problem facing the department. I congratulate the new Minister of Education who, in the short period he has held office, has shown himself to be courteous in replying to questions and eager to give assistance and do everything in his power for the department, or everything he is allowed to.

As to our lack of success in obtaining fully trained teachers, if members study the *Education Gazette* they will find that the net increase at the Teachers College in the last five years has been 70 students, excluding private students. As Mr. Dunstan pointed out last night, and as has appeared in the press and been stated by the Minister, we must expect a great increase in secondary students. The question is whether we can expect an adequate supply of secondary school teachers. I have ascertained that at the end of this year approximately 17 fully trained secondary school teachers will be ready to leave the Teachers College. Others, because of the dearth of teachers, may have to go out to schools before they complete the full four

years' course, and thus be incompletely trained. They will have to continue their training for degrees and diplomas while still teaching, and that is not easy, as I know from experience. Secondary school teachers cannot be trained in a few months, and that also applies to primary school teachers, although it has been attempted.

We must admit that the overall position in relation to temporary teachers is not improving. It is more or less common knowledge that there have been more retirements of this type of teacher than recruitments. I do not know the reason, but it may be that some people teach for a short period to earn a specific amount for certain purposes, and then revert to their normal household occupations. At present qualified women teachers are supposed to retire at 60 years, but because of the shortage they are allowed to continue until 65, but must then retire. Some experienced teachers may be lost because of this rule, and I therefore suggest that at the Minister's or the Director's discretion women over 65, if willing and capable of continuing, be allowed to remain in the service for a further year or two. I believe that the reservoir of former trained teachers is practically dry. Despite the recent press statements concerning increased teacher recruitments, facts do not bear them out. I am reluctantly forced to the conclusion that the Government policy on teacher recruitment has been a failure. I shall suggest reasons for this position, but not in a carping spirit. I have gone to much trouble to study facts and figures and I want to offer constructive suggestions. Conditions generally in the department have not been improved. The profession must be made more attractive, and in this regard we have done less than the other States.

Mr. O'Halloran—Are they short of teachers in Queensland?

Mr. JOHN CLARK—They have plenty there. The lack of promotion opportunities is one reason why the department experiences difficulties in obtaining sufficient teachers. It may be said that young people thinking of entering the department do not realize these things, but I know that many do. They have more than half completed their secondary school education and are intelligent enough to ascertain the ultimate rewards the profession offers. Promotion rewards are not commensurate with the qualifications required. Ambition is being killed for many in the service because, although they have the qualifications, the prospects of promotion are few. In most Commonwealth

Public Service departments more than half the officers occupy positions carrying salaries above the base rate, but in the State Public Services only one in three hold a senior position. In the primary branch of the Education Department the proportion holding positions above that of assistants is about one in four, and it is not because they have not the qualifications to fill a senior position, but because vacancies are not available.

The position among women teachers in primary, infant and technical schools is much worse. Compared with other professions there is very little incentive for women with ambition to make teaching a career, and in comparison with the rewards offered by other professions it is hard, and becoming harder, to get young women to accept the responsibility of training for the teaching profession because of the lack of chances of promotion. The chances of remaining assistants all their lives are great and there is little scope for organizing and administrative ability, which I am convinced women have, therefore we are forced to the conclusion that more promotional opportunities must be created if numbers of the right type of trainee teachers are to be obtained. Further, teachers' salaries are not attractive enough compared with those obtained in comparable professions and with those for teachers in most other States. It is useless for Government spokesmen to say, as they have said, that the average salary of teachers is a certain amount, because that does not give a true picture. A study of teachers' awards in other States reveals that, in almost all categories which demand comparable work and comparable qualifications, South Australian salaries are relatively low. In fact, they are often £100 below general interstate levels. Recently, New South Wales teachers obtained a new award, some conditions of which have appeared in the Adelaide press. That award has placed their teachers' salaries above those of South Australian teachers in comparable positions by amounts ranging from £100 to £200 a year, despite the fact that the recruiting position in that State is not nearly as acute as it is here. In Victoria, although the shortage of teachers is proportionately nowhere near as acute as in South Australia, negotiations are now proceeding for an increase in teachers' salaries. Those States, with others, have realized the importance of the teaching profession, and, in their endeavours to obtain an adequate supply of teachers, they are realistically facing the competitive situation existing today. It is competitive,

because the Public Service and private firms are demanding the best people and are prepared to pay them the salaries they are worth; indeed, competition is forcing them to do so. A similar injection of realism is required in this State to convince those in power that the shortage of teachers and relatively low salaries are not merely coincidental facts. The inadequacy of salaries is only one reason why our recruiting drive has not met with the success the profession warrants.

Another reason concerns long service leave. A comparison with the position in other States and other services show that our long service leave provisions are not such as to predispose a young person seeking a career to enter the Education Department. This Government is to be congratulated on having done something in the matter of long service leave for teachers, but conditions here do not compare favourably with those in other States. In this respect three disabilities are suffered by South Australian teachers. Firstly, the maximum leave falls below the general standard for teachers. The average leave obtainable by teachers in other States is at least nine months; it may under certain conditions be even higher. In New South Wales 12 months' long service leave may be granted, in Victoria 12 months, in Queensland nine, in Tasmania six, and in Western Australia six. Moreover, in Tasmania and Western Australia an extension may be obtained under certain conditions. These leave conditions contrast sharply with the South Australian maximum of six months. Secondly, the conditions relating to long service leave are more severe in South Australia than in any other State. In all other States the first three months are obtainable after 10 years' service, but in South Australia 15 years' service is required before three months' leave may be taken. Further, in all other States six months' leave may be taken after 20 years' service, but South Australian teachers must serve 25 years before being credited with six months. Thirdly, in all other States teachers may obtain the same long service leave as may public servants; only in South Australia is a distinction made between the two groups. South Australian public servants may apply for a maximum of 12 months, but South Australian teachers may obtain only six months. From this aspect, as well as from others, teaching is less attractive as a career in this State than is the Public Service. The Premier has said that the reason for this differentiation is that teachers have more holidays than public

servants, but that argument is true in other States, and it has not been considered a valid argument by the authorities there.

Mr. Quirke—The other jobs are not as exacting as the teacher's job.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—That is so, and the present unsatisfactory long service leave conditions have undoubtedly had an adverse effect on the recruitment of teachers. Long service leave must be liberalized for teachers if the Education Department is to compete with other services in recruiting the best types for the profession. The conditions and amenities throughout the teaching service are not likely to attract young people, nor to interest parents who are considering future vocations for their children. In fact, despite their anxiety to enlist more recruits, teachers are often reluctant to urge young people to enter the department. The housing of teachers, particularly in the country, is unsatisfactory. Many teachers must go into the country, where most of them must live in older type houses. Further, the allowances paid to teachers on account of the remoteness of their districts are too low. Although the headmaster of the Leigh Creek school is paid £24 a year to compensate him for his remoteness, an employee of the Electricity Trust at Leigh Creek is paid an allowance of about £3 a week, yet the teacher must keep up appearances the same as those employees receiving higher allowances. More houses are required for country teachers. At present the housing position is difficult in country towns, and, unless an assistant has been established in a country town for a while, he has difficulty in getting board if he is single or a house if he is married. These difficulties discourage young people who may be thinking of becoming teachers. A country bank officer is provided with a house rent free and his electricity and telephone bills are paid, yet the country teacher, who enjoys none of these privileges, is expected to keep up appearances the same as that officer.

A woman who qualifies at the Teachers College and is sent to a country area finds conditions there a little different from those she has been used to. Such young women do not complain about this difference in conditions, but the position is accentuated by the fact that many temporary assistants, some certificated and others uncertificated, are working in schools within a few streets of their home, and the Education Department cannot very well transfer them to the country, because, if it did, they would resign. Last

year a woman complained to me that her daughter, on completing a full course at the Teachers College, had been posted to the country, whereas her girl friend, who had gone through high school with her, taken up another occupation and later entered the profession as a temporary teacher, was teaching at a school only a few streets from her home. Although that may not have a great effect, it does have some effect on people permitting their children to become teachers.

Mr. Quirke—How would you supply country schools?

