

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, June 7, 1955.

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

### QUESTIONS.

#### GRASSHOPPER PLAGUE.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Apparently the recent autumn infestation of grasshoppers was more widespread than on any previous occasion, and in some parts of the State considerable damage was done. Have officers of the Department of Agriculture been able to study their activities, or has the Minister of Agriculture any information to give the House?

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—It is known that the infestation was practically State-wide, and some damage was done to fodder. Local government bodies throughout the State have been circularized as to their obligations, and those of landowners under the Pest Destroyers Act to mark areas where egg-laying has taken place so that, if conditions are favourable later and the eggs begin to hatch, we will know where to concentrate our attack. The matter is certainly being watched very closely, and I imagine that we shall be ready for any new outbreak later in the season.

Mr. HEASLIP—I don't suppose any part of the State has suffered more through grasshoppers than the Upper North, but despite the information about breeding grounds we have not seen any of the pests in the hopping stage. They all come from somewhere farther afield. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the department has taken any action to ascertain where the grasshoppers originally came from, so as to prevent their coming again?

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—I have no personal knowledge of where they originated this year and I doubt whether any departmental officer has that knowledge. As a matter of fact, from my observations they appeared to come from nowhere all at once without warning. There is a scheme of control which all States have agreed to, and which will be financed by the Commonwealth and the States conjointly, but its first place of operation is in New South Wales territory. The object of the scheme is to do what the honourable member suggests—discover where the breeding grounds are, and thus be in a position to attack the grasshoppers. The scheme provides for a definite plan of campaign when an outbreak occurs.

#### DAZZLING HEADLIGHTS.

Mr. PEARSON—In this morning's *Advertiser* appears a report of a French invention which, it is claimed, overcomes the problem of dazzling headlights. As the State Parliament from time to time has passed legislation regarding the dipping of headlights and so on, will the Premier request the Motor Vehicles Department or some other State authority to inquire into the feasibility of this invention? If it proves feasible possibly we could provide that new vehicles, after a certain period, should be equipped with the invention. Everyone is aware of the grave danger of glaring headlights and the number of accidents for which they are blamed.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I understand that the invention is not yet available for testing, but the matter will be examined. We are naturally very anxious to improve the safety of the roads. One of the problems which arises with any anti-dazzle type of lamp is that the more effective it is against dazzle the less effective it is for visibility.

#### HOUSING X-RAY EQUIPMENT.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—A statement appears in this morning's *Advertiser* from Dr. Mayo regarding the housing of x-ray equipment for the treatment of cancer which is expected to arrive later this year. Can the Premier report on the matter?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have not read the statement by Dr. Mayo, but he advised the Chief Secretary's department that the statement printed was not a complete account of what he said. The matter has been before the Public Works Committee for some time and I believe it has taken much evidence. One of the problems we always encounter in connection with hospital services is that so many experts desire to give evidence to the committee. The evidence is always conflicting and as a result hospital building is seriously held up while the committee sifts so many opinions. For one of our major hospitals no fewer than three sketch plans had to be drawn before any conclusion could be reached. It is easy for an expert to come along and suggest, say, that instead of having one major hospital in Adelaide there should be a ring of them around the city. That involves the committee in an investigation; in the meantime no building can take place, because the Government is powerless to go ahead until it receives the committee's report. I am not criticising the committee, but the fact is that when a

medical opinion is sought on any project there is never a unanimous view but a multitude of views, everyone advocating something different.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I regret that it should be thought that Dr. Mayo was responsible for any delay in housing this equipment, because, as a man who has done so much for so many people with any semblance of a cancer, and as one who has suffered so much himself, I do not think that he would do anything that would cause delay. Will the Treasurer consider asking the British Medical Association to submit proposals in respect of hospitals generally instead of going to individuals, even though many of them are specialists in their own fields?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Let me assure the honourable member that there was no implied criticism of Dr. Mayo. He has performed outstanding service to this State and enjoys the well-merited confidence of the Government and, I believe, of the community as a whole. The Public Works Standing Committee has, of course, the duty of examining all propositions put before it. I do not think it can suppress any evidence that is submitted, but I know from personal experience that when so many experts express so many views, it necessarily takes a long time to sift those views and to prepare a report. If I may digress, in order to give an example, the Committee had a large number of submissions in respect of the new Nurses Home at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and ultimately made a report. After it was made numerous further submissions were made by experts to the effect that the Committee's report was all wrong, and finally we had to say that we would accept the Committee's recommendation, right or wrong, and get on with the job, because had we waited for the experts to agree, it would never have been started. We have a board responsible for the administration of the Royal Adelaide Hospital and it has drawn up plans for the development of that institution. I believe that they are good and logical plans, but when someone who claims to be an authority on the subject puts up an entirely different proposal the Public Works Committee is bound to examine it and probably refer the question back to the hospital board. The upshot is that the proposals are held up almost indefinitely in some instances, not because the Committee does not want to make a report, but because it is subjected to so many conflicting views.

Mr. Frank Walsh—Is the B.M.A. responsible?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I do not think it could speak for all branches of the medical services. The Government has a very valuable liaison with the B.M.A. and often consults it, but frequently we have physicians giving evidence on surgical matters, and *vice versa*; we have experts saying that we should not have a big hospital in the centre of the city, but that more should be in the outer suburbs. The whole point is that it takes a long time to sift the various opinions, and while this is going on plans are not being prepared and contracts are not being let.

#### NORTH WALKERVILLE-GLEN OSMOND BUS SERVICE.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Following on the Premier's reply to me last week about the North Walkerville-Glen Osmond bus service, I understand that Lewis Bros. have indicated to the Tramways Trust that they are prepared to run a service on the lines which the Premier indicated he believed would be acceptable to the trust. Can he inform the House whether that is so and what steps have been taken?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have not got the information the honourable member desires, but I will most certainly get it, and also bring to the notice of the trust the views I have expressed on this topic.

#### STRATHALBYN COURT HOUSE.

Mr. WILLIAM JENKINS—Over 12 months ago approval was given for the supply of a magistrate's dais and furniture for the court house at Strathalbyn, but since then the Government furniture factory has been destroyed by fire and the goods have not come to hand. Can the Premier ascertain when it can be expected that they will be available?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will get the information the honourable member desires.

#### PORT PIRIE WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. DAVIS—Until recently the water the Port Pirie people received from the Baroota reservoir had a most unpleasant smell. It was so bad that it could not be used for making tea and for cooking purposes. I made inquiries from a visiting officer who said he was making investigations and that samples of the water were being sent to Adelaide for analysis. Has the Minister of Works a report on the matter?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—No. I have had neither reports nor complaints, but now that the matter has been raised I will get the

information. Each of the reservoirs is more or less interlocked with the others and it is hard to say which water a person is receiving because the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline serves the area, too.

#### TIMBER-FRAMED HOMES.

Mr. JENNINGS—Last Thursday the Premier, in reply to a question put by me on another subject, expressed the opinion that temporary homes in this State were being excessively amortized, and went on to say that after they were completely amortized they would still have a considerable residual value. Can he inform me whether a similarly unrealistic amortization is being applied to timber-framed homes, and if so, whether a more genuine amortization would permit of the excessive rents being reduced?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No. Timber-framed homes were built by and operated under the normal conditions of the trust. Emergency homes are financed by the State Government and are a charge upon the State, which is responsible for any losses. At present heavy losses are accruing because the amortization is very heavy, but I do not believe the loss is a real one because I believe that when they are totally amortized they will still have a fairly high residual value. Probably many of them will still be occupied as residences at the end of the amortization period. I do not agree that the losses shown on purely a bookkeeping basis are genuine. Timber-framed houses are subject to the same rules as the trust applies to its houses generally.

#### NANGULA RAILWAY SIDING.

Mr. CORCORAN—Has the Minister of Works any further information in reply to a question I asked last Thursday about Nangula siding?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The Railways Commissioner has furnished me with a report as follows:—

Nangula is a siding which does very little business, a total of 440 tons, both inwards and outwards, being handled there during the year ending 30th June, 1954. The siding is situated only  $3\frac{1}{2}$  miles from Millicent, where as many as four sales per month are held by the livestock agents. Two sales per month are also held at Tantanoola, which is situated about  $5\frac{1}{2}$  miles from Nangula on the Mount Gambier side. The inwards freight is principally superphosphate, and the outwards freight principally barley. It will be seen from the figures that the business is very small indeed, amounting to the equivalent of

seven bogies of superphosphate and one van of livestock inwards each year, and two bogies of barley outwards. It would cost approximately £6,000 to construct a broad gauge siding with facilities at Nangula. Not only would this substantial expenditure be saved if the siding were closed, but it would result also in reduced operating costs and the more expeditious transport of goods. It is safe to say that interest, maintenance, and depreciation costs of the siding if constructed, together with the additional costs of operating, would amount to about £2 for every ton of goods handled at Nangula. When the proximity of Nangula to Cellulose and Millicent is taken into consideration and the fact that there is a good bitumen road parallel and close to the railway between Cellulose and Millicent, I am strongly of the opinion that there is no justification for constructing a broad gauge siding at Nangula and desire that the existing narrow gauge siding be closed as soon as broad gauge working is extended to Millicent.

The comment of the Minister of Railways is that in view of that report and the cost to the general taxpayer he has no alternative but to concur in the Commissioner's proposal.

#### ASSISTANCE FOR FRUITGROWERS.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Some weeks ago the Premier received a deputation from the Renmark Irrigation Trust asking that a loan be made available to settlers in its area, through the packing sheds, so that they could pay their water rates. In answer to a question I asked some time afterwards the Premier intimated that the whole negotiations had fallen through because of what I took to be a misunderstanding as far as the packing sheds and the State Bank were concerned. I now ask the Premier whether the growers' representatives and the State Bank have conferred and whether funds can now be made available along the lines asked for?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Since the honourable member asked his question I have received two communications from the packing sheds stating that in their opinion the type of advance suggested would not help them much because they wanted a long-term advance, not a short one.

Mr. Macgillivray—I think they asked for three years.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The case they put up was that the water rates were now due and the fruit had not been sold, that the Renmark Irrigation Trust, by law, was compelled to charge a 10 per cent penalty if rates were not paid by the due date, and it was necessary for money to be advanced so that the rates could be paid pending the sale of

fruit. I am examining the two letters I have received and getting reports on them from Treasury officers. I point out that the Government has no power to lend money as suggested by the deputation. It can only be done by an advance from the bank, and then only on terms acceptable to the bank as reasonable and involving a reasonable chance of repayment. The proposal that has come down now seems to be one that would not be acceptable to the bank because it provides that, although there would be a procuration order taken out over the fruit, the order would not need to be honoured until the grower had an equity in his account. The packing sheds could advance money and continue indefinitely and the grower would never have an equity in the account. Personally, I do not believe they would do that, but that is not in accordance with normal banking business, which is that an obligation to repay is not to be expressed in an indefinite way. I do not believe the bank will accept the proposal, but the matter is being examined and the honourable member will be advised as soon as I can determine on some definite policy.

#### GRANGE ROAD LIGHTING.

Mr. HUTCHENS—In recent years the Highways Department has been installing a very satisfactory type of lighting on main highways and it seems that it will continue with this policy. I am concerned about the installation of more satisfactory lighting on Grange Road. Because of extensive building that area is becoming more densely settled. The lights on that road are poor and, consequently, dangerous. Can the Minister ascertain when the Highways Department will provide more satisfactory lighting on that highway?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I will refer the question to my colleague, but, speaking from memory, I think the Act relating to this matter provides that the Highways Commissioner shall only contribute to lighting of two highways—the Anzac Highway and the Port Road. If that is correct, the lighting of this road is not within the province of the Highways Department.

#### TRAMWAYS TRUST APPEAL.

Mr. FRED WALSH—As this Parliament has, on at least three occasions, approved of loans to assist the finances of the Tramways Trust, I ask whether the Premier can say whether he was consulted or advised in the

matter of the application by the manager of the trust for leave to appeal against the tramway award made by Mr. Conciliation Commissioner Tonkin?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It is true that the State has provided a number of debentures to assist the trust in carrying on and I believe it will be necessary for that to be done on future occasions unless it is proposed to increase fares to an enormous extent. I think further loans will be inevitable and, in point of fact, they are accepted by the Grants Commission because the same procedure applies in some other States to even a greater extent than here. At present the only control the Government has over the trust lies in the fact that it is the function of the Governor to appoint the board. The board has then the duties imposed under the Act of maintaining and operating a service. In direct answer to the question, the Government was not consulted in connection with the proposed appeal.

#### WHEAT RESEARCH.

Mr. STOTT—Some negotiations have taken place between the Commonwealth Government and State officers of the Standing Committee of the Agricultural Council in respect of a levy of one eighth of a penny a bushel for the purposes of wheat research and the extension of services throughout the States. The Federal Minister for Commerce has already held a conference with representatives of growers, who suggested that an overall Federal committee be set up to allocate the monies received for these purposes and that liaison committees should be set up in the States comprising representatives of growers from whom the money would come and representatives of research institutes, the university and the Department of Agriculture, to suggest how this money should be used. Can the Minister of Agriculture indicate whether he or Cabinet has considered this request from the Commonwealth Government and, if so, what Cabinet's decision is regarding the establishment of such committees?

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—The matter has not developed to that stage where decisions can be made in the State sphere. I believe it will be dealt with at the forthcoming meeting of the Agricultural Council on July 4 and 5, but until it is discussed there and a general policy determined we are not taking any steps to decide what should be done or how the fund should be administered.

## TAPEROO PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. TAPPING—Last Tuesday, in reply to my question, the Minister of Works announced that he had agreed that £16,000 be spent on a sewerage system at the Taperoo primary school. Since then I have been approached by the progress association in that area to urge the Government to treat this matter as most urgent. Can the Minister indicate when the work will be commenced?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I think I indicated last Tuesday that this work would be done as soon as the resources of the department permitted. Firstly, there will have to be a survey because, whereas the first discussions on servicing the school were based on a septic tank system involving at least £5,000, which scheme would not have enabled any other part of the district to be served, after thoroughly going into the matter and conducting negotiations between the departments over some weeks, it was decided by Cabinet that a sewerage system, which would also serve the adjacent area, be installed at an estimated cost of £16,000. Obviously, if the work started tomorrow it would be many weeks before it could be completed. Cabinet has approved the work; surveys will be made as soon as possible, pumping plant will be procured, and the work will proceed thereafter with every expedition. I notice that the school committee said it was afraid of an outbreak next summer unless something were done, but the present proposal is that the work should be completed not later than the commencement of the school year next February.

## FISH PRICES.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Has the Minister of Agriculture any further information on the question I asked last week regarding the comparative prices of imported and locally caught fish?

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—The Chief Inspector of Fisheries and Game reports:—

According to information given by the secretary of the South Australian Fishermen's Co-operative Ltd., shark fishermen members are given a first payment averaging 1s. 3d. a pound for their shark carcasses. The Society fillets, packs, freezes and later transports the prepared products by refrigerated truck to Adelaide and stores it at a low temperature. As required the "snapper flake" is distributed to retailers who are charged 2s. 9d. a packet (12oz.), and who are recommended to sell it to the public at 3s. 6d. a packet. The retailer holds the product in deep freeze cabinets. Hake from South Africa retails at 3s. 9d. a packet (16oz.). I do not

know the intermediate prices nor do I know what price the South African fisherman is paid for his fish. Whiting for which there is no comparable imported fish has the following co-operative society prices: to fishermen 3s. 2d. a lb. whole fish; to retailers 8s. a lb. fillets; to public 9s. 6d. a lb. fillets.

In filleting a fish approximately a half is wasted, therefore one pound whiting filleted costs the society 6s. 4d. Incidentally, members of the co-operative society receive a second payment for their fish. This is in the form of a bonus paid at the conclusion of their trading year. Yesterday at the fish auctions in Adelaide whiting averaged 4s. 6d. a lb. In one fish shop whole fish were priced at 5s. 9d. and fresh fillets at 12s. a lb. In the deep freeze shops the frozen fillets were 9s. 6d. a lb. Buyers of fresh fillets apparently were prepared to pay 2s. 6d. more for their fancy.

## FLOODING OF OTTOWAY.

Mr. STEPHENS—On Friday last, with the mayor, aldermen and councillors of the Port Adelaide Corporation, I visited Ottoway, a small suburb just outside Port Adelaide proper, and found the place flooded, some homes were flooded out, some people could hardly get out of their homes, the foundations of new houses were covered, and roads were scarcely passable, although the conditions then were better than they had been a day or so before. This floodwater comes down from Enfield and Woodville and collects at this spot. I understand that some little time ago a deputation waited on the Premier with reference to the construction of a drain to take it away, and the Premier expressed himself as sympathetic. Has anything been done in the matter, or, if not, will he do something in respect of a drain to assist the council in removing this water?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I remember the deputation, and I thought that the proposals were necessary. They were referred to departments concerned for examination in detail and the working out of financial provisions. There are two sides to this question, and I believe that the local people should make some contribution towards a scheme of this description. I do not know whether such a scheme would have to go to the Public Works Standing Committee, and my reply is subject to that qualification, but I would be prepared to consider the Government's providing 50 per cent of the cost if the local authorities provided the remainder. Some of the flooding is due to the fact that more water is coming into the area from outside, which warrants the Government's making some contribution.

## SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. WILLIAM JENKINS—I have been invited to attend some functions in July and early August and, in order to be in a position to accept or otherwise, it would be helpful if the Premier could indicate when the House will adjourn and when it will resume afterwards.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The programme that the Government would like to carry out is to sit until Thursday, June 30, and to resume after the adjournment in about the second week in August. The Loan Council and the Premiers' Conference will be called for June 22 to June 24, but it is not proposed that the House should adjourn for that period. That means that there are 12 more sitting days in this month, and it is hoped in that time to get through some of the more urgent matters requiring attention.

## GLADSTONE TO ADELAIDE TRAIN.

Mr. HEASLIP—This morning I travelled from Gladstone to Adelaide by rail, having arrived at Gladstone at 6.40 a.m. to catch the 6.45 train. I got into the first carriage and endeavoured to close the door, but the latch would not work, and the door was still open and swinging when we arrived at Adelaide. I tried to close two windows, but they would not move, despite all the force I applied. Anyone sitting in the carriage would have been frozen before he reached Adelaide, and the result was it remained empty. I went to the next compartment and the door to the convenience had no latch and it swung backwards and forwards all the way to Adelaide. The train did not leave until 7.15, owing, I understand, to the late arrival of the train from Peterborough. There was no comfort or warmth on the journey and everybody was really cold. Will the Minister of Works inquire from the Minister of Railways whether there will be any improvements made to this service, and when the additional diesel engines are put into service will they be available for this line?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I will draw the honourable member's remarks to the attention of my colleague.

## TRAMS ON PAYNEHAM ROAD.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Last year I asked the Minister of Works a number of questions concerning the possibility of placing warning devices on the single track tramway line to Payneham and Paradise. So far I have only a promise from the trust that it is experimenting with

reflector devices on the trams. This in no way gives a warning to motorists that they have to take particular care. A few days ago an accident occurred between two motorists on this road who were trying to avoid a tram going in a direction opposite to that expected. Will the Minister take up with the trust the possibility of having warning notices displayed along this line for motorists to watch out for trams approaching on the left-hand side?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I will be glad to do that.

## MARINE STORE COLLECTORS.

Mr. JENNINGS—I have been approached by several marine store collectors in my area who complain that they are suffering severe competition from collectors who have been licensed but are otherwise engaged in full-time occupation during the week. They operate at week-ends. Will the Premier investigate whether those in this business full-time are suffering from competition from those not depending mainly on it for a living?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will have the matter examined and let the honourable member have a report.

## PORT PIRIE HIGH SCHOOL YARD.

Mr. DAVIS—I have received a report from the parents of children attending the Port Pirie high school concerning the condition of the school ground. Yesterday I found portion of the grounds in a shocking condition. The children have to pass through an area on the southern side, where the soil is of a clayey nature and it is difficult for the children to cross in the winter to get to their playing ground. The western side of the main building is often a quagmire because of the water that runs off from the building, and an old piece of felt has been laid to enable the children to cross. They have difficulty in getting into some of the emergency classrooms. Will the Minister of Works take this matter up immediately so that there can be some relief, and will he call for a report concerning the lavatories?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Yes.

## GRANT TO WORKERS EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION.

Mr. STOTT—I would like the Government to consider increasing the grant to the Workers Educational Association to help discussion groups in country centres. Recently one was formed at Loxton, but the association

finds itself handicapped because of the lack of finance to encourage these groups. The Premier would be one of the first to agree to the setting up of adult educational groups in the country in order to discourage the growth of the cult of bodgies and widgies. Will he consider allocating additional money in the Estimates this year?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—As with all other highly desirable expenditures in which the State engages, the Government will consider this matter when the Estimates are being considered.

#### SHELTERS AT TRAM STOPS.

Mr. JENNINGS—Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question regarding the provision of shelter sheds at tram and bus stopping places?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The Tramways Trust advises that its general policy is to establish shelters at the end of sections and outside terminals, where other shelter is not available in the near vicinity. The trust has in hand the matter of providing shelters on the two bus feeders mentioned when the route and outer terminals are shortly established.

#### KAROONDA HOSPITAL.

Mr. STOTT—Recently the committee assisting the local government hospital representatives considered further allocations of subsidies to country hospitals. I understand that the Karoonda Hospital has hitherto not been subsidized by the Government, but has now been favourably recommended. Will the Premier consider this matter when preparing the Estimates for 1955-56?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—This matter is handled by the Chief Secretary, to whom I will refer the question and get a reply.

#### SOIL EROSION.

Mr. STOTT—I have been informed that on the Advisory Board of Agriculture no member has a direct knowledge of wind soil erosion. I speak particularly of the sandhill areas, and as the Minister knows there is one at Wanbi. Recently some discussion took place with people interested in a proposal to remove the top of the hill with a bulldozer and sow a pasture that will grow there. Has the Minister of Agriculture an officer of his department with a knowledge of wind erosion and, if not, will he consult local committees, particularly in my area, and get the benefit of expert advice?

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—I think most officers of the Soil Conservation Branch have a good general knowledge of the aspect of soil erosion mentioned by the honourable member. They are actively engaged in the various districts in which they reside. A good deal of advice has been given from time to time on how to cope with sand drift. As the honourable member knows, one of the best methods is to plant rye corn, which is being done extensively throughout the State, frequently at some cost to the Soil Conservation Branch which provides funds for the supply of the necessary seed etc. There are practical men on the advisory board. For instance, there is Mr. George Cant of Kimba, who understands both wind and water soil erosion, and has taken effective measures on his own land, which is an object lesson to people in the locality. We have personnel with a practical knowledge of the problem—departmental officers and men acting in an advisory capacity.

#### DENTAL HOSPITAL.

Mr. TAPPING (on notice)—

1. How many persons were treated and/or supplied with dentures at the Dental Hospital during the years 1952-53 and 1953-54 respectively?

2. How many of such persons—(a) made any contribution at all towards the cost of such treatment and/or dentures received by them; or (b) paid the full cost of such treatment and/or dentures received by them?