Mr. JOHN CLARK—If these things did not happen teachers would go to country schools, but there is a nasty feeling in their minds that their training entitles them to less than people with very little training. There is a very great lack of opportunity for promotion for women, and if they can find a comfortable job in the city at, for instance, a bank, with more congenial conditions and possibly more remuneration, they will take it in preference to a number of years of training in the Education Department, especially if they know they will have to go to the country when it is completed. Facilities at many schools, although they are being improved to some extent, are not every attractive, and in new buildings very little more than the minimum, such as desks and blackboards, are provided. If the amenities are compared with those in other professions or most modern factories it will be found that the Education Department suffers. Let me suggest one or two things that should be in existence at schools, which would enable the department to get more teachers. Each school should have a head teacher's office properly furnished with all necessities, and special book-rooms for stock for sale. After all, a head teacher has to buy his own stock of books and has to be his own office boy and clerk. Each school should have adequately furnished teachers' rooms for men and women, and adequate toilet facilities handy, not down yonder where most of them are. They should have lockers, and cooking facilities of some sort in the teachers' rooms. Although these may sound very simple things, if all schools were equipped with them there would be a little more glamour to the profession than there is. I do not say that we want nothing but glamour, but in this day and age there are not very many people who are idealistic enough to take up a profession simply because they feel they are doing some good for the world by so doing. Thank goodness there are some idealists in many professions, but I am afraid there are not many. If these matters

are not attended to the comfortable, quick-earning job with amenities will usurp the Education Department's opportunity of obtaining the best type for teachers; the children will suffer, and it is the children I am interested in. If some of these suggestions are followed the already good standard of the Education Department will be raised immeasurably. I have tried without political rancour to advance constructive ideas that will be of some value. It has often been said that the teacher of today makes and moulds the citizen of tomorrow and this trite saying, although it has become hackneyed, is true nevertheless.

I apologize to the House and particularly the Premier for taking so long, but there was a lot that could not be said conveniently in other debates. I realize that it is the duty of the Opposition in most democratically-elected Parliaments to help forward the business of the House, although I do not by any means think that this Parliament is a democratically-elected one, so I wonder if the responsibility of the Opposition is to help business as much as possible and whether we should be very anxious to co-operate until we are given a free and just system of election.

Mr. QUIRKE (Stanley)—In supporting the motion I join with other members in offering my congratulations to the mover and seconder. Although I do not necessarily agree with all they put forward, what they said was their firm conviction. Speaking with conviction is of value in this place, because in doing so we attempt to give something of the truth as we see it, and as they spoke with conviction I congratulate them. I also congratulate the new Ministers. A very happy choice has been made, not only because they are extremely nice gentlemen, but also because, as events have proved since they have taken office, they are very capable in their jobs. I have already had occasion to approach them on several occasions and am gratified with the results. It would appear that they are intent on getting their work done with the greatest possible expedition consistent with justice. They always do their best for the members concerned.

Like the honourable member who has just resumed his seat I was very happy this year in the visit of Her Majesty the Queen. In the light of world events since that visit, I look upon the Queen as a woman of destiny, and I am not happy with the road that lies ahead. The world is still in complete conflict and although there is no shooting war

nevertheless there has been no alleviation of warfare. It is a war of ideology and we are losing it so far. Korea, for instance, is one country divided into two. Was that a successful conclusion in view of the enormous casualties incurred there? I am afraid it was not. We have the same position in Indo-China where the factions against which democratic forces contended are in occupation of half the country, with influence over the other half. Germany, of course, is divided into two, and Poland and most of the southern and central European states are well behind the Iron Curtain. Now we have had the greatest blow of all in learning that Suez is to be vacated. This means that the Commonwealth as we know it is cut precisely in half. I do not look forward to the future under these conditions, and I am growing to the opinion that we should have no dealings with Communism as controlled from Moscow. We have achieved precisely nothing from all the conferences and talks—if anything, the advantage has been with the other side. Recently, the Geneva Conference took place. It was like an armed camp, or the signing of a peace treaty with armed factions on either side. What were the results? Nothing at all. It is time that we who are opposed to totalitarian Communism realized that we cannot negotiate with a rattlesnake, and the sooner we appreciate that the sooner they will take a different attitude towards us. I am convinced of that. In international spheres the idea exists that we must not trade with Japan or send scrap iron there. If that idea is right, why send wool to Russia? I think that is a fair question. Australia has about a £50,000,000 trade with Japan each year and if that country is to be ostracised forever for what it did to us what about Belsen and other camps in Germany? That is not the way to tackle international problems. Notwithstanding what happened to us in the past we can be very thankful if Japan does not ultimately become Communist. If we can survive the next 10 years without being blasted out of existence and without civilization crumbling under the impact of modern war we will have seen the distance, and it is improbable that we will have a war in the near future after that. The next 10 years is the crucial testing time. Much depends on how Australia confronts the rest of the world. We are isolated geographically, but we are close enough to every conceivable form of modern warfare to know that we could be annihilated. We know enough of modern weapons and scientific discoveries to know, or

do we know, that it is possible, by a synchronized attack on Australia, to obliterate all our capitals in five minutes. Therefore, we must face up to world problems. I maintain that there can be no reconciliation or dealings with people who in their fundamental teachings say, "We shall impose our ideology on the whole world". They have been mightily successful so far, principally because of the attitude of the democratic countries. This attitude reminds me of the umbrella policy of Munich. The line must be much stronger, or we shall perish in our weakness.

Economically, primary production is not as sound as it might be. Wheat marketing is troublesome, and the marketing of our dried fruits has become difficult. Last year prunes sold at 1/4d. lb., but today they are 10d. A drop of 1d. a pound means a drop of £9 6s. 8d. a ton, so a drop of 6d. a lb. is a colossal fall. There are no forward sales of sultanas today, and money is not available to growers for the fruit that has been processed and packed. Currants are in a better position, principally because of the failure of this year's Grecian crop, which for the first time in my memory has been below normal. Sultanas and lexiass are in a bad way. A price was more or less agreed upon for them for this year after the cessation of buying activities by the British Ministry of Food, but we have had the dumping on the British market of 50,000 tons of accumulated dried fruits stocks, against which we have to sell in competition. The urge is to clear the accumulated stocks, with a consequential slowing down of the sales of our fruit. It seems that dried fruits will become even less remunerative, not that dried vine fruits have ever given the same returns to growers as other primary commodities have. It has always been the Cinderella primary industry of this country. Tree fruits have returned good prices, but the vine fruits have always been on the balance, because we have such terrific competition from America and the Lebanese countries on the English and Canadian markets. This competition has kept prices down and when the British Ministry of Food was buying an Australian delegation had to go to England every year in order to earn a little more for our growers of sultanas and lexiass.

The wine industry is in the doldrums, but not in a position that it cannot be resuscitated quickly. It does not take a massive surplus of wine to seriously affect the industry. Even a continually small surplus has an adverse effect because most sales are made in Australia.

Further, there has been a big increase in plantings as a result of soldier settlement—an increase of about 7,000 acres. Minimum production from those plantings would be five tons to the acre, which is half what they will return in full bearing, so that means 35,000 tons more grapes in the first years of their bearing. The industry will certainly feel the impact of that. If we put these men on the land to grow wine grapes should we not provide facilities for sale? There seems to be an impression among many people that the matter can be easily solved by transferring the problem overseas, but I do not hold with that. It is our problem, and it is mainly a South Australian problem, because South Australia produces 80 per cent of Australian wine.

The Hon. A. W. Christian—You can take a horse to water, you know.

Mr. QUIRKE—Yes, and you can give the horse the opportunity to drink, but you are not doing that.

The Hon. A. W. Christian—The people in the wine producing districts show far greater concern for the barley industry than for their own.

Mr. QUIRKE—They might as a change, but the Minister just said that you can take a horse to water. So you can, but in doing that you at least attempt to give him a drink and you provide water for him. In South Australia there is not even drinking material for the horse. The solution of this problem is primarily a matter for this State. The sale of wine for the year ended June 30 was 8,800,000 gallons, which was 571,000 gallons less than the previous year. What were the reasons for that? Members probably do not know much about the so-called legitimate channels for the sale of wine. As a medium for selling wine hotels are an utter and hopeless failure, yet there are few other avenues for its sale. The hotels have failed because there are hundreds of thousands of people who will not go into the bottle department or public bar to buy a bottle of wine. If the hotel is the legitimate channel for the sale of wine let us examine conditions in New South Wales, where 70 per cent of all the hotels are owned by breweries or big organizations who say what may be sold in their hotels.