3. Is a means test applied to persons receiving treatment at the Dental Hospital, and if so, under what authority?

4. If a means test is applied, how is it administered?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The replies are:—

	1952-53.	1953-54.
1. Number of persons treated . . . .	16,976	13,600
Number of persons supplied with dentures . . . .	1,227	1,304

2. The number of persons—(a) who made some payment for treatment (excluding dentures) during the two years was 985; (b) who made some payment for dentures during the two years was 55. Information is not recorded as to which patients have paid part cost or full cost, so that this information is not available.

3. The means tests has been in operation since the inception of the Dental Hospital and fees are charged under authority of Part 5 of the Hospitals Act, 1934-1952.

4. In the application of the means test the financial position of each patient and his ability to pay is taken into consideration in each case. Pensioners and indigent persons are treated free, and the members of a family consisting of man, wife and two children on the basic wage would be treated free. All patients, irrespective of financial circumstances, are admitted for emergency treatment for relief of pain. Patients considered ineligible for treatment are rejected by the assessing officer and cases of doubt are referred to the Dental Superintendent. Patients requiring dentures are assessed by the assessing officer

Year.

1950	193
1951	203
1952	270
1953	334
1954	392

In addition, there are approximately sixty other establishments in the metropolitan shopping district from which petrol is sold as a side line in conjunction with some other major classes of business, mostly motor car sales and motor repair garages, but from which no sales of petrol are made after the normal closing times of non-exempt shops.

#### MENTAL HOSPITAL PATIENTS.

Mr. LAWN (on notice)—How many adults, according to the Superintendent of Mental Institutions, were in mental institutions merely because of old age, as distinct from mental ill health, in each of the years since 1932?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Superintendent of Mental Institutions reports:—

For the years concerned, adult patients admitted to the mental institutions were suffering from varying degrees of mental abnormality, and in the case of the aged, this mental abnormality was the consequence of the physiological and pathological process of ageing. With the exception of those patients who entered the mental institutions on their own signed request, there must be one or two medical certificates of mental defectiveness, together with a justice's order or a request for admission signed by a relative or friend. The Mental Defectives Act specifically provides for the admission of "persons mentally infirm—that is, persons who, through mental infirmity arising from age or the decay of their faculties, are incapable of managing themselves or their affairs."

and in case of doubt are referred by him to the board.

#### PETROL RESELLERS' LICENCES.

Mr. STEPHENS (on notice)—How many petrol resellers' licences were issued in the metropolitan area for each of the years from 1950 to 1954?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The numbers of licences issued to petrol resellers in the metropolitan shopping district to sell motor spirit after the normal closing times for non-exempt shops, under the provisions of the Early Closing Act, 1926-1954, are as follows:—

Total number issued.	Number issued during year to new occupiers who have taken over premises from holders of current licences.	Net number of premises licensed.
1950	28	165
1951	25	178
1952	60	210
1953	56	278
1954	41	351

#### CORNSACKS.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (on notice)—

1. What is the cost per dozen of cornsacks in South Australia at present?

2. What premium, if any, is allowed by the Australian Wheat Board on wheat delivered in bags?

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—Mr. Taylor, State Superintendent of the Australian Wheat Board, reports:—

1.	Per dozen. s. d.
Wholesale price	33 6
Distributor's margin to farmers	0 7
	34 1

2. On overseas sales, buyers will not pay any premium for bagged wheat over the price of bulk wheat. In Australia, millers and produce buyers are required to pay for bags in addition to wheat.

#### LOANS FOR HOUSING.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (on notice)—

1. How much money has been provided each year for the last ten years to the Housing Trust for the purpose of building houses for letting—(a) from funds made available under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement; (b) from Loan Council allocations, (c) from other sources?



2. How much money has been provided each year for the last ten years to the State Bank for the purpose of building homes—(a) from funds made available under the Commonwealth-

State Housing Agreement; (b) from Loan Council allocations; (c) from other sources?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The replies are:—

	(a)	(b)	(c)
Year.	Commonwealth- State Housing Agreement.	Loan Council.	Other Sources.
1945-1946 . . . . .	—	No funds allocated this financial year	—
1946-1947 . . . . .	—	750,000	—
1947-1948 . . . . .	—	1,300,000	—
1948-1949 . . . . .	—	1,000,000	—
1949-1950 . . . . .	—	2,100,000	—
1950-1951 . . . . .	—	3,900,000	—
1951-1952 . . . . .	—	4,750,000	—
1952-1953 . . . . .	—	3,470,000	950,000
1953-1954 . . . . .	4,500,000	2,500,000	—
1954-1955 . . . . .	3,300,000	1,000,000	250,000

	(a)	(b)	(c)
Year.	Commonwealth- State Housing Agreement.	Loan Council.	Other Sources.
1945-1946 . . . . .		294,031	
1946-1947 . . . . .		519,492	
1947-1948 . . . . .	No	448,493	No
1948-1949 . . . . .		413,915	
1949-1950 . . . . .	moneys	581,983	moneys
1950-1951 . . . . .		883,408	
1951-1952 . . . . .	provided	1,160,626	provided
1952-1953 . . . . .		973,724	
1953-1954 . . . . .		1,317,578	
1954-1955 . . . . .		1,500,000 (estimated)	

#### MAGILL OLD FOLKS HOME.

Mr. LAWN (on notice)—

1. How many wards at Magill Old Folks Home are vacant?

2. How long have these wards been vacant?

3. What is the normal number of patients catered for in these wards?

4. Is it the intention of the Government to place these wards in use again? If so, when?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The replies are:—

1. Two.

2. One for some years, and the other quite recently.

3. Thirty-two to a ward and 24 to an infirmary.

4. One ward is available and furnished for occupation, when required. Tenders are about to be called to convert the other vacant ward into an infirmary, when it will be used for that purpose.

Mr. LAWN (on notice)—

1. Have any aged persons been transferred from Parkside Mental Hospital to the Magill Old Folks Home this year; if so, how many?

2. Is it intended to transfer any more?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The replies are:—

1. Yes, three last year from Parkside Mental Hospital. (Greater numbers have been so transferred in previous years from both Parkside and Northfield Mental Hospitals.)

2. Yes.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on the motion for adoption.

(Continued from June 2. Page 211.)

Mr. STEPHENS (Port Adelaide)—I join with other members who expressed sympathy with the relatives of the late Hon. R. J. Rudall and Mr. H. S. Dunks. These men were held in very high esteem by all members, and I had the great pleasure of sitting in this House with them for many years. I congratulate the new member for Mitcham on his election, and I hope that in this House he will advocate and vote for the principles put forward by the Mitcham Young Liberal Branch of the Liberal and Country League. In making that statement I am referring to an article that

appeared in the *News* of September 8, 1953, which contained the following:—

Three hundred delegates representing nearly 50,000 S.A. Liberal and Country League members will attend the league's annual conference opening in the Liberal Club Hall tomorrow at 9.30 a.m. Motions dealing with electoral reform, subscription fees, and L.C.L. constitution changes will be submitted. Mitcham Young Liberal branch proposes to add a new clause to the constitution and platform:—"To safeguard and strengthen the British system of Parliamentary government by the implementation of the principle that every elector's vote should be of equal value."

I am pleased that other people beside members of the Australian Labor Party advocate that principle. When we are severely criticized by members opposite for supporting it, I will remind them that one of the younger members of their Party feels as we do on the subject, and I am looking for a more democratic view from him than from many of his colleagues.

In paragraph 3 of the Lieutenant-Governor's speech the following appeared:—

The steady flow of migration can be expected to keep the economy buoyant.

If the State Government wants a steady flow of migrants to keep the economy buoyant it should at least see that they are decently housed when they get here. The Government promised to find accommodation for migrants from Great Britain, but many of those unfortunate people were herded like sheep in the wool stores at Port Adelaide. They were not provided with decent baths, lavatories, or meals. When opening Parliament on June 26, 1947, His Excellency said, *inter alia*:—

Under an arrangement between the Commonwealth and the States, the Commonwealth has undertaken to find ships to bring migrants from Great Britain to Australia, and the States have agreed to provide accommodation and employment for migrants on their arrival. My Government has completed its preparations for carrying out this arrangement.

When, with other members of this House, I inspected the accommodation provided in the wool stores at Port Adelaide I thought that if those people had known before they left England how deplorable their housing conditions would be they would not have come here. I have had several complaints about this matter. Recently I received a letter from a migrant, who stated:—

My wife is very disheartened about hostel life, and if she does not move very soon I shall have no alternative but to send her back to the United Kingdom and to follow on myself. I have only two bedrooms here and my children—a daughter 7½ years and a son 4 years—in one room. The wife, myself, and baby (seven months) are in the other.

This man has tried his hardest to get out of this unsatisfactory accommodation, but he cannot. I have taken up the matter with the Housing Trust and, although I have not yet been successful, I hope to be able soon to do something for this man. Paragraph 3 of the Lieutenant-Governor's Opening Speech concluded:—

Governments may be unable to raise sufficient money for next year's requirements.

I do not know why we always allow money to control everything, for in 1948 the Premier told the people that the State Government would control prices. If he said that, why does he not control interest rates now? Prior to the 1948 referendum there was in a newspaper a beautiful photograph of the Premier holding up his hand and saying he had this personal message to the people of South Australia:—

You may vote "No" on Saturday in the full knowledge that when Canberra control ceases your South Australian Government will introduce legislation to control prices and rents as may be necessary.

If the Government is concerned about interest rates, as is indicated in paragraph 3 of His Excellency's Speech, why does not the Premier control interest rates and thereby assist the State? Paragraph 10 refers to the progress made with wharves and cargo sheds at Port Adelaide. I believe that they are as good as any in Australia, but they would be made more efficient if travelling cranes were provided. The installation of sliding doors and the elimination of the fixed sides between the doors has assisted in clearing cargo from the sheds, and the enforcement of the charges for the storage of imported goods has also assisted. The Harbors Board has done a wonderful job at Port Adelaide, but many people always blame the waterside workers for the slow turn-round of ships. However, it is often the people making these complaints who are at fault. I have often seen the cargo sheds full, so the waterside workers could not unload the ships. Sometimes the merchants and carriers, who have hundreds of tons of cargo in the sheds, will not take it out because it does not suit them at the time. They use the wharf sheds as stores for their cargoes. There was a great outcry when the Harbors Board decided to charge storage fees for cargo left in the sheds. Even then many merchants would not remove their cargo until the Harbors Board built a shed for the receipt of cargo and charged merchants for the service.

At one time when waterside workers were being blamed for the slow turn-round of ships,

I visited Port Adelaide and found the cargo sheds full. The waterside workers were anxious to go on with their work, and I invited the Premier, Minister of Marine, and any other members to go with me to see the conditions, but my offer was not accepted by any member opposite, though one or two Opposition members accompanied me. Instead of seeing the conditions for themselves, members supporting the Government blamed waterside workers for the delay. I am pleased that as a result of action by the Harbors Board there are no longer blockages in those sheds.

Mr. Brookman—Who is responsible for the slow turn-round of ships?