I am closely associated with a winery, but it has been impossible for us to sell any of our wine through those hotels in New South Wales. Application must be made to a committee in Sydney and I understand that applications are usually turned down, because if the people concerned try to spread the cake

there is a little less for themselves. That committee is dominated by the big brewery interests who desire to exclude wine from hotels. Even if they allow the sale of wine they charge $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent on the invoice cost, $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of which goes to the hotelkeeper and 5 per cent to the owner. If they say the wine must be delivered to one of their stores instead of a hotel their charge is 10 per cent. Those conditions do not obtain to the same extent in South Australia, but New South Wales has the greatest population of any State. I think the Honourable R. G. Casey said in the Commonwealth Parliament that within 100 miles of Sydney and 100 miles of Melbourne there resides over 50 per cent of the total population of Australia. Members can see that unless a winery is in the ring in Sydney it is difficult to dispose of its products. Today the big trade unions in New South Wales are blistering their own Government in order to overcome that disability. Information that I have received leads me to forecast that their efforts will fail. The breweries are too strong, even for the unions who will not be able to influence the Labor Government of New South Wales. The brewery-controlled hotels have a stranglehold on the Australian avenues of trade to the exclusion of the wine industry.

At present we have an annual surplus of 3,000,000 gallons of wine which represents 18,000,000 bottles, or one bottle every three weeks to 1,000,000 people. That illustrates how easy it would be to get rid of the surplus if there were proper avenues of trade accessible to the industry. Of the wine produced, 90 per cent is sold in Australia and only 10 per cent goes overseas. Of that 10 per cent, two-thirds goes to the United Kingdom and one-third to Canada, New Zealand and other countries. Before the war, England took 3,000,000 gallons of wine a year—the equivalent of our annual accumulating surplus today. Today she takes 800,000 gallons. A duty of 6s. 8d. a bottle is imposed on Australian wine in England and when all other charges, including transport, are added, the wine cannot be sold under an average of 15s. a bottle, although some may sell at 12s. Red wine is no longer fashionable in England or Australia, but the major portion of our pre-war exports was red wine. Now it is white or sherry type wine. We would have to reorientate our manufacture to recapture our trade. If no duty were paid it would be no use our sending what was not required. The Premier made rather a loose statement when he suggested

that South Africa, through having a centralized manufacturing process, had increased its sales to England 500 times.

Mr. Shannon—I think he said five times, not 500.

Mr. QUIRKE—Then if South Africa previously sold 1,000,000 gallons to England it would now be selling 5,000,000, but that is not so. The total amount of sherry it sent to England before the war was 1,750,000 gallons, but today it is 1,250,000 gallons.

The Hon. A. W. Christian—During the period from 1939 was there not a considerable decline which has since been overtaken?

Mr. QUIRKE—That could possibly have happened, but South Africa has not yet overtaken its 1939 quota. We could manufacture sherries to equal the South African sherries, but we would still be at a disadvantage inasmuch as our costs would be greater. South Africa has cheaper labour: our standard of living is high and the grape-growing and wine-manufacturing industries have contributed to that standard because of the high wages they pay and the general standards of their organizations. We are further away from the market. We are selling good sherries in England today and I hope the trade will increase.

The Hon. A. W. Christian—At present a large quantity of heavy red wine is produced. Could the industry switch to the lighter sherry type wine?

Mr. QUIRKE—It is possible to make a white wine out of a red wine by certain processes, but that cannot be done with large quantities. It is possible to make a white wine from a black grape, but it cannot be marketed within 12 months. The Minister has suggested a scheme whereby we would follow the example of South Africa and bring our wines into one place, blend them and so put a standard wine on the English market. I agree that could be done and possibly it is desirable that it should be done if we want to export to England, but it represents no answer to our immediate problem because it will take years to implement. Today, there is a surplus of totally different wines scattered all over Australia. That could not be put into one vat, stirred and produced as an Australian blend. There are complications which enter into wine-making known as the acid P.H. of the wine. There are varying sugar contents and varying degrees of fortification in wines. All wines at present held would be excluded from the Minister's proposal. If we follow the example of Africa and produce a standard wine, the wine must be taken from wherever it is made, before it

has adopted its own character, to a central organization where it would be assessed by experts and classified into either first, second or third grade sherry. No-one would make an individual wine for this scheme. The fermented product would be sent to the organization as quickly as possible. Is it possible to do that in Australia within the next five years? I suggest not. However desirable, it is not an answer to the immediate problem. There is only one remedy that could be achieved effectively if we had the internal economy to do it and that would be to provide more avenues of trade for the sale of wine in this country. Until we can do that we will have this problem. I am not prepared to suggest that England should take up our burden. God knows she has enough burdens of her own. Why should she be expected to do it? Why should we fulminate against England because she puts a duty of £2 a gallon on our wine when our own Federal Treasurer is the genesis of the smashing of the wine trade to its present condition? I say without fear of contradiction that Sir Arthur Fadden was the prime destroyer of the wine industry.

A ton of crushed grapes will produce 150gall. of juice—that is distillation wine or, in other words, a dry wine prepared for distillation. That, primarily, would come from, say, doradillos. When converted to brandy that produces 30 liquid gallons and represents a considerable saving in storage. In other words, 120gall. of that liquid goes down the drain and 30 liquid gallons of spirit remain. That illustrates what economy of space can be achieved through converting dry distillation wine into brandy. A great many tons of grapes can be stored in a small space as a result.

This is the story of brandy as per Sir Arthur Fadden: the grape industry should peg him down to an anthill. In 1950-51 the duty per proof gallon of brandy was 53s. 6d. That returned £1,432,000 in revenue for 535,000 proof gall. of brandy sold. Members will properly appreciate these astronomical figures when they read them in *Hansard*. In 1951-52 the duty remained at 53s. 6d. for part of the year and then in one fell swoop was increased to 84s. 6d. Notwithstanding that increase the revenue was only slightly greater and sales fell from 535,000gall. to 426,000gall. It still remained at 84s. 6d. in 1952-53 when the revenue collected was £1,228,000 and the brandy sales fell to 290,000gall. There was no extra revenue but the brandy trade of Australia was destroyed. We talk about sending our wine to England and asking for the duty to be removed, but

let us first put our house in order. If we deal with the matter internally we need not worry about any one else. In 11 months in 1954, at the lower duty of 63s. 6d., brandy sales amounted to 343,000gall. The duty early in 1942 was 26s. a gall. On September 3, 1942, it was increased to 53s., on September 27, 1951, to 84s. 6d., and on September 10, 1953, it was reduced to 63s. 6d. The best thing to do in the interests of the trade is to put the duty back to 26s., so that brandy can be sold at 15s. or 12s a bottle instead of being sold as a locally produced article at 19s. a bottle, with much of the 19s. being duty. When we remember that there are only 30 liquid gall. of brandy obtained from 150gall. of grapes, and that wine sales have been fallen off, we see that there must be a heavy tonnage of grapes for storage.

As much as 33,400,000gall. of wine were produced in Australia in 1952-53, of which 22,000,000gall. were produced in South Australia. Of the latter about 50 per cent went in distillation for fortifying the spirit and brandy-making, which left 13,000,000gall. for storage in bond. The consumption in 1953 was 9,371,000gall. It is possible for South Australia to solve the problem. The consumption of wine in Australia represents a fraction of an ounce per day per head of population. A quantity of 3,000,000gall. represents 18,000,000 bottles, and this number of bottles distributed amongst 1,000,000 people works out at a bottle every three weeks.

We must first destroy the stranglehold on the industry by the brewing interests, as obtains in New South Wales. Victoria is facing up to it in some degree, and I hope we do so in South Australia, but until I can get a lead I have not much chance of doing anything. Men on the Loxton area are growing wine grapes which are placed in a mass production silo called the Loxton winery. I do not like the look of it. It looks too much like mass production and the selling to proprietary firms in large quantities. When there is a recession these firms will say "We do not want anything from you. We have plenty of our own." I may be wrong, but I do not think so. The winery looks like a wheat silo where the product can be stored hoping that later it can be sent to people for distribution, but how is it to be distributed? Is it to be through the existing licensed trade, which is completely inadequate? I know from the experience of managing a winery that thousands of people are prepared, provided that they do not have to go into the main bar or

bottle department of a hotel to get it, to have wine in their homes. They are temperate people and ask other people to get the wine for them. I have a great appreciation of their view.

I would like to see a bottle of wine sold as readily as a pound of tea. Are we such a morally decrepit nation that we cannot be given any responsibility? Must we be burdened with restrictions of every conceivable kind for our own moral good? I do not want anyone to look after my morals. I shall do it myself and if I make mistakes I shall take the responsibility. We are hamstrung in this country by carping legislators in petticoats, or who ought to be in them, and today it is impossible to assist an industry we have given to returned soldiers as a reward for their services. This is a very important matter because so many people are engaged in the industry. There are 60,000 acres of land involved and millions of pounds invested. There are many growers in co-operative concerns. Growers and workers and their families are dependent on the industry. I do not think there is any other form of primary production where so many people are concerned with small areas.