Mr. STEPHENS—There is no slow turn-around of ships at Port Adelaide now. I have known wharves and cargo sheds to be vacant while vessels have been waiting at the anchorage and men have been ready to work, but those wharves and sheds have been reserved for certain companies. Other boats have had to wait until the companies' ships have been discharged before they could berth. Overseas vessels have complained that our tugs are not strong enough. One complaint was made about a particular tug, but when the matter was investigated it was found that the tug was perfectly all right and that only the gear of the vessel was faulty. Another reason for the slow turn-round of ships is the way cargo is loaded. It frequently happens that cargo for Melbourne and Sydney is loaded on top of cargo for Adelaide and the waterside workers have to unload that cargo before they can discharge ours. They are credited with handling a certain tonnage whereas they have handled many hundred tons more because of this unsatisfactory method of loading. A few days ago an article in the *News* said, in effect, that this was a condition for which the waterside workers could not be blamed. They are frequently criticized by those who do not know the full facts. I would be happy to show any Government member the work performed by our waterside workers. When Commander Symonds was in charge of the wharves at Port Adelaide he told a gathering of people, at which I was present, that the waterside workers were doing a grand job and he would not have them criticized. He said that on occasions they worked all around the clock and that he frequently asked them to come out on emergency jobs and never once had they refused. It is only natural that if they are always blamed when something goes wrong it will have a bad effect on them. They are never given any credit by some people.

Years ago when the wharves were controlled by private enterprise they were in a disgraceful condition. Notices were displayed everywhere warning owners of vehicles that they drove on the wharf decking at their own risk. They had to drive on to the wharves and I have known of men being injured and horses having limbs broken because of rotten wharves. I have seen the wheels of vehicles break through the decking, but nothing was done to remedy the position. The wharf owners didn't care what happened so long as they got their profits. I remember one occasion when three horses were killed because of the bad conditions. Fortunately the hunter and hook boy escaped. The South Australian Company, which owned the wharves, permitted their lines to project and action was taken against the company. For three years that matter was fought in court. The case was known as the Richardson case. No doubt the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) had that case referred to his notice when he was studying law at the University. After three years that case was eventually decided in the High Court. Another legal action was the Booth v. Adelaide Steamship Company case, which was also won by the workers. It was only after those cases that the firms began to do anything.

We have decent wharves and sheds at Port Adelaide today because the Harbors Board has provided a good service not only to the ship-owners, exporters, importers and carriers, but to all the people. By means of modern wharves the Government is rendering a valuable service to the community. Members opposite may call that Socialism, but their Government uses Socialistic projects whenever it suits.

Mr. McAlees—The poor struggling ship-owner must be considered.

Mr. STEPHENS—The wharves have also benefited that class. Before the passing of an Act under which wharf properties were acquired, we had the spectacle of private enterprise on the one hand looking for profits, and the Harbors Board, on the other, trying to render a service. The passing of that Act resulted in a vast improvement in the condition of our wharves, and it is interesting to note that in the debate that preceded its passing the same arguments were used as are being used today by some members in this Chamber regarding the establishment of a steelworks at Whyalla. Similar arguments were also used prior to the establishment of the Electricity Trust, but little is heard of them today because valuable service is being rendered by that Government instrumentality.

Paragraph 11 of His Excellency's Speech states that £6,000,000 is to be spent on roads this year. Reference is made to the great increase in the number of motor vehicles using our roads, but I point out that not only is the number of motor vehicles growing, but also the weight and length of the load that many carry. The member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon), who lives in the hills and is particularly conversant with this problem, has frequently referred in this House to traffic on the Mount Barker Road. Last Sunday I travelled along that road to Bridgewater and saw a large commercial vehicle, with a trailer, delaying at least 17 motor cars. Such commercial vehicles use our roads both day and night and are tearing our roads to pieces. They should not be allowed to use the roads. At various times Government members criticize our Railways Department. Many of them have fought for better railway facilities, but, after these have been supplied and there has been a consequent improvement in the value of the land they serve, the Railways Department is condemned because it does not charge a cheaper freight rate. Recently a member said he could cart certain of his produce more cheaply by road than by rail, but I remind him that this is partly because primary producers enjoy a concession in the registration of their motor vehicles. They use those vehicles to the disadvantage of the Railways Department by carting the first class freight themselves and leaving the second and third class for the department. In doing this they are disloyal to their Government and are guilty of hypocrisy. In effect they say, "We will stand behind our Government, but we are not prepared to give a fair deal to its instrumentality."

I hope that something will be done to prevent big commercial vehicles making the roads unsafe for other users. The railways are capable of carrying much of the freight now carried by road. What a hue and cry there would be in certain country districts if the railway lines were taken up. Deputations would be organized and certain country members would worry the Government into relaying the lines; but I have no doubt that after they had been re-laid the Railways Department would be patronized by primary producers no better than it is today because of the few paltry shillings that may be saved by road haulage. Recently I was shocked by a press report about a number of primary producers who had swindled the Government by not paying their income tax.

The Hon. A. W. Christian—They were not all farmers.

Mr. STEPHENS—Possibly, but there were more farmers than any other class in the list. I do not say that all farmers are of that type, because I know that many are honest and deserve all the support we can give them. As in all other occupations, however, there are all types. Paragraphs 13, 16 and 17 of His Excellency's Speech deal with the building of schools, hospitals and houses. Although certain progress has recently been made in building projects, there was for some time previously a lack of progress owing, it was alleged, to a cement shortage. Recently, however, cement supplies have improved and progress has been made. The reason why we made no progress was that the Government would not establish its own cement works.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—Reinforcing rods were in shorter supply than cement.

Mr. STEPHENS—Yes, but the Minister will recognize that the main trouble has been the shortage of cement. Ordinary dwellings do not require many rods.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—Hospitals do.

Mr. STEPHENS—But shortage of cement has always been given as the reason for the delay. I suggest members take the trouble to ascertain who are the directors of the cement companies and then have a look at the membership of another place and they will see the answer.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—Do you think that affects an honest Government? I am surprised at the honourable member descending to those depths.

Mr. STEPHENS—And I am surprised at the Minister pretending not to know all about this matter. When something was said about repudiation while the Premier was speaking the other day, I interjected, "His own members charge him with repudiation," but I know more than that: I know that a motion carried in this House by a majority of members was ignored by the Premier who, in effect, said "Parliament is not controlling South Australia, I am." In reply to the Minister of Works I say that we are living under a dictatorship and not a Parliamentary system. The Government should have supplied cement from its own establishments just as it has supplied coal, electricity and timber. Paragraph 17 of His Excellency's speech refers to housing and we are informed that the Government

does not intend to supply any more temporary homes. However, that sort of thing does not worry a lot of members. If a season turns out badly and their sheep or cattle are going short of feed it is a most awful calamity and the Government has to go to their assistance, but they do not worry when it is only human beings who are suffering. I will give but one illustration of the appalling conditions that still exist through lack of housing—I could give hundreds.

Mr. William Jenkins—This Government has done more than any other in the matter of housing.

Mr. STEPHENS—I will tell the honourable member what is happening in Port Adelaide, although I know members opposite are not concerned as long as it is not in their own districts. I have a letter which says:—

My wife, self and two teen-age people—one a girl of 15 and the other a boy of 16½—and two boys aged 12 and 10, are living in a room 15ft. by 11ft. Our furniture, which comprises a three-room scheme with accessories, is stacked all around the walls, so you will see that we have not much room. There are 20 people living in this house in which there are six families. There is only one stove and it is a circus to see us cooking our meals. We eat and sleep in the one room.

Mr. William Jenkins—Have they tried to do anything about it?

Mr. STEPHENS—Of course they have. I can see one member opposite who knows that cases nearly as bad as that exist in his own district, but members opposite do not worry about it and will not help us to do anything. Notwithstanding these bad conditions migrants are invited to come here and are told that accommodation will be found, yet the Government will not even provide temporary homes for our own people. I could speak at length on this, but I think it would be useless because we are controlled by one man; the Government is a one-man band and to get anything we have to convince one man.

Paragraph 20 refers to the Electricity Trust and Leigh Creek coal. The use of Leigh Creek coal was a favourite subject of the late Jack Fitzgerald who represented Port Pirie in this House for many years. Long before I ever came here Mr. Fitzgerald fought to get the field opened up, but he was always ignored. After the Government commenced operations on the field much prejudice against the coal was shown by manufactures; they said it would not burn in their furnaces and the Adelaide Electric Supply Company said it could not and would not use it. That put the Premier's back up and that is why we passed the Electricity

Trust of S.A. Act. The main objection arose from the fact that many of the merchants had shares in the shipping companies which in turn, owned the coalfields in New South Wales, and they wanted to trade with themselves instead of with the Government. Notwithstanding all this, today Leigh Creek coal is used extensively by the Electricity Trust at Osborne, and exclusively at Port Augusta powerhouse. It was condemned, not because it was no good, but because it was Government-owned.

Mr. William Jenkins—They had to convert their furnaces to use it.

Mr. STEPHENS—They said it was impossible to do that, yet as soon as the Government took over the Electric Supply Company it became possible, simply showing that the engineers employed by private enterprise were not as efficient as those employed by the Government.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—The engineers in that case were all private employees.

Mr. STEPHENS—If we can use it now why could they not use it then? It was only because of the natural prejudice against Government-owned things. Today the Electricity Trust is supplying services to the people, whereas the old company was only concerned with building up profits for its shareholders. Some members shouted "repudiation" when we talked of taking over the Electric Supply Company, but it would be interesting to know what they say to their constituents today. I remember the days when, if we wanted lights in a street, we first had to pay for the poles to be erected and then guarantee the use of a given amount of electricity; the company had to be assured of a certain profit before it would supply the lights, and it would not go outside the metropolitan area. Today the trust, that belongs to the people, is supplying electricity throughout the country and I do not think any member would be prepared to tell his constituents that he would do away with it. This House passed the first Bill introduced, but it was defeated in the Legislative Council. However, the Premier was not to be beaten and he called a special session and again it was passed by this House, every member of the Australian Labor Party voting with him. Some of his own members, because they were more interested in the shareholders than in the advancement of the State, voted against him. He must have waved a magic wand because he got hold of some of those who had voted against the Bill before, and although it had not been altered the Legislative Council passed it on the second occasion.

When speaking on the present motion the Premier set out to criticise the Australian Labor Party for its policy of one vote one value. With other members of my Party, I believe in this policy because it is democratic, and when we forsake that policy it is another step toward dictatorship. The Premier tried to read into the rules of the Party that they did not provide for one vote one value. He selected certain of them and put his own interpretation on them. In criticising the member for Norwood he said:—

Many loose statements have been made on this matter. Last night the honourable member for Norwood quoted a few selected passages taken out of their context.

He got hold of our rule book and very conveniently overlooked those dealing with this particular point. He quoted from rule 20, but rule 19 is the one which covers the position and it reads as follows:—

Notwithstanding provisions of any other rule the voting on any question before convention shall be decided by a card system of voting in such a way that the vote of each delegate shall be counted in proportion to the number of affiliated members such delegate represents . . . . The system of preferential voting shall be adopted for all elections at the annual State convention and central council meetings, excepting where time does not permit ballot papers to be printed, and in the latter case ballots shall be by the exhaustive system.

Is not the policy of my Party in this respect also that of the new member for Mitcham and of the Mitcham Young Liberal League, and did not they want it adopted at the L.C.L. conference? We have not heard whether it was carried or not, but I would not be surprised if it was not. I could not expect the honourable member to vote for it because he is pledged to his Party's policy and I do not want to see him twist on it. However, we will still keep fighting for it because it is a democratic and right principle. If we do not have democracy in this State then we shall soon get further into the mire with the dictatorship we have today.

Mr. Goldney—What country has democracy?

Mr. STEPHENS—I would advise my friend to send in his resignation to the undemocratic L.C.L. and apply to join the A.L.P. and then he will be associated with a democratic body. I think the Premier was stupid when he made a comparison between the representatives from New South Wales and Tasmania at our Federal Conference. Anyone would think from what he said that all the thousands who voted for Labor in New South Wales were members of the New South Wales branch of our Party.

It is unnecessary to go any further in this analysis and I would not insult member's intelligence by doing so.