Right down through the ages the vine has been held as the symbol of fertility and fruitfulness. It bears bountifully, and used wisely and well can be a blessing to humanity. It is like a lot of other things—if abused it can be less than a blessing. It is possible for a person to swill himself to death with tea, but I shall not go further into that matter. If we had less tannin in our food in the form of tea and drank light dry wines there would not be so many dyspeptics in this country. It would be helpful if we could get people out of bad habits. It makes one cringe to see a person taking his soup whilst drinking beer. That person finds before middle age that he is a gastronomic misfit. The industry could undertake the necessary task if permitted to disseminate information in the right quarters. It could educate the people in the uses and abuses of all forms of alcoholic drink. That would be a wise thing to do because it is impossible to prohibit it. It would be unjust to prohibit it entirely and it would be absolutely foolish to attempt it. Wine has been associated with the human race for so long that such interference with liberties would not be tolerated. Let us educate the people to the wise use of one of the finest beverages on earth, and then we will have no

difficulty, and will get away from the position where 10 per cent of the population browbeat and attempt to make fearful members of Parliament and others who are not game enough to face up to this problem.

Nothing put forward in the scheme propounded by the Minister of Agriculture is a solution of the immediate problem, although it is highly desirable that his proposal should be given effect to. If all sections of the industry did not co-operate, I should not agree to one section being called upon to export its surplus of production and leave the Australian market to those who did not enter into the arrangement. That is one of the difficulties the Minister would be up against in working out his scheme. There is only one answer and that is through the avenues of trade. What is wanted in South Australia is the licensing of grocers to enable them to deliver wine with groceries. The Licensing Board would look after the position. I have visited a shop in a small New South Wales town where there was a milk bar, one could purchase all kinds of groceries and also obtain a bottle of the various wines manufactured in that State. There was no evidence of abuse of the position. When I investigated the problem the civic authorities said that one would not know wine was available there.

The trouble with the average Australian is that he lacks education of the proper use of wine, a type of culture which has been inherent among Continental people for hundreds of years. People should learn to drink wine without making pigs of themselves. Perhaps we can blame the winemakers for not providing that necessary education. At parties attended by young people one often hears them say they do not want any of the hard stuff, such as whiskey or gin, but ask for a dry sherry. I always do my best to tell them that possibly sherry is the hardest drink they could have if drunk to excess, and they are always very grateful for that advice. At one time cheap wines were manufactured in various places in the hills districts and sold in disreputable wine saloons in the city and elsewhere, but many of the people who criticize our wines are not prepared to sample the products of a good winery. If they did they would not then say there was no culture in a bottle of wine.

Mr. HUTCHENS—You are not saying that cheap wine is not manufactured now?

Mr. QUIRKE—I am. That is a cheap statement from the honourable member, who

does not know what he is talking about, because a cheap wine is not necessarily a bad wine. It can be the very best of wine. One could have a wine that is 32 per cent proof and it could be 20 years old, and one could have another bottle of wine only 18 months old with the same spirit strength, and if you drank the two at different times one would not may you any more drunk than the other. It is a question of the alcoholic strength of the wine and the quantity consumed which knocks you over. One could have a bottle of claret which was sold for 1s. and it might be said, "It is nasty, cheap wine." It could be really good wine. This suggestion of cheap wine does not relate to the best of our wines in Australia. They are not cheap enough, particularly when bought in hotel lounges.

Mr. Hutchens—What about inferior wines which are sold as plonk?

Mr. QUIRKE—I should like the honourable member to name one commercial wine in South Australia that is an inferior wine. If he can name one I will give a garden party. As far as I know there is no such thing as "plonk" marketed in South Australia, and I challenge the honourable member to produce a bottle of it from anywhere on the wharves, Hindmarsh or Hindley Street which is labelled and comes direct from the maker. We have a great industry and should be proud of its products and proud to drink them. I deplore the derogatory reference to wine as being plonk. Nothing of that kind is produced by reputable winemakers in South Australia and I do not know of a disreputable winemaker here.

Mr. Dunks—Is any vinegar made from good wine?

Mr. QUIRKE—Yes. Seppelts make enormous quantities of vinegar from the best dry wine. No wine is too good for making that class of vinegar.

Mr. Dunks—Is not some wine sold very young?

Mr. QUIRKE—That is not detrimental to it. If you sell a young wine and it is, say, 20 per cent of spirit by volume it will not make one more drunk because it is young. This depends on the spirit in it. It may taste a little more fiery because of the lack of maturation of the spirit. It is the alcoholic content which knocks one over. A finer wine has finer quality because of its maturation and it is not because it is young that it detrimentally affects people. Unscrupulous people have sold wine to those who want to

drink it as they would drink beer. I do not want to see wine drunk by the glass in hotel bars under the shouting system. That is not the right way to drink it and is most undesirable. Let us take the control of the industry out of the hands of the great breweries of New South Wales and see what the industry can do for itself. That is all we want, and then we would not ask the Governments of Australia for a penny.

Mr. Macgillivray—It applies not only in New South Wales, but also in South Australia.

Mr. QUIRKE—But the major example is in New South Wales, where there is a stranglehold on the licensed houses, which cease to be an avenue for the sale of wine. As 80 per cent of Australian wine is made in South Australia we cannot expect the other States to do what we are not prepared to do ourselves, and we should not expect England to do it for us. I do not write down the proposal put forward by the Minister of Agriculture. It could be implemented, but it would be impossible to do so under five years. If anyone wants to know the technical difficulties associated with the industry, just ask a wine chemist and he will describe in five minutes more difficulties than one ever dreamt existed. There is only one way to meet the position and that is to blend new wine before it has adopted its own character, because you cannot make a standard wine out of thousands of gallons of mixed wine. This question of marketing wines is our responsibility. Let this House accept its responsibility and if it does so the wine industry will not ask the Government for any help for advertising or anything else. Let us do that and our difficulties will be solved.

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

Mr. GOLDNEY (Gouger)—I endorse the sentiments expressed by other members with regard to the visit early this year, of Her Majesty the Queen and His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh. That visit enabled many people, who would not otherwise have been able to do so, to see the Queen. I was particularly impressed by the gracious way in which Her Majesty opened a session of this Parliament, and my only regret was that only a few people were privileged to see and hear her on that occasion. I understand that the Queen created the same impression when she opened sessions of the Federal and other State Parliaments. It was the first time that a reigning monarch has visited Australia, and her visit was a great inspiration not only to Australians, but to all the peoples in the dominions she

visited. I congratulate the new Ministers of Education, Roads and Agriculture on their appointments. They are doing an excellent job and I trust that the State will benefit from their services for years to come. The Cabinet and the people generally owe a debt of gratitude to the former Minister of Agriculture, Sir George Jenkins, a man of outstanding ability and a man of the people. The work he has done over the past 10 years as Minister of Agriculture has been of a high standard, and I feel that his successor, the Hon. Arthur Christian, will continue that good work.

At present there is a surplus of wheat in Australia and in the other great wheat producing countries, and in recent months certain people—some of them holding high positions—have said that we should adopt an acreage restriction; but that would be a step in the wrong direction by Australians, because, with our incidence of rainfall, particularly in South Australia, one dry season could make a big difference in our total wheat production. Rather than advocate the restriction of acreages, the authorities should encourage farmers to turn their attention to stock raising.

During the past few days a conference of weed eradication experts has been held at Roseworthy Agricultural College, and the findings of that conference will be received with interest, because weed eradication must be tackled seriously. This season has been particularly favourable to the growth of the soursob on the Adelaide plains, and I understand that this weed has been mentioned at the conference and that our experts are tackling it in real earnest. Despite efforts to kill this weed, it seems to be getting a stronger hold and spreading over more country, and, although some farmers regard it as good feed for sheep and lambs, I believe that its advantages are far outweighed by its disadvantages. As feed, it grows early in the season and dries out later, leaving nothing in place of useful fodder. It is difficult to deal with because it grows from bulbs that are dragged over paddocks by farm implements, particularly in damp weather. A few bulbs scattered in this way will soon grow into a big patch of soursobs. The findings of the Roseworthy conference should be a great help to primary producers in South Australia, and indeed throughout Australia, and I trust that the soursob problem will be successfully tackled so that this weed may be kept in check in the future.

During the past few years the Government has undertaken some major water storage and

reticulation schemes including the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline, South Para Reservoir and Aroona Dam at Leigh Creek. The reticulation of water throughout the country will be of immense benefit to landholders, particularly those carrying large numbers of stock, and this State should strive to conserve water wherever possible. Although the rivers in our northern parts do not run throughout the year, they are sometimes flooded, and the water conservation experts in the Engineering & Water Supply Department should use every possible means in an effort to discover means whereby this water may be stored for, although the amount of water stored in existing reservoirs may be in excess of requirements at certain times, sometimes it is in short supply. During the last 20 or 30 years reservoirs—particularly those supplying the city—have occasionally proved inadequate and restrictions have had to be imposed on the distribution of water. In districts supplied by the Barossa Reservoir and other reservoirs in our near northern areas, however, the Whyalla pipeline has been tapped so as to supply those reservoirs in times of drought.

In seasons of heavy rainfall the Gawler River has caused serious flooding, and the increase of more intense culture along the river banks makes the position more disturbing, for today there are many vegetable gardens, glass houses and orchards in the area. In 1952 the landowners there suffered from a severe flood. Further north, the River Light overflowed on to the railway and landholders' property. The conservation of water from these streams in times of heavy rainfall would minimize the damage by flooding. Along the Gawler River landholders have thrown up banks, which may be seen from the main roads, but, if a further flood occurs, these banks could be the means of diverting the water on to other properties and causing considerable damage. This threat of flooding, however, will be greatly relieved by the completion of the South Para Reservoir, which will take much of the water now flowing in these rivers. Although the Electricity Trust has done a very fine job in extending supplies to the country, there are still many districts within 50 miles of Adelaide not connected with the trust's mains. Some years ago the Government decided to subsidise certain schemes to enable the trust to extend its operations to small townships, yet because of the scattered nature of the population in many of these, it is still not profitable even with the help of subsidies to supply electricity

to them. These people desire to be connected with the trust's main, and should receive consideration as far as economically possible, because this would be of benefit not only to householders, but also to primary producers, providing cheaper power for milking machines and shearing plants.

I now turn to the contentious subject of roads and railways. We can expect an improvement in the condition of roads because of the extra funds available, both from the Commonwealth, by way of distribution of petrol tax, and from additional registration fees. In the past many roads have deteriorated because they have not been sealed, which is the only effective method of keeping them in order. It would have been better to do this than to carry out such a large programme of unsealed roads. The railways still play an important part in the economy of this State, and indeed of the whole of Australia, and will continue to do so for many years. Although a great deal of criticism has been levelled at them, for long distance haulage they provide the most economical means of transport. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. JENNINGS (Prospect)—I have much pleasure in supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, and like most other members who have spoken, express my delight at the success of the recent Royal Tour of South Australia. I join with other members in congratulating those who obviously went to great pains to ensure that this great occasion was one we will never forget, and in mentioning them we should not forget the staff of Parliament House all of whom, from top to bottom, did an outstandingly good job.

The next most important matter that has occurred since we last had the opportunity of addressing ourselves to the House is the appointment of two Ministers and a change in the Ministry. Firstly, I congratulate the new Minister of Education. I am very glad to see this portfolio in this House, because this is where it belongs. I am also pleased to see the honourable member for Glenelg occupying this most important position, for if I had had the task of choosing someone from members opposite to fill it, he would have been my choice. I do not suggest that my preference influenced the appointment, because I realize that had it been known it might have militated against his chances. I admire his ability and honesty and realize he has a tremendously important job. It is pleasing to notice that when he answers questions in this House he does

so without delivering a spate of propaganda that has nothing whatever to do with the matter, and I assure him that my appreciation is not lessened by the novelty of this. I believe that the new Minister is more genuinely liberal than most of his colleagues in the so-called Liberal Party and I look forward to his putting the department in good shape so that it can be taken over in good order by a Labor Minister after the next election. There are indications already that slowly but surely he is breaking through the departmental iron curtain that confronted him when he assumed office, and I believe that he has seen letters I have written to him recently. It is not long ago that I had very grave doubts about whether the Minister ever saw letters addressed to him and I hope that the next step will be for him to sign correspondence to members of Parliament at least, as the Minister of Works has always done, because then we can be assured that he has seen it and is properly acquainted with it. If members cannot be certain of that it is obvious that many of them, including myself, will prefer to raise questions in this House that could easily be dealt with by correspondence.

The new Minister has many problems confronting him, not the least of which is the chronic shortage of teachers. The honourable members for Norwood and Gawler have dealt with this subject very exhaustively and effectively. The principal reasons they gave were insufficient allowances for trainee teachers and insufficient pay after they had qualified. These matters should be obvious to the Minister, and I hope he will continue to take the matter to Cabinet to get a bigger grant. The member for Gawler spoke briefly on another reason for the shortage, that is, the working facilities offered to school teachers. I visit all schools in my area regularly and I have never seen one in which the headmaster, a man to whose importance we pay such a lot of lip service, has anything else but a barren, desolate office that a fifth rate clerk in any business would scorn. The same applies to lunch rooms and other facilities given to teachers; usually they are such that teenage girls in a factory would not tolerate them. School teachers are very important people and we should treat them as such. If the present niggardly attitude towards them continues it is certain to have disastrous consequences to the education of our children, which after all must be one the most important functions of a State Government. It is

our job to see that the Minister gets every encouragement to advance the welfare of education in this State.

We all know that around schools there is a tremendous number of jobs to be done, and the Minister of Education should have attached to his department a maintenance staff. At present, after the Minister or the appropriate officer gives approval for work to be performed and for the money to be expended, the matter is handed over to the Architect-in-Chief's Department and lost in the labyrinth of other departmental work awaiting attention. It is ludicrous for a Minister to approve work to be done at schools and then not have the machinery within his own department to complete it.

Mr. Shannon—Would you apply that to all departments?

Mr. JENNINGS—I am not sure whether it could be, but the Education Department is an example of its own in this regard: Some time ago I wrote to the Minister of Education making representations for a new fence that was urgently required around the high school at Enfield. The Minister, realizing the urgency of this work, approved of it and then passed it on to the Architect-in-Chief's Department. A couple of months ago I got in touch with that department asking when this work would be done, and was told it would be commenced in a fortnight. I visited the school this morning, but there is no sign of the fence being started. Surely the erection of a fence around a high school is a matter for the Education Department, not one to be tossed around from one department to another.

The Hon. A. W. Christian—What about having a working bee?

Mr. JENNINGS—That interjection, though on the surface it may appear irresponsible, perhaps portrays what the Government really thinks about education.

The Hon. A. W. Christian—That is how we overcome these difficulties in the country.

Mr. JENNINGS—The Minister of Education is in a humiliating position when he has to depend on a department over which he has no authority to undertake work that he has already promised. I hope he will not be content to remain in that position but will insist on having at least a maintenance staff permanently attached to his department. There was much prognostication, speculation and uncertainty about who would be appointed Minister of Roads, Local Government and Railways. I do not think it would be unfair to say that when

the new Minister was named the prophets were confused and confounded. I do not wish to be unkind, but one of my friends said to me, "This is surely the strangest appointment since the famous Roman Emperor appointed his horse a Consul." Others, after their astonishment had abated, said "The Premier didn't have much choice anyway". However, I commend the new Minister for the way he is throwing himself into his work. He is showing a determination to get around and see things for himself. I wish the new Minister of Agriculture well and I hope that he, together with the other Ministers, will keep his department in tip-top order so that when Labor Ministers take over after the next elections they will find everything in order.

I have frequently asked the Government to relieve the burden on tenants of prefabricated homes who are now paying, in some instances, £3 5s. a week rent. I have not got far yet, but some time ago I asked the Premier whether he would ascertain whether it was possible to increase the amortization period on these homes so as to permit a reduction in rent. He promised me he would, and I have his reply that the period is already 53 years. Apparently I was expected to infer that this was the maximum that could be allowed and that therefore the rent could not be reduced. By a simple mathematical calculation we find that 53 years at £3 5s. a week is £8,957, which is staggering. That means that a tenant, or a succession of tenants, of a timber-framed prefabricated house pays just under £9,000 for it.

Mr. Corcoran—That is not right, is it?

Mr. JENNINGS—It is not right, but it is correct. We know that in addition to the original cost there are interest and maintenance charges, but if that means that the Government must recoup almost £9,000 members will need no convincing that these homes were a bad buy in the first place and that the Government should not expect one group of tenants to bear the burden for its mistakes. It should accept the responsibility and subsidize the rents of these homes so that the people who were forced into them—and they were virtually forced into them because they had nowhere else to go—will not be penalized in perpetuity.

Mr. Shannon—Did you work out how much interest is involved in that £9,000?