I was going to speak on the floodwaters position in the Port Adelaide district, but having received a satisfactory reply from the Premier today I will not deal with it any further. I feel sure he will do something. The Premier has said that he will take notice of what members say in the Address in Reply debate, and I hope he will do so. Despite what has been said about the establishment of steel-works in South Australia, we do not want repudiation. However, if a company did something in this State which was detrimental to its progress and safety, the Government should do something no matter what you call it—whether repudiation or something else—to find steel for the people. The Minister of Marine knows the position of those who have had their homes taken away by the Government because the land is wanted for Harbors Board work. That is not called repudiation, nor is it when the Government takes land from the people for railways, schools and other public purposes. Is it any more repudiation to claim back the land that has been leased by the Government to a company when the State is in need of steel? I know something will be done. The Broken Hill Proprietary Company will not over-ride the Premier. He is more powerful than it is and also more powerful than Parliament. What he did with the Adelaide Electric Supply Company he will do with this company; if it will not do something he will do something instead. I support the motion.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY (Chaffey)—I join with other honourable members in expressing deep regret at the death of the Hon. R. J. Rudall and Mr. Dunks, and extend sincere sympathy to their relatives. I was closely associated with Mr. Rudall when he was Minister of Irrigation. No district in South Australia, or even in the Commonwealth, is more dependent on decisions of a Minister of the Crown than my district, irrespective of whether it is in regard to fruitgrowing blocks or the towns in those areas. A Crown decision can largely make or mar development. My relationship with the Minister at that time was a happy one. When I went to see him about a matter he said he knew little about the inner workings of the department and suggested that I go to the head, and that if I did not get satisfaction I was to go back to him. That showed his good sense. If I did not get

all I asked of him I was satisfied that I got more than a good degree of justice. I have sat under only two Chairmen of Committees since I have been in this place—Mr. Rudall and Mr. Dunks. The latter gentleman and I differed on a number of subjects, but there were many things on which we had a common understanding. I liked his continual defence of private enterprise and loathing of Government departments and bureaucracy. His passings means the loss of the last true Liberal in this House. When I entered this place 18 years ago the Government benches contained a number of men who were always ready to stand up for Liberal principles; so far as I know there is none now.

I congratulate Mr. Teusner on his election as Chairman of Committees, a position which is given to a member as a gift from the Party in power, but even if all members had been free to vote as they wished I am sure Mr. Teusner would have had a good chance of being selected for the position. He is a man of ability and his legal training will be an advantage to him. I also congratulate Mr. Lawn on his enterprise in challenging Mr. Teusner for the position of Chairman of Committees. All members in this House should have equal rights and responsibilities, and it will be a good thing when the Party system is entirely abolished; then members will be able to exercise their own judgment.

I congratulate the new member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse). It has been said that he is the youngest man to enter this Chamber. I listened to his maiden speech with much interest. Whilst I have been here I have listened to the first speeches of many new members. It can be truthfully said that most of the members here now have become new members since my election. When new Labor members deliver their maiden speeches there is not much diversion from the stock Labor speech; they all come here to advocate the policy set down for them. The stock speech of new Liberal members is that they have been elected to carry out the policy of the Government, but reserve to themselves the right to oppose it if they think fit. Mr. Millhouse started off by referring to high principles but hurriedly broke down that stand in the concluding paragraph of his speech. Last week-end a young man in my district asked me about the new member for Mitcham. I said he was going along splendidly and that all speakers in the Address in Reply debate thought highly of his maiden speech. The young man said he was delighted because Mr.

Millhouse belonged, as he did, to the Young Liberal movement. That showed me that up to that time I had been looking through a glass darkly, but now all is made clear why Mr. Millhouse broke down his remarks about high principles and said he would comply with the dictates of the Party system.

One of the main issues before us is a proper electoral system. Evidently Young Liberals with ideas are thinking about the matter in the same way as I am, because if we are to retain democracy we must have a true electoral system. Anything that breaks down such a system destroys democracy. These young people evidently realize the position and hope that the new member for Mitcham will follow that line of thought. I hope he does but I suggest that he is in a dangerous position. He said that as a member of the L.C.L. he subscribed to the principles and beliefs it upholds. He must decide what the league stands for. It stands for the existing electoral system and the movement, of which the honourable member was a leader, pointed a dagger straight at the heart of the league. There is a political organization which puts a man on trial if he dares to criticize its principles, and often he is kicked out of the Party. That is a messy business, especially if the man is a fighter. During war-time when a general proves himself to be a messer, is he disgraced, stripped of his honours and kicked out of the army? It is not done because it would be a messy business, and probably others would be involved, so he is promoted to a position where he is useless. No-one can criticize promotion.

I wonder if that has happened to the new member for Mitcham. Has he been promoted to a position where he will be helpless to pursue the high principles of the movement with which he was associated? He must now follow the principles of the Liberal and Country League. Does he support a Government which passes a Communistic type of legislation and puts Parliament outside the jurisdiction of the courts, which this Government did last session? Does he support a Government which denies a section of the community the right to appeal to the courts, which his Government has done? Does he support the Government in prosecuting a country industry whose biggest sin was to challenge the Gepp's Cross abattoirs? If he attacks the latter move he will have the support of an important section of the community, the housewives in the metropolitan area who are sick to

death of strikes holding up work at the abattoirs and having to chase around the country to get meat for their families. The housewives will welcome some other challenge to this monopoly, the Master Butchers will support the honourable member if he fights for the rights of this little private enterprise, and above all, the farmers will support him as they, like the housewives, are sick to death of having the killing of young lambs held up year after year. The honourable member may have noticed the anxiety of the honourable member for Newcastle when I asked the Premier a question on this matter. He tried to close the subject by suggesting the matter was *sub judice*. Of course, the honourable member for Newcastle, when a Minister, was the cause of the trouble by refusing a licence to the meatworks.

These are the things that the honourable member for Mitcham, like all other members, has to decide on when coming here as a supporter of the Liberal and Country League Government. The decision cannot be made lightly and it will probably cause him a good deal of worry, especially if he lets his mind wander to what happened in Canberra in the last week or two, where another young man, also a supporter of the Liberal Government, a man full of ideals and ideas, felt, rightly or wrongly, that the Government of the day was neglecting the security of the people in our big capital cities in the event of the outbreak of another war. He gave notice that he would introduce a Bill to do what he thinks should be done, what I think should be done and what every reasonable citizen of the Commonwealth agrees should be done. Everyone will agree that another war is not an impossibility and it is too late to start getting ready for it once it starts, but what happened to this member? He was charged before his party with trying to break down the power of his Government. We do not know what happened. We have had statements made by the Prime Minister, but anyone who knows about this political set up would realize that in the Party room this man, Mr. Wentworth, must have been told what he must do "or else," because he promptly withdrew his suggestion. The people of the Commonwealth will be the worse for that decision.

I will take the honourable member further back, because I would like to warn him what may happen in reconciling his conscience with his allegiance to the Party. A few years ago returned soldier candidates of the Federal Liberal Party pledged themselves during the election campaign to do certain things

in the interests of their comrades and they, like Mr. Wentworth, were challenged to carry them out. For a little time they spoke about forming a break away movement because they did not want to let their comrades down, but they did let them down and denied everything they stood for, because the Party Whip is stronger than conscience when Party control is in the balance.

I feel that the addition of another member of the legal profession to the Government benches has created a problem that Mr. Speaker may have to consider, and I hope, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will draw his attention to it. I say that because recently in Canberra a member of a certain breakaway group went to the Speaker and told him what it desired to do and what the name of the group would be, and the Speaker agreed to this. I am assuming that the Speaker has some control over the set up. Obviously there are no longer any Liberals on the Government benches and there is no longer any member of the Country Party, which was swallowed up, assimilated and voided many years ago. Instead we have something that is probably unique on a per capita basis in any part of the British Empire—six members of the legal profession in a comparatively small House. The Government benches today are almost a home for lost lawyers and I suggest that the Speaker consider whether the Government Party has the right to call itself a Liberal and Country League or should be called the Legal and Non-Country Party, which I think is a more apt description.

I now wish to turn to problems peculiar to my district, those dealing with the dried fruit, wine, citrus and canning industries. To the settlers the two most important are the dried fruit and wine industries, which, contrary to ministerial opinion, are passing through a very bad time indeed. One of the peculiar things about this matter is that both in the Federal and State spheres there are two Ministers more or less directly connected with this industry who deny the statements made by spokesmen for the industry. For instance, the acting Federal Minister for Agriculture, the Hon. George McLeay, meeting a conference of dried fruitgrowers at Mildura, concluded his remarks by saying, "The growers can live on their fat." I will not repeat what the growers thought about this question of fat—they probably thought the Minister himself had a great deal more fat than they. The Minister of Irrigation, in reply to a question I put to him last week, said that the growers should be able to carry on for another year.



because of the good seasons they have had in the past. He quoted a number of figures relating to previous years that I, as a grower, had the greatest difficulty in believing. The interesting point is that neither of these two Ministers knows or could be expected to know the first thing about this subject. The Hon. George McLeay is an acting Minister, but even the Minister for Agriculture does not know much about the subject because, although he is a primary producer, he has had no experience of dried fruit. Statements made in both the Federal and the State sphere come from the departments concerned. I suspected that would happen and warned the growers that if they went to Canberra seeking assistance they would probably find that any scheme they put forward had been white-anted by Government departments.

During the war years the price of dried fruit was controlled. I am not complaining about that, and I would like to see it reduced now to assist sales, but unfortunately costs of production are so high that this cannot be done. The leaders of the industry decided during the war that it would be a generous act to sell fruit at less than parity prices on the export market to help Great Britain to feed her people and to conserve Britain's overseas credit. This was done on the assumption that when the war was over they would have ensured themselves of a safe market, but that has not happened. Britain is now buying considerable tonnages of fruit from the United States of America, not because American fruit is better than ours, but because the Government of that country is giving a substantial subsidy to its growers to export it. Apart from California, Greece and Turkey are doing the same thing, although by different methods. The wheat and wool industries demanded world parity prices and have obtained security in the markets, but the dried fruit growers have not been able to do so, and have been left without the substantial incomes and reserves that other industries have. This industry has not asked for sympathy, which is all it has got so far, but feels it has a right to assistance. When I said the dried fruit industry exported its fruit at less than cost of production, I should have pointed out that only the growers did that.

The loss to the industry fell entirely on their shoulders. The packing sheds, agents, merchants, Governments and retailers supplying tractors and machinery (which were urgently needed because of the manpower shortage) and wire, galvanized iron, and other commodities,

demanding their full pound of flesh, and got it, but the growers, who were supplying the Old Country in its time of need, suffered the loss. Therefore, the dried fruit industry has a case for help that no other primary industry has, at any rate to the best of my knowledge. As early as 1950 some growers in Victoria, because of the bad seasons and low prices, faced bankruptcy, and went to the Labor Government of that State for assistance. That Government promised a loan provided the growers were credit-worthy. It is interesting that the Treasurer of this State is using this same term today when we ask for a loan to help the growers in the Renmark Irrigation Trust area. He says that if they are credit-worthy they will get a loan. The point is that if they were credit-worthy they would not need a loan. The packing sheds and the banks will assist any man who is credit-worthy, but when a man is struggling he goes to the Government for assistance, although often his request is turned down.