Mr. JENNINGS—I do not know the rate of interest, but £9,000 is a staggering sum. Most speakers have referred to many items in

the Governor's Speech, but the speech did not follow tradition by being mostly an outline of the Government's legislative programme. Two-thirds was taken up by very thinly veiled propaganda for the Government. It is a dangerous principle when a representative of the Sovereign is forced to engage in Party propaganda. Further, it is an insult to the representative himself to be put in that position. We know that the Government writes the speech, so it must take the blame. The mover of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply greatly disappointed me. I was hoping for better things from the member for Mitcham, for he is one of the most capable speakers on the Government side. He usually argues his case in a constructive, forthright and convincing fashion, despite the fact that his views are fairly antiquated, to put it mildly. However, on this occasion he was extremely disappointing because he adopted an ultra-virtuous attitude. He probably now sees himself in the role of an elder statesman. He was virtually saying that "Politics are beneath me now, so I will philosophize for the benefit of members," but unfortunately it put him in the position where he had to spend most of his time talking about things he knew nothing of, and in some cases he admitted he knew nothing about them.

Mr. Dunks—Which one?

Mr. JENNINGS—All of them. He criticized the 40-hour week. That was his only provocative statement, and apparently he could not resist the temptation because he is so used to grousing about it. However, the honourable member is wasting his valuable energy in complaining about the 40-hour week because, whether he likes it or not, it is here to stay until it is replaced by a shorter working week. If he wants to serve his own cause effectively he should get in early in opposition to the introduction of a 36-hour week. I stress that I am a firm believer in the 40-hour week for the present, and I hope at some future time to be in the vanguard of those advocating a shorter working week. Production has increased since the introduction of the 40-hour week, which has brought greater happiness to workers because they can now spend more time with their families and have more time in which to pursue knowledge and culture.

Mr. O'Halloran—The Premier testified to that statement when he spoke last week.

Mr. JENNINGS—Yes. Apparently the member for Mitcham has committed the unpardonable offence, for a Liberal member, of going

against his leader. When the time is opportune I think that even members opposite will support a shorter working week, for it is only right that the worker should get the benefit of more efficient production and greater technical skill and capacity. After all, who is responsible for increased production? Isn't it always the worker? Has any member ever known of a shareholder, as such, increasing managerial efficiency? Of course not. The worker should receive the benefit of a greater leisure time which arises as a result of more efficient means of production.

Mr. Dunks—How has the worker increased managerial efficiency?

Mr. JENNINGS—Is the manager not a worker? Unfortunately, some are not, but strangely enough they are the persons most violent in their objections to the 40-hour week. I have noticed that those who are loudest in their condemnation are those who work considerably shorter hours. That probably is responsible for their opposition to it. The golf-playing and whisky-sipping executives who work about 25 hours a week, and spend half of that time arguing with their office confreres about the 40-hour week, are most violent in their opposition to it.

Mr. Heaslip—How many hours a week do you work?

Mr. JENNINGS—I work considerably more than 40 hours as the honourable member well knows but I do not begrudge other people enjoying a favour I do not receive. The Premier, at the commencement of his speech, displayed what can only be described as colossal effrontery by asking members to curtail the debate on this important motion. He has repeatedly, consistently and stubbornly refused to have another session of Parliament a year, but now, after keeping Parliament silent for seven months, he endeavours to circumscribe this debate. We know that the Premier does not like Parliament and is much happier when it is in recess. We also know that he does not like grievances to be aired nor public matters to be thrashed out in Parliament. Like all leaders of dictatorial inclination he would rather keep Parliament silent and run the State by executive action. On this occasion he clearly showed his contempt for Parliament by saying, in effect, "Well, boys, we have a lot of work to do so cut this debate short."

Mr. Dunks—He could easily have done so by using the gag.

Mr. O'Halloran—Are you suggesting he should?

Mr. Dunks—He never has and never would, but the honourable member is suggesting he has practically done that.

Mr. JENNINGS—There is a much more effective method of gagging business and that is by means of exhausting members. It cannot be disputed that Parliament did not meet for seven months except for a couple of days and now that we are confronted with a heavy programme requiring night sittings we are requested to shorten debate on the only opportunity we have of fully discussing general matters. The Premier, realizing that his statements would be well reported by the press, referred to the £2,000,000 surplus from last year's Budget. We all know that that was nothing more than bravado. The Premier did not intend that surplus—it was an accident occasioned by bad budgeting and, although he had two bites at the cherry and introduced Supplementary Estimates in the last months of the financial year for the express purpose of balancing the Budget, he still could not get within £1,800,000 of doing so. Is it to the Government's credit to have a surplus of almost £2,000,000 when our hospitals are in a deplorable condition, highways require repair, the Tramways Trust is in a shocking mess and schools are inadequate? That surplus could have been spent profitably in my district and in all other electorates. We should be ashamed that there was a surplus when so many matters required urgent attention. The Premier did not say, although it is correct, that the surplus will be taken into consideration by the Grants Commission to the financial disadvantage of this State.

Mr. Brookman—Do you suggest the Premier should have spent that surplus on the Tramways Trust?

Mr. JENNINGS—I think members will agree that too much has already been poured down the drain on the trust and I would not favour spending another penny on that organization until it was made responsible to this Parliament so that it would know what is being done with the money devoted to the trust. The Premier told us how well off we were and underlying his remarks was the inference that we were well off for one reason only—because the Hon. Thomas Playford was Premier of South Australia. He produced figures which he derived from some source but which varied when another member went to the same source. The Premier made much play of these figures. He said that the average male wage in South Aus-

tralia was £16 a week but that figure has no bearing on the Leader of the Opposition's statement, which I support, that the degree of economic stability we have reached has been reached primarily through the efforts of the working people of the community. Does the average wage of a male wage earner mean the wage of the average male? Of course not! It means nothing like that. Even if the Premier's figures were correct, they have no bearing on the situation because included in that figure are the salaries of company directors, managers of banking concerns, big business executives, Cabinet Ministers, the Premier, members of Parliament and other people who are receiving far in excess of what the average worker is receiving. The average wage of the State and the wage of the average person of the State are entirely different.

It is also interesting to note that the Premier frequently mentions Savings Bank balances. Obviously, the average Savings Bank balance does not necessarily have any bearing whatsoever on what the Savings Bank balance of the average person is. The Premier went to great pains to confuse us with these figures. He also referred to the number of motor cars at present owned and compared that figure with those owned in 1938. Obviously, in any community which has progressed, there will be more motor cars. There are many people who possess motor cars who cannot afford them but they are prepared to mortgage themselves rather than to ride on the obsolete and inefficient tram services.

I was sorry that the Premier descended so liberally to that effective but unethical debating trick, the half truth. Throughout his speech he provided comparisons between 1938 and 1954 and always to the advantage of himself and his Government. However, he did not at any stage mention the tremendous increase in our population which necessarily has a bearing on those figures. When he mentioned money figures he did not once refer to the changed value of money in the period under review. If the Premier had included these fundamental considerations in his comparisons they would have been of greater value but they would not have been nearly so favourable to the Government. The point, of course, is that when the Government wants to, it always refers to the very fundamentals I have mentioned. For example, when we refer to the inadequate hospital and school accommodation we are told, "But consider the difficulties we are confronted with because of the increase in population and

the increase in costs?" The Government wants it both ways when obviously it cannot have it both ways.

I was particularly interested to hear the Premier say that the people of South Australia were well off because of the Government they had. It should be perfectly clear to all members, and to any person who takes notice of election trends, that the people do not consider themselves well off under this Government. They, after all, should be the judges. They made it obvious at the last election that they did not want this Government and they sacked it, but, of course, the Government had the benefit of violently unjust gerrymandered electoral boundaries which insulated it from the wrath of the people. I was amazed at the Premier's attitude in this regard. It was an attitude similar to that adopted by a Mussolini, Hitler or Stalin: "I know what is best for you; you can like it or lump it." It is for the people to decide what is best for them and not for some Parliamentary dictator to say, "I know what is best for you and you are better off under the system I advocate and and devise, so you will have to put up with it whether you like it or not." I do not need to refer fully to the remarks of Mr. Travers, mainly because most of them were only a repetition of what he said last year. I was interested, however, in his claim that in these days there is not sufficient inducement to acquire skill. I thought for a moment that the trade union movement had a convert in support of its case for margins for skill, but it became clear later in his remarks that the only skill he acknowledged was that possessed by lawyers. Irrespective of Party affiliations, we all agree that the honourable member was not disinterested in the matter, and as a result his statement did not bear any importance. However, he did a service in exposing conditions at the Adelaide gaol. He did it 12 months ago, but he has been singularly inactive in demanding that remedial action be taken. He is an optimist if he believes that by raising it in every Address in Reply debate, and forgetting it for the rest of the year, he will get what he wants, particularly as it is obvious that the honourable member has only one more Address in Reply debate to participate in anyhow. In rather a violent and ill-balanced attack he referred to fear and cupidity arising from the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. I was astonished to hear him later advocate a much more healthy and wholesome return for lawyers, who, in my opinion, are not doing too badly for themselves.