I am glad the Minister of Agriculture is in the Chamber, and I again ask him to take a firm stand on this question at the forthcoming Agricultural Council meeting. Perhaps it is not necessary for me to make this plea because he has indicated he is prepared to take a firm stand, but I point out that the South Australian Government is just as interested in some form of stabilization scheme for the dried fruits industry as the growers themselves. The Government has invested large sums in our irrigation areas and unless we get some form of stability it will have little chance of getting the growers' commitments paid. There are two main industries interested in grape production: the dried fruit and the wine industries. I was glad to hear the member for Stanley dealing so ably with this question. He has an inside knowledge of the wine industry. My knowledge has been gained only as a supplier of wine grapes, but there are some aspects of the industry that should be examined. It is probably unique in Australia in that, by and large, until recent years it belonged entirely to certain family groups. I do not have to enumerate them because they are well known, especially in South Australia, and we owe these families a great debt of gratitude for the wonderful pioneering work they have done in bringing the industry to its high standard. However, there are now other interests that deserve some recognition from Parliament, and I am thinking particularly of the co-operative wineries that sprung up after World War I. After the speech made by the member for

Stanley a spokesman for the wine industry made a long statement to the press. Under the heading "Winemakers Dislike Pool Plan," he is reported to have said:—

I believe the Premier knows that the progress made by South Africa—which he extols and implies puts Australia in a poor light—has resulted largely from the availability of large stocks of dry or near-dry sherry from South Africa.

When I read that report I thought if South Africa is in a position to supply the wine that Great Britain wants why is Australia not in that position? It is not that the winemakers of Australia did not know the position, for when the Land Settlement Committee was taking evidence in 1945 about the possibility of developing a new irrigation area at Loxton the then chairman of the Wine Board (Mr. Kay) gave evidence. He said the market for red wines was gradually falling off, but that there was an unlimited market for sherry and sherry-type wines. He made that statement 10 years ago. What have the winemakers of South Australia, who produce 80 per cent of Australian wine, been doing in those 10 years? If they had taken the advice given by Mr. Kay they would not have their cellars cluttered up with wine that no one wants.

The Hon. A. W. Christian—Can they make sherry from all the grapes that we grow?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—No, and that is an important point. Again, we must examine the history and development of these family groups. In the first place, those people were not winemakers but grapegrowers. They planted vineyards and then processed their own grapes into wine. Later they began to expand, and now they are probably more interested in winemaking than in growing grapes. If the family groups had taken the advice of the then chairman of the Wine Board they would have had to change their plantings, and that is where the catch came in. I doubt very much whether any of these private winemakers are holding much of their own wine, in spite of the surplus we hear of. They control the marketing of wine. They have their own blends that are well known and they have the opportunity to sell to the public houses and other places, and they have wine licences of their own.

During the last war there was no need for anyone to worry about what kind of wine he made because there was great difficulty in getting beer and ale and there were many American troops stationed in Australia. The demand for all types of wine was so great that the present chairman of the wine board,

Mr. Hardy, said in the press that there was a possibility of customers being rationed. There was no need then to find any market overseas to dispose of supplies. Extensive investigations have been made throughout Australia in recent weeks to find the difference in the cost of shipping wine from South Africa to Great Britain and from Australia to Great Britain, but without result. No-one knows the difference in cost. It is the co-operative wineries that are feeling the effects of the diminution in the sale of wine. The private companies can sell the wine they have, and as soon as they get short in any line they can send a tanker up the river and build up their stocks. Today the co-operative wineries are like a cow that is milked when supplies are short, but they are left in milk when wine is not wanted. They cannot carry on long under those conditions, especially when we consider that at Loxton we have an area that will be in production in a year or so, and that will put a further 1,000,000 gallons on the Australian market. The wine-makers will have to work together with the co-operative wineries or they will be faced with trouble. They cannot sit on the fence indefinitely and continue to build up their supplies. It seems that they will have to build up an export market.

When the chairman of the Winemaker's Association said recently he was not in favour of pooling I felt considerable sympathy with him. The wine makers have built up their own blends and they have a ready market. I think the Australian market should not be interfered with, but we should establish an equalization scheme, as has been done for other primary industries. Let those who get the benefit of the home market pay some of their profits into a fund to help those who export. I do not expect the wine industry to carry all the responsibility of that scheme because the Commonwealth Government should come into it. There is nothing new in this particular approach. Before the war there was an export bounty fund which paid a bounty on all wine exported. I think it started at 4s. a gallon, but was gradually broken down until eventually the exporters got 1s. a gallon. However, I am not interested in the amount so much as in the principle. That principle was accepted and it worked. When the war broke out the exporting of wine was stopped and there was no more need for the fund which had over £1,000,000 in credit. The Commonwealth Government promptly took £500,000 for its own purposes. Recently, the

other £500,000 was assigned to help research in the wine industry. That research will be centred in South Australia. I am not opposed to that, but I am still of opinion that what is most required in the wine industry is not research, but markets. We cannot keep building vats to store wine for which we have no market. Had that £500,000 been used as a subsidy I think it would have been of greater benefit, although no doubt the research will be of great value in the long run.

Citrus growing is also a big industry on the river. We have heard the Minister of Lands suggest that growers are not in as bad a position as press reports would lead us to believe, but we are fortunate in many instances on the river in having substantial acreages of citrus fruits. Oranges have paid well. The demand for oranges is never satisfied and we could add considerably to our plantings before we met the demand. It is not fair, however, to suggest that because some settlers have added income because of citrus and other tree fruits, the man who depends entirely on the growing of grapes does not need assistance, because he does. Our main fear in the river areas is that there may be an infestation of fruit fly. At the present time the river areas have a monopoly on the export of citrus fruits. We have the responsibility of supplying New Zealand and, eventually, Singapore with all the citrus fruits the Commonwealth can export. The eastern States have been put out of the export market because of fruit fly infestation. While referring to this pest I might also draw attention to the grave menace to our tree fruit of the oriental fruit moth which practically ruins all hopes of harvesting peach crops. I have been creditably informed that in the Murrumbidgee area a settler had 20 acres of peach trees bearing a heavy crop, but he did not harvest a case because every peach in the orchard was destroyed by this moth. One can appreciate the grave danger it would represent to our river areas.

In a recent publication on the river there was an interesting paragraph to the effect that California was subsidizing the sale of oranges on the New Zealand market. I made inquiries and was informed that the report was incorrect. It should have stated that the United States was subsidizing the export of Californian oranges to Iceland. That is somewhat different from New Zealand, but it does show that the United States is prepared to help her primary industries. One would imagine that it would hardly be worth while considering subsidizing oranges for sale in Iceland, because the demand

on that island would not be great. The Americans have a policy of helping their primary industries to get into every possible market.

The canning industry has grown since the latter years of the war. Last year there was trouble between the canneries, which are situated mainly in the metropolitan area, and the growers on the river. A representative of the canneries went to the river areas and said, "We cannot pay you the price the Sugar Commission has fixed for your fruit. We would like you to accept £4 a ton less than that price and then we will be able to handle your products." The growers refused that proposal. The eastern States were paying the price fixed by the Sugar Commission and eventually a substantial bonus. Our growers had no intention of being scabs on their fellow growers in those States. They indicated that unless the canneries were prepared to pay the price fixed they would dry their fruit. That speaks volumes for the integrity of the growers, because they did dry their fruits—particularly peaches—and lost heavily. The result was that the canneries, which could have canned this fruit which would have met an eager and valuable market in the United Kingdom, were short by that amount of fruit. It is common knowledge that those canneries are in great financial difficulties and it was apparent to the growers on the river that they had to cut down their income by the amount suggested by the canneries so that the cannery could pay their liabilities to the bank. I believe the bank concerned is the State Bank.

I have some doubts about the Government's wisdom in having the manager of the State Bank on the boards of the various undertakings. I say that without reflecting personally on the manager. I think the principle is wrong. How can the manager, whose first duty is to protect his bank's money, which has been invested in city canneries, help to finance a country cannery which would be in opposition to the metropolitan canneries and may take away the profits he wants the city canneries to reap to repay the amounts borrowed from his bank? I think the system is wrong. The Government should appoint an officer of the Treasury who would not be an officer of the bank, but who would report back to the Treasurer who could then take whatever steps were necessary. There is no doubt about the future of the canning industry. When the city cannery tried to reduce the growers' price they said that there was no future for the canning trade in Great Britain. There was

a suggestion that South Africa was going to cut its prices. In the eastern States canning is a major industry and, as a result of this suggestion, a representative was sent to South Africa. When he asked about the intentions of cutting the price, he was told that South Africa had no such intention, but was frightened that Australia would cut its price. Everyone who has been associated with primary production knows that this is an old racket. Both ends are worked against the middle. One is told, 'If you don't do it, someone will cut the price and you will lose your market.' Instead of South Africa being prepared to cut prices, it was anxious to co-operate with Australia and agree upon a price that would be fair to growers and to consumers in Great Britain. The net result was that as soon as the canned fruit was landed in the United Kingdom, within a fortnight £10,000,000 of canned fruit were sold and the market was clamouring for more. If the canners in South Australia had been prepared to pay the growers a fair price they would have been better off and in a better position to pay their liabilities to the State Bank. The State and Commonwealth would have been better off because of the very valuable export building up overseas credit. The people on the river were so disgusted with the treatment they received that there is a strong movement afoot to start a co-operative cannery on the river. They feel that would be preferable to carting fruit long distances. I hope when this question is placed before the Government it will give more consideration to it than to some of the other requests from the river in recent months.

One of the difficulties on the river is getting itinerant labour. At one time there was no difficulty, but today everyone who can be regularly employed is employed. Those available for seasonal work are those who do not like to be tied down to one position and like to get away on a working holiday in the country. Other valuable helpers are aboriginals and half-castes. Unfortunately, unprincipled people supply aboriginals and half-castes with liquor. I brought this question before the House last year and was thankful when I got the wholehearted support of members when I had a term of imprisonment provided for those who illegally supply these people with intoxicating liquor.

I asked for a report and was told that up to the present on the river only one supplier of liquor to aboriginals had been sent to gaol. This is a serious crime and one that should carry a minimum penalty of 10 years'

gaol. Nothing upsets me more than to see aboriginals exploited through wine, originally costing 4s. 6d. a bottle, being sold at 10s. and sometimes £1 a bottle. I have discussed this question with a number of people including justices of the peace who try these cases and with police officers who must administer the law, and these people inform me that under the law in its present form it is practically impossible to prove a charge against a supplier of liquor unless he is caught red-handed and there is evidence to prove his guilt. I would like the Premier to ask the Police Commissioner for a report on whether this law is difficult to enforce and what steps should be taken to protect these unfortunate aboriginals and half-castes. Under the present law it is not a question of the aborigine's intoxication; a police officer has merely to smell liquor on the aborigine's breath to be able to charge him. I have listened to some of these cases conducted in court, and, although police officers do their best to help them, the aboriginals, because of their background, are unable to defend themselves at law and can simply say "Yes" or "No" as the case may be, whereas any other person could avail himself of legal help. I know of many white men who have been acquitted of charges of drunkenness when they were obviously more guilty than many aboriginals convicted under this law. The maximum penalty under it is £10, and I know a young married aborigine who had to pay that amount, which represented practically his week's wage. The whole system is unfair and an imposition on the aboriginals and part aboriginals. The law should be altered so that the real offender could be more easily convicted and punished.

The Hon. C. S. Hincks—The aborigine will seldom admit the source of his supply.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—That is so, but he would not have to because everybody on the river, including the police, knows who supplies the liquor. The problem is in being able to prove the charge. The duty of the police is to prevent crime, and it is only when they cannot prevent it that they assume the responsibility of punishing the criminal. What is being done on the river in this case is to punish the crime without taking effective steps to prevent it. If we cannot get satisfaction from the Police Commissioner's report that I have suggested, a Royal Commission should be set up to investigate the whole question. If we cannot stop the supply of liquor to aboriginals and part aboriginals, it would be

better to take off the controls altogether. It would be better to punish the aborigine for drunkenness or any other crime the same as the white man is punished instead of making him the sitting shot he is at present.

I was recently perturbed by a statement on the rehabilitation of returned soldiers, which was made by a man himself a gallant soldier who has suffered from war injuries for many years, and who has taken an active part in the work of the Returned Soldiers League. The effect of his statement may be so serious as to divide the returned soldier movement into two parts, which is something against which members of the league have always fought. We, as members of the league, have always tried to approach rehabilitation problems from the aspect of how they affect ex-servicemen generally, but this gentleman makes an undesirable distinction between the ex-servicemen who have been put on to the land and the men who have gone back to their jobs in the metropolitan area. This gentleman said:—

I wish to speak up for the returned soldier who comes back and gets on with his job; he is the man who has my sympathy . . . I think we must bear in mind always the position of the men who have gone away, fought, come back and gone into their old jobs.

What were the jobs that were previously held by our soldier settlers? Have they not gone back to their old jobs, because most of them were on the land before they enlisted? The suggestion in the statement, however, is that the soldier settler is getting something for nothing and something to which the man in the city is not entitled. It is not true that the city ex-serviceman who went back to his job received no help, because in fact he was entitled to £1,000 as a loan if he desired it. I admit that that amount was not much and that the period during which he was eligible for it was too short. Indeed, I wrote to the Prime Minister pointing out that when a man enlisted to serve Australia he placed no time limit on his services, whereas the Commonwealth Government placed a limit of five years on the period during which it would help the ex-serviceman in this regard. Last week in this House the member for Unley (Mr. Dunnage) took this matter further as the following quotation from *Hansard* shows:—

Mr. Dunnage— . . . I desire to refer to something the Hon. C. R. Cudmore said in the Legislative Council.

The Speaker—The honourable member cannot touch on that. It is against Standing Orders.

Mr. Dunnage—A gentleman I know said that soldier settlers had been placed on the

land at enormous expense to the Commonwealth and the State. What, however, have we done for the men who enlisted from the metropolitan area? They are not provided with homes. Ex-servicemen are placed on the land and given everything they require. As a matter of fact we give them money to stay on the land if they cannot make it pay.

Mr. Coreoran—Do you suggest we should not exploit our land resources?

Mr. Dunnage—No, but we should not do it to the detriment of ex-servicemen from the metropolitan area. If a man who enlisted from the metropolitan area wants a home he must pay for it himself.

Mr. Dunnage suggested that soldier settlers are placed on the land to the detriment of city ex-servicemen, who must pay for their homes, and implied that the soldier settler does not have to pay anything for his block.

Mr. Hutchens—That statement showed a gross misunderstanding.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I consider it is a statement of gross stupidity. I have been in the soldier settlement scheme for more than 30 years and know what happens to soldier settlers. Their farms are not given to them as a gift; they are saddled with a large mortgage, the total of which they do not know. The only thing the soldier settler gets is the opportunity to work, and he cannot work only a 40-hour week as does the city worker. He must work 80 to 100 hours a week the same as I did when I first went on to my property. The only way to succeed on the land is to work seven days a week if necessary. Mr. Dunnage mentioned the city ex-serviceman, but he works only 40 hours and receives time and a half and double time penalty rates for time in excess of that. After World War I the soldier settler worked for a quarter of a century and denied himself many things before he was finally able to pay off his liabilities. Indeed, it was not until World War II that the soldier settler from World War I was able to discharge his liability. Who benefits from land settlement? This is an important question, because we will soon have to consider the liabilities of these soldier settlers.

The gentleman who originally made this invidious distinction between soldier settlers and other ex-servicemen is associated with a big distributing company in Adelaide, which supplies cement, steel, galvanized iron, wire, timber and other products necessary for soldier settlement projects. This company, and others like it, have enjoyed their share of trade with the soldier settlers. I do not know how much the directors' pockets were affected directly, but indirectly soldier settlement must have been of particular benefit.

These are the people who got the benefit out of soldier settlement and not the soldiers themselves. They obtained an unearned increment from soldier settlement, but the soldiers got their increment by their own toil and sweat on their properties. Possibly I know the soldier settlement position better than any other member in the House because I have been in it longer than any of them. It is entirely false to suggest that returned soldiers, because they have been put on a farm or fruit block, received a gift. In fact, they got a liability and are running the risk of being forced off their properties if they cannot meet their liabilities.

I thank the member for Burnside for the kind things he said about Mr. Quirke and myself when dealing with the question of Government finance. He is in the position I was in 20 years ago. When I heard of financial reform I said I had heard many silly things in my time, but nothing as silly as this, and I set out to prove how silly it was. Instead of proving that the claim for financial reform was wrong, I proved that I was wrong, and the longer I went on the more thankful I was that I had made some investigation into this matter. I want to address myself now to the Minister of Education, not with the idea of thanking him, because I owe nothing to him. When he took up his Ministerial position I felt very proud of him and thought that here we had a man who would stand up to the bureaucrats, and give us something worthwhile in education, but what do I find—a weak reed. When I asked him what the educational system could do regarding teaching about the creation of money he promised a report. Before the end of last session he submitted a report which was complete nonsense because it completely evaded the question I asked. Much nonsense is spoken about the distribution of money under our economic system. I then asked him another question and his personal secretary eventually replied on April 4, which would have been better if dated April 1. The reply was as follows:—

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of March 17, 1955, addressed to the Minister of Education with reference to the teaching of the University and high schools as regards the creation of money.

There was no doubt about the question—it was about the creation of money. Just before the House met I received a reply dated May 17, direct from the Minister as follows:—

I have delayed a reply to your letter of March 17, concerning principles governing the creation of money taught in schools and the University while inquiries were being made. The position is that in the subject of economics

at the leaving level, which is taken by a few students only (less than 200) the principles governing the creation of money are touched on as part of the course in economics. The work is taken a little further at the leaving honours level where 20 or 30 students only take the subject. At the University, a course in accounting, as I indicated in my earlier reply in Parliament, deals with public finance as well.

Courses at the University are, of course, under the control of the University Council. For your information, I forward a copy of the syllabus for studies for 1955 at the leaving and leaving honours levels in our schools and a copy of the relevant University courses.

I have here a list of subjects which, as far as I can see, are pure gibberish. They do not make sense. There are numerous abbreviations, which may be all right for a professor of economics, but are no use to the ordinary member of Parliament. I could not understand it at all. At one time I thought of asking your permission, Mr. Speaker, to put it in *Hansard* and record for all time the stupidity of the Education Department when asked a simple question about the creation of money. However, I thought it would be cruelty to the Government Printer to ask that to be done. In his reply the Minister evaded my question, but I shall take an early opportunity to ask it again, and will keep on asking it until I find out what the University does teach. I do not think it teaches anything about the subject at all except in a superficial manner. The member for Burnside had some doubts about the subject, but a man should be sure about what he supports before supporting it. I shall quote from McKenna, who did not talk out of the top of his hat. He was chairman of one of the biggest banks in Great Britain, bigger than all the Australian banks put together, and that was not his only qualification. He was also Chancellor of the Exchequer in Great Britain who had to deal with thousands of millions of pounds. Therefore, Mr. Clarke should be interested in anything he said on the subject. Dealing with the question of how money is created he said:—

The amount of money in existence varies only with the action of the banks in increasing or diminishing deposits. We know how this is effected. Every bank loan and every bank purchase of securities creates a deposit and every repayment of a bank loan and every bank sale destroys one.

When I first started to talk about financial reform and said that the banks destroyed credit everyone laughed, and the higher up they were in the financial world the louder they laughed. Here we have McKenna, one of the world's leading finance authorities, making the very statement that bankers are

taking money out of the country and starving it. He also wrote:—

People often talk of money going abroad or of foreign money coming here, but as a fact when gold is not in use money is incapable of migration.

We are asking that American capital should be sent here to develop Australia. Let us see what McKenna says:—

The title to money may change. An individual may sell his sterling to an American for dollars, but the American will then own sterling in England and the Englishman dollars in the United States.

In spite of all the false thought about the matter, you cannot take American dollars into Australia and use them. You can get a loan in America and buy American goods with them, but you cannot use American money as Australian money. The idea that you can is the kind of fallacy still accepted by people of orthodox thought. We are afraid of any change. McKenna goes on to say:—

While banks have this power of creating money it will be found that they exercise it only within the strict limits of sound banking policy.

It was sound from the banks' point of view, as it was in the 1930's, and as it was unsound from the people's point of view. It is all-important that they have that power of creating or destroying money, and they use it. Another interesting topic dealt with by McKenna relates to the creation and destruction of money. He writes:—

I am afraid the ordinary citizen will not like to be told that the banks or the Bank of England can create or destroy money. We are in the habit of thinking of money as wealth, as indeed it is in the hands of the individual who owns it, wealth in the most liquid form, and we do not like to hear that some private institution can create it at pleasure . . . Now, although a bank loan increases the aggregate of bank deposits it does not increase the aggregate of bank cash, and it follows that, so long as each bank adheres to its conventional cash ratio, the power of the banks to create money is limited by their power to obtain additional cash.

The point is that the banks among themselves have created a certain formula. In Britain it was usually accepted as safe for the banks to issue ten times the amount of credit money—money that could be added to by loan and drawn on by cheque—but in Australia it was generally accepted as being seven times the amount of cash, because in Australia much more business is done by cheque than in the Old Country. What connection has that with the ability of the people to produce goods? Primary and secondary industries have put so much production on the market that the

people of the world do not know what to do with it. Industries are turning out goods as never before, and despite that we are moaning about the time-payment system. There is not enough money to buy the goods that primary and secondary industries are producing. We might question whether we ourselves have not a major responsibility in seeing that the goods, whether primary or secondary, are used. The producer has never failed in production. I have never known in the last 30 years when Australia did not produce more than the public could possibly eat. Yet down through the years, especially in the 1930's when people lived on rations and a small cash allowance, some people have been starving. It is the consumer who always lets down the producer. **He must buy to keep the producer going.** It may be said that this is an over-simplification, but all great truths are simple, but because of their simplicity people will not agree with them. To love and treat your neighbour as you would have him love and treat you is a simple matter, but it is not always carried out. Mr. Stephens told us a heart-breaking story of a family living in impossible conditions. That sort of thing could be multiplied *ad lib.* There is the case of three people living in a shanty being burned to death. These things are happening in a country where there is much production and the financial system and those who support it are responsible.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart)—I support the motion and join with previous speakers in expressing regret at the passing of the Hon. R. J. Rudall and Mr. Dunks. I have fond memories of the late member for Mitcham. He was possessed of a big heart. I came into this House in the same year as he did. They were times of depression and I recall referring to him a number of matters that had come from his district. I know the great personal generosity with which he dealt with them. Although I disagreed with his political outlook I always retained a great admiration for his sympathetic dealings with the people who came to him. I will always remember his speech on the motion I moved in 1953 for the appointment of a Select Committee to enquire into the establishment of steelworks at Whyalla. Later in this debate I shall refer to one or two statements he made then, for they are apropos of the important subject now before us. He used words of which we should be cognisant. I had happy associations with Mr. Rudall, first when he was a private member in this place and then when he was Minister of Lands. He

took a great interest in representations made to him regarding the sale of land at Whyalla. We put it to him that the Government should do better by the Whyalla people than was being done in the sale of land for residential purposes. It was land leased by the Government as a pastoral holding and it was being offered by auction. The workmen who required a small piece of land on which to erect a dwelling had to compete against city firms and pay an exorbitant price for it. He was asked whether the Act could be altered so that the Government could put a nominal value on the land subdivided for building, and make it available to the most worthy applicants. He said it would be impossible and rejected the idea, but within a week he intimated he had reconsidered the representations and thought it could be done with advantage. He introduced a measure which meant a departure from accepted practice, but the Whyalla workmen were able to purchase a block of land for £25, or alternatively accept a perpetual lease at a rental of £1 a year. I thought that was typical of the original thinking of the late member. There are happy recollections of our association with him.