In conclusion I refer to what I regard as the most important matter in the Governor's Speech, although it was mentioned only briefly as an electoral matter. It is clear from the statement made recently by the Premier that he contemplates some re-arrangement of electoral boundaries. The unsophisticated, innocent and babes-in-the-wood might claim that this is the result of belated stirrings of a long dormant conscience, but I do not believe it is. I think his conscience has been so long out of use that it has become atrophied. I do not expect any improvement in the electoral set-up. I warn the Premier that if the re-arrangement of electoral boundaries is intended to close up gaps which have appeared in the present gerrymander as the result of changes in time and population, or to perpetuate the gerrymander in order to save himself, there will be bitterness unprecedented in this Parliament, and there will be a public contempt of him and his Party unparalleled in the history of South Australia. I support the motion.

MR. HEASLIP (Rocky River)—I support the motion and join with previous speakers in their remarks about the recent visit to South Australia of Her Majesty the Queen and the Duke of Edinburgh. The visit did something that could not have been accomplished otherwise. If there were any doubts as to the loyalty to the throne of South Australians the seeing and hearing of the Royal personage must have removed those doubts. The bond of loyalty that South Australians have always held so dear was further strengthened. Legislation passed last session enabling an enlargement of the State Cabinet has already been fully justified. The expanding population of the State requires greater administration. The increased spending of money by various departments requires much closer control and only by personal supervision can the taxpayers who provide the money get the best from the expenditure. In the new Minister of Education, the Hon. Baden Pattinson, we have a man who can get results. I am pleased that he is in this House. In the person of the Hon. N. L. Jude, the new Minister of Railways and Highways, we have an energetic man who has already travelled over much of the State and thus obtained a far better grip of the situation than would have otherwise been the case. I congratulate the two members on having been raised to Cabinet rank. I am sure the departments they have taken over will give better service through having their personal attention. Sir George Jenkins, the previous

Minister of Agriculture, has retired. For years he has been associated with rural industry and he knows primary production from beginning to end. He built up the Department of Agriculture to such a standard that the other States come to it for advice. We should be proud of our Department of Agriculture. I congratulate Sir George on his achievements and I trust he will remain in this House for many years as a supporter of the Government. The choice of the Hon. A. W. Christian as his successor was a wise one. He has lived in the country and has been associated with all the problems of primary production. We could not have a better man to administer the department, and I congratulate him on his appointment to Cabinet rank. I am sure the standard set by his predecessor will be maintained.

The early reference to primary production in His Excellency's speech indicates its importance. It was pointed out that wheat production reached 29,000,000 bushels last year, at an average of 18 bushels an acre, from just over 1,500,000 acres. The barley yield was 28 million bushels and the average was 28 bushels to the acre from about 1,000,000 acres. Our sheep population more than 12 months ago reached 12,000,000. It is reasonable to assume that in the meantime it has reached 12,500,000. Only on four occasions previous to 1951 did South Australia ever carry more than 10,000,000 sheep. We have easily reached the greatest sheep population in the State, and always when we reach such a position there is a danger of something happening. Beef cattle increased by 15 per cent to 29,000 head. The number of dairy cattle has increased, and we have had heavy fruit, wine grape and potato crops. These high returns cannot continue indefinitely. Our average wheat yield from 1941-1952 was 12.80 bushels an acre: last year it was 18 bushels an acre. It is reasonable to assume that after having passed through a period never experienced previously in the history of the State, when the rainfall enabled us to increase production, this state of affairs must soon come to an end. We can expect a return below average. The wheat yield could easily be five bushels below average next year, and that would give a yield of only 12,000,000 bushels. There could be a reduction in the barley yield to about 13,000,000 bushels. Over night the yield of all primary products could be reduced. We are not short of food in Australia, but there is a danger of our having reduced exports, instead of large exports of primary products which give economic life to the State, and

if that happens we can look for trouble. I deplore the statement of the Chairman of the Australian Wheat Board (Sir John Teasdale) and hope he spoke as a private citizen and not as chairman of the board, because he had no authority to make a statement relating to the reduction of wheat areas. The same applies to Mr. Renshaw (president of the New South Wales Wheatgrowers' Association). I cannot see any sense in reducing production, because to be economically sound we must produce. Wheat, wool and meat are at least three of our industries that can compete with the rest of the world, and the more we produce of those commodities the more overseas credit we create. To cut down on that production would result in financial suicide. While we keep down the cost of production to a safe level we need not worry about over-production. At present there is a world over-supply of wheat, but still we can undersell any other country. It behoves us to keep down costs so that we can export.

Mr. Riches—Would you say there is not under-consumption in many countries?

Mr. HEASLIP—I do not know about that, but it is foolish to give grants to uneconomic industries to bolster production.

Mr. Riches—It means that hungry people can get supplies.

Mr. HEASLIP—If those countries cannot afford it, we should not ask growers to supply wheat as a gift, unless taxpayers are prepared to agree. For the past five years the wheat industry has been subsidizing Australian consumers, even to the extent of 50 per cent, but they should not receive less than the cost of production. It is reasonable that they should have a margin of profit. Primary industries are in a far better position than secondary industries in this regard. We could reach the stage in South Australia where our secondary industries are over-balanced compared with our primary industries. We are and always will be dependent on our primary industries. Secondary industries can produce whatever they like, but unless money is made available by primary industries for their purchase, those goods cannot be sold. What is the use of manufacturing machines which cannot be purchased? We cannot get rid of them overseas, and they must be used in Australia. I draw attention to the following remark by Mr. Hutheens:—

No man can be expected to take up land unless he is assured of economic security and production that will provide a reasonable profit.

As one who has lived all his life on the land, one cannot expect economic security from the land. One has to take the risk of the seasons. Prices can be fixed, but seasons cannot be controlled. The only way to continue on the land is to be prepared for those things and put aside funds to meet them, and in addition, work more than 40 hours a week. I congratulate the Government on helping to bring about wheat stabilization. The Premier and the Minister of Agriculture returned from a conference recently with the assurance that wheatgrowers would be given the opportunity by a ballot to decide whether they want stabilization for the next five years. I have no doubt they will vote overwhelmingly for stabilization and thereby create a little stability for this industry.

I was pleased to see a statement in the press this morning that the Public Works Committee might submit recommendations to the Government this year on proposals for bulk handling at Wallaroo and Port Lincoln. That is good news for the great majority of South Australian wheatgrowers. I asked a question on this matter in the House a few days ago, and from the reply I gathered that after a period of seven years we are to get a report on bulk handling. Wallaroo and Port Lincoln have been named as possible terminals, but there is a wharf at Port Pirie where it would be comparatively easy to install bulk handling facilities. I consider it one of the first places that should have a terminal. If that is not done growers who previously have sent their wheat to Port Pirie, which is the outlet for growers as far afield as Gladstone and Peterborough will be heavily penalized. The freight from Gladstone to Port Pirie is 19s. 6d. a ton on wheat and to Wallaroo 31s. If there is not a wheat terminal at Port Pirie it will mean that wheatgrowers in the area mentioned will pay 11s. 6d. a ton more to get their wheat to Wallaroo, equal to 3½d. a bushel. Any growers above Gladstone, because of the break of railway gauge, will have to pay handling charges in addition to the 11s. 6d. lost in sending the wheat to Wallaroo.

Mr. Riches—What will happen when the standard line goes through from Port Pirie to Broken Hill?

Mr. HEASLIP—There will be extra cost for transport on wheat unless there is a terminal. It is a far greater distance to Wallaroo than to Port Pirie, and, irrespective of the break of gauge, there will be extra charges. I hope the Public Works Committee will recognize that

these people will be penalized if Port Pirie does not get a terminal. I feel sure that the committee can evolve a scheme whereby they will get the same benefit as those in other parts of the State. Possibly the biggest ships will not be able to complete loading at Port Pirie because of the lack of sufficient depth of water, but they could be part-loaded there and then go to Wallaroo to be topped up.

Mr. Dunnage—Would not that involve an extra cost?

Mr. HEASLIP—There would be very little additional cost.

Mr. Dunnage—Do you want bulk handling at every port?

Mr. HEASLIP—No, at the main outports—wherever there is sufficient wheat to justify it. That is a problem for the Public Works Committee. Wheat which is close to the railways is being carted by road from as far afield as Kybunga to Ardrossan. What it is costing us in road damage and for cartage I do not know, but it must be tremendous, and the sooner this kind of thing is stopped the better for the State, the railways and the producers.

Mr. Dunnage—There must be a reason for it.

Mr. HEASLIP—Because there is no terminal except at Ardrossan, and wheat cannot be sold unless it is in bulk. I feel sure that South Australia will gain a huge benefit from the Government's policy of broadening the South-East railway system. The change of gauge has almost reach Millicent, and when it gets to Kingston that section of the work will be complete and there will be no break of gauge through to Adelaide. This will result in a big reduction in freight charges for the transport of produce to market. I have my doubts about the economic value of the duplication of the Goodwood-Marino railway line, which is taking a long time to complete. The solution to our railway problems may be the use of diesel electric locomotives, for metropolitan lines such as the Goodwood-Marino have not paid their way with steam locomotives. Increased fares on public transport services have only resulted in more of the public travelling by private motor car. Our train services must be improved, so that, like the Adelaide-Melbourne service, which is one of the best in Australia, they will pay. Each week primary producers are told to cut production costs, but it is no use telling them that if the Railways Department keeps raising its freight rates, for such increases must be borne by primary

producers. Prior to the last increase in railway freight rates in July, 1952, the primary producer paid freight on the weight of the wool carried, but the rate has been changed to so much a bale. From my property 150 miles away I pay £1 on each bale carried by rail to Adelaide, and, in addition, I must load the wool on to my lorry, cart it to the station, unload it from the lorry, and load it on to the train. Therefore, I take it direct to Port Adelaide by truck and collect £30 on each trip.

Mr. Riches—The primary producer, paying only 50 per cent motor registration rates, is able to cart his wool, yet the public carrier is kept off the road by the Transport Control Board.

Mr. HEASLIP—If a man works hard enough to produce goods, he should have the right to cart his produce to market.

Mr. Stephens—What would it cost you to get your wool to Adelaide if good roads had not been constructed by the Highways Department?

Mr. HEASLIP—Like all other taxpayers, the primary producer helps pay for the roads. In 1952-53 the Railways Department carried 291,817 bales of wool, and, in 1953-54, 246,765 bales—a decrease of 11.6 per cent. The South Australian clip did not decrease by that amount, and it is interesting to note one of the reasons for the decrease. An Adelaide woolbroker told me that in 1952-53 he received into store 137,971 bales, and, in 1953-54, 129,207 bales—a decrease of 8,764 or 6.3 per cent; therefore, the railways lost about 5 per cent of the total clip to road transport. In 1952-53, 104,693 bales (or 76 per cent) was received into store ex rail, and 33,278 bales (or 24 per cent) ex motor; whereas, in 1953-54, 90,626 (or 70 per cent) was received ex rail, and 38,581 bales (or 30 per cent) ex motor. Those figures show an increase over a year of 6 per cent in the quantity of wool carried by road, mainly because of the increase in rail freight rates. In days gone by one of the most profitable lines carried by the railways was wool, but today lorry after lorry comes down the Main North Road carrying wool to Port Adelaide.

Mr. Dunks—That is in owners' trucks?

Mr. HEASLIP—Yes, and nothing can be done about it. Registration fees have been increased whether the vehicles are used or not. The answer to the problem of the railways is not an increase in freights but the provision of a better service. It is common for us to have the experience of putting a machine on the railways at Mile End and in a for-

night's time to be still waiting for it at Gladstone. I have known farmers waiting for baling machines to ring the local railway station after about a week to learn that the authorities have not been able to find them, and eventually they have turned up in places as far away as Balaklava. If a better service is not provided the railways will not get customers. I can come to town in my lorry, buy machinery and be back at night, but if I wait for the railways to bring it I will wait for a week for its delivery. The sooner we introduce diesels and get a faster service the better off we will be. Their introduction will go a long way towards solving the problem, but even with them the railways will not attract business unless better service is provided.

I had the pleasure and privilege of visiting the opening of the Port Augusta power station which, in conjunction with Leigh Creek coalfield, is a great achievement, as it is providing electricity throughout the State at a profit. Last night and tonight we heard from the Opposition benches that the Government was not doing anything about decentralization, but if the industries established at Radium Hill, Port Augusta, Port Pirie, Whyalla and Leigh Creek do not constitute decentralization, I do not know what does. They are instances of decentralization at no cost to the taxpayer and are of real benefit to the State.

Mr. Riches—It is because Nature put the uranium at Radium Hill.

Mr. HEASLIP—Yes, Nature did everything in South Australia, but somebody has to do something with Nature before we get uranium ore. It is not that the Government is not doing enough to bring about decentralization, but the amenities in cities today are so great that people cannot be induced to stay in the country. In the city the 40-hour week and sick and holiday pay, combined with other amenities, are such that people cannot be expected to stay in the country unless they receive increased rewards. The 40-hour week is the biggest factor.

Mr. Riches—Have any people left the country because of it?

Mr. HEASLIP—Yes. As soon as Whyalla opened, some farmers living near me left their properties and went there, and we will never get them back again.

Mr. Riches—Were they landholders or employees?

Mr. HEASLIP—Some of them were landholders. We hear much about reaggregation of farms; in one of these instances a man had

tried to make a living from 500 acres and practically owned his farm, yet he went to Whyalla after selling his farm to a neighbour, because it would not support him.

Mr. Riches—Did the 40-hour week entice him to Whyalla?

Mr. HEASLIP—Until its introduction he made a fight of it but gave it up when 40 or 50 miles away such good conditions were offering. I hope that something will be done in connection with the repair of the Port Germein jetty.

Mr. Frank Walsh—Can't you get the Minister to give you a sympathetic hearing?

Mr. HEASLIP—I think I will. We have read that £240,000 was voted for foreshore damage, of which Port Germein was to receive £215. Of the total amount, at the end of June £12,000 could not be spent by the councils of seaside resorts, and I can assure the House that if Port Germein had been able to get a portion of it it would have been happy.

Mr. Hutchens—But you cannot get the labour?

Mr. HEASLIP—That is so, but if we had a 48-hour week the work could have been done. The electricity reticulation scheme provided by the powerhouse at Port Augusta, although it goes through my district, is of no benefit to country people because all the power will go to Osborne to serve the bulk of the population in the city. This will provide more amenities to attract people from the country. I do not object, because I know we must have secondary industries, but this powerhouse is not the great factor some people think it is in providing electricity for country districts. However, it is a wonderful achievement and will do much good for this State. For one thing, it has helped in the development of Leigh Creek. I admit that slowly we are getting electricity services in the country. Wirrabara Forest which has already waited five years, may obtain it in the next twelve months. That will be very welcome after waiting six years.

Mr. Stephens—How long would you have to wait for electricity if it had not been for the support the Labor Party gave the Government to get the Bill through the House?

Mr. HEASLIP—I know nothing about that, but in the Napperby and Nelshaby areas, which

are in my district, there are about 85 householders who are hoping to be supplied with electricity in the near future. These areas are only six miles or so from Port Pirie, and I believe many people from that city would live there if amenities were provided. Although I did not concur in much that Mr. Jennings said, I agreed with his remarks about the Architect-in-Chief's Department. The Minister of Education and his officers are doing a good job, but, as the honourable member pointed out, when maintenance jobs are approved it is often a long time before they are carried out. The Minister of Agriculture interjected that in his district working bees are organized to do jobs, but in our district, too, people volunteer to do the work. However, because a docket was stuck in the Architect-in-Chief's office we once had to wait two months, although the amount involved was only about £30. I think that the maximum amount that can be spent without being referred for approval has been altered, but I point out that the Architect-in-Chief's Department is sadly understaffed. In one instance the Education Department did not do a good job, for it built a school in the middle of a road. Rather than shift the school it was decided to shift the road. The school teacher tried to grow trees around the school, but found that it was impossible without a fence. Local residents were prepared to put the fence up, but they had to wait many months for a surveyor to mark the boundaries and close half the road. The Education Department is doing a good job, but getting these small jobs done constitutes a weak link in the chain. The total number of school children has increased in five years by 47 per cent, so it has been difficult to provide the necessary teachers, buildings and amenities. The Hospitals Department faces similar difficulties. The fact is that we are growing so fast that we cannot keep up with the pace, but if we are to go forward we must grow up, and in the meantime we must put up with a few inconveniences for the defence and development of this country.

Mr. CORCORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.27 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 5, at 2 p.m.