I join with the members who have congratulated Mr. Teusner on his appointment as Chairman of Committees. I hope he will not find his duties too onerous because of the behaviour of members on this side, but I am sure he will command the same respect from them as previous Chairmen of Committees. I congratulate Mr. Geoffrey Clarke on his appointment as Government Whip. I feel that the association we have with him as he cracks the whip amongst his own members, and arranges pairs for members on this side, will be the same as has been customary. I can go no farther in congratulating him. There can be no congratulations from us on his speech. I thought some of his remarks called for strong comment from members on this side. I was disappointed because I did not think his remarks were characteristic of his earlier speeches. I took strong exception to the following statement:—

It must be disappointing for the supporters of the Opposition to find that, with one or two exceptions, members opposite have contented themselves with generalities rather than critical or constructive analyses of the Government's policy.

That is purely a matter of opinion. Other members have considered that constructive criticism has been offered in this debate. On the promise of the Premier we believed the criticism would be examined by the department

concerned and that where suggestions could be adopted to the advantage of the State they would be adopted. I doubt the genuineness of the Premier's statement that constructive criticism will be considered, because I think little notice is taken of speeches made in this debate. We have had no evidence that it is taken by any Minister apart from the Minister of Works. We have had replies from him to constructive criticism that has been made in the Address in Reply debate, but in my experience it is not general. Apparently little notice is given to constructive suggestions. Mr. Geoffrey Clarke also said:—

One can well repeat the editorial in a recent issue of the *News*—"Where is the Labor expert on health, mining, works, education, roads, local government and so on?" That very pertinent question has not been answered in this debate.

Does Mr. Clarke expect that, as we address ourselves to the problems facing the State, we should pose as experts? Heaven forbid, because it would be the biggest humbug I know. He was asked, "Where are the experts on your side," and he replied, "They can be found on the front benches." Let us look at the departments administered by the Ministers of the Crown and see how ridiculous that statement was. If we follow it to its logical conclusion, the Chief Secretary must have been a policeman or a miner, the Minister of Works must have worked in sewers or on the wharves, the Minister of Railways must have driven a railway engine, and the Minister of Education must have been a school teacher. The Minister of Agriculture may have grown a crop successfully: I do not know about that; but I have no doubt that he has been fortunate in acquiring land and that with the help of Providence he has had successful crops. I do not know whether he is a good fisherman and so can qualify for his portfolio as Minister in charge of fisheries.

The Hon. A. W. Christian—I have tried to catch fish.

Mr. RICHES—No doubt, but I have not seen much evidence of success. On that score I challenge the right of the honourable member to hold the portfolio.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—Answer the question put by the *News*.

Mr. RICHES—The answer is that the experts controlling the departments are trained men, and the function of members of the Cabinet is only to determine policy for the experts to carry out. Any Minister who claims to be an expert in the department he administers is a



humbug. I suggest that the Minister of Education would not say he is an expert on education.

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

Mr. RICHES—Before the adjournment I was attempting to answer a question thrown to members on this side of the House by the honourable member for Burnside, who reiterated a statement that he said appeared in an editorial in the *News*, asking, "Where is the Labor expert on health, mining, works, education, roads, local government and so on?" I take umbrage at that statement which I consider an insult to members on this side of the House.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—That was an extract from the evening paper.

Mr. RICHES—And it apparently pleased the honourable member greatly because he referred to it twice, so surely he cannot object if I answer and give my considered opinion on his statement. I repeat that it was not characteristic of the honourable member. If he is led into repeating an editorial from the *News* he must accept the responsibility for doing so and accept the answer that I propose to give. I am not attempting to reply to the editorial, but I am attempting to reply to the challenge issued by the honourable member who seemed to derive much satisfaction from the fact that a newspaper raised this matter. I believe he has completely misconstrued the functions of Parliament as I understand them, and I hope the day will never come when this State will be governed by experts, because if that happens we will have to do away with Parliament altogether and let the heads of departments run the State. I would never agree to that and I do not believe for one moment that such a policy would find any support from the people.

When I asked the honourable member, "Where are the Government experts?" he replied, "They are sitting on the front benches." I wish to examine that statement briefly. I ask the honourable member for Burnside whether he will insist that the Minister of Works must first serve a term in the Sewers Department or on the wharves, whether the Minister of Local Government and Roads must serve a term making roads, or whether the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries must be an expert fisherman, because it is open to question whether he has ever caught any fish. The Minister of Education would not for one minute boast of being an expert on education, otherwise he would have risen to reply

to the constructive criticism of the honourable member for Gawler. The lack of teachers is a matter for grave concern and although the honourable member for Burnside said he could not find anything constructive in the speeches of members of my Party, I suggest he could look at one speech with profit. Our concern on this matter is added to by the statement of the Minister that shortages of teachers are grossly exaggerated. We wonder if he has an appreciation of the difficulties that have been faced up to, in my part of the State at any rate, in finding sufficient personnel to keep the schools running, and if he has any knowledge of the number of schools closed because of these shortages. One district alone is 29 teachers short. I know that the Minister of Education would not hold himself up to be an expert, and it is not desirable or necessary that he should. However, members of the Labor Party are experts in the field of human relations, they understand human beings and are capable of determining policy, which is all that members are required to do. We would not entrust the driving of a train to the Minister, and even the Attorney-General consults the Crown Solicitor because he does not hold himself out to be a legal expert. These men are trained from youth, they are at the disposal of the Government no matter what Party is in power, and they assist in formulating policy.

I well remember this matter being raised by the member for Chaffey on a previous occasion and to refute the arguments of the honourable member for Burnside I am indebted to the Honourable R. J. Rudall for the illustration that he used. When Commissioner of Crown Lands in this Chamber, he was challenged on not having had experience on the land, and I well remember that he replied, "Following that argument to its logical conclusion, a doctor could never be a gynaecologist unless he had first given birth to a child." I would like the honourable member for Burnside to say where he would place the ex-Prime Minister of England in his committee of experts. At what was Sir Winston Churchill expert? I ask him where he would place the late Mr. Chifley, whom the Premier, in the course of this debate, told us was one of the greatest statesmen Australia has ever known. He came off the footplate of a railway engine, but in what was he an expert? He knew the needs of the people, he could assess a situation and he called to his assistance people who were able to afford him the necessary advice. That, I

believe, is the function of Parliament, and I hope never to see the day when we will find ourselves governed or controlled by a body of experts because they are next door to bureaucrats. When I entered this House there was a feeling throughout the State that it was being governed by departments and that Parliament should not allow itself to get into the hands of these so-called experts.

I will now refer to a member who used to stand on this side of the House and who drew attention in eloquent terms, sometimes in more picturesque language than I could ever hope to employ, to the value of the iron ore deposits at Iron Knob. I refer to the late Mr. John Fitzgerald. As far back as 1920, probably earlier, by way of question he pleaded with the Government of the day to give proper assessment to the value of South Australia's iron ore deposits, to cease allowing so much of it to be exported from the State and to insist that industries be established in South Australia.

Mr. O'Halloran—And he did that as a member of the Labor Party with the full cognizance of the Party.

Mr. RICHES—Yes, he had the full support of his colleagues. In 1928, not content with questioning alone, he devoted speeches to the subject; in 1929 and 1930 he again spoke on the matter, and in 1930 he said:—

I have said on many occasions that we have not many miles from the city one of the choicest and greatest blessings any State could possess.

Mr. Fitzgerald was very keenly sympathetic towards the men who were walking the length and breadth of this State in search of work. These young men were capable of great deeds during the war but could find no place in our society on their return, although they could well have been employed in developing these great deposits. He was therefore entitled to call them a blessing. He continued:—

I refer to the iron ore deposits at Iron Knob and Whyalla, which in my opinion are worth more than all the gold and silver produced in the world today. Unless the State and people will use this blessing for the development of the iron and steel industry to its fullest advantage we cannot make the best of our State. I have heard it said that wheat is our primary product. That is only because we have neglected this other product which history has shown to be the most vital any nation can possess. All that we have been doing with it up to the present is to collect 3d. per ton royalty on every ton of ore mined and sold by the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited. I believe that any Government which neglects the opportunity we have for the development of the

iron and steel industry is not deserving of the sympathy of the Commonwealth Government or of the people.

In 1932, 1933 and 1934 he made other speeches on this subject and when ultimately in 1937 an agreement was entered into between this Government and the Broken Hill Proprietary Company for the establishment of a blast furnace at Whyalla, we all hoped, believed and were told that that would be followed by a coke oven and steel works. Reference was then made by the Premier of the day to the persistent advocacy of the late Mr. Fitzgerald. The Premier said that the people of South Australia should recognize his foresight in calling attention to the fact that we should not continue to allow the export of this iron ore without insisting on some compensating industry being established in this State. Iron ore is now being exported to a far greater extent and our resources are dwindling far more than the late Mr. Fitzgerald ever dreamed possible. It is little wonder that the Mines Department year after year calls attention to the fact that our high-grade iron ores are being depleted and that unless we develop the low-grade ores in association with the high-grade a serious wrong will be done South Australia.

In 1937, when a Bill was introduced granting the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Ltd. certain leases, the then Premier referred to the work and advocacy of Mr. Fitzgerald and suggested that Backy Bay, one of the loveliest bays on Spencer Gulf, be renamed Fitzgerald Bay. In 1940 the present Premier, in introducing the Bill authorizing the construction of the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline, paid a similar tribute to Mr. Fitzgerald and referred again to the renaming of Backy Bay. I stress that in all the negotiations with the B.H.P. Co. the words "steelworks" were mentioned, not only "blast furnace." The company secured its leases on the definite understanding that steelworks would be established, though that may not have been written into the letter of the agreement. I give the Premier credit for his foresight, when speaking on the Bill, in saying that the agreement provided only for a blast furnace. Apparently he did not expect the company to do any more, but at that time he was a back bench. However, the Premier of the day, the Hon. R. L. Butler, said:—

I am certain that the establishment of this blast furnace will be followed by the establishment of steelworks and I can visualize the development in this State in connection with secondary industries. I am sure that every member will approach the question with this aspect in view.

I did not represent that district at the time, but I voted for the Bill after Mr. Butler's appeal. We were then in the throes of a depression and anxious to reach out after anything that promised employment. With the definite promise of a blast furnace and Mr. Butler's assurance that steelworks would follow, Parliament voted in favour of the Bill. It contained about eight clauses and the whole of the indenture was contained in a schedule, but the schedule had to be accepted or rejected in its entirety. The indenture was the subject of inquiry by a Select Committee. The same procedure was adopted for the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline, though that was also the subject of inquiry by the Public Works Committee, but the agreement was signed and sealed before Parliament had an opportunity to discuss it. Many members were doubtful whether the indenture should be accepted, but the House endorsed it on the assurance of the Premier that steelworks would be established. There was also a clause in the agreement which stated that when the company was prepared to commence the establishment of a steelworks it would notify the Government, which would be obliged to supply adequate water. Again steelworks were mentioned. When giving evidence Mr. Essington Lewis spoke of his confidence that steelworks would be established, and I believe he gave his evidence in all good faith.

At this stage I want to state how much I appreciate the value of Mr. Essington Lewis's work. The member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) has been charged with attempting to belittle him, but I do not agree with the Premier's interpretation of Mr. Dunstan's remarks. Mr. Dunstan said that Mr. Lewis was a clever gentleman when he answered an interjection "Are you trying to belittle him?" Mr. Dunstan said he considered him a wonderful man and continued, "However, I do not agree with his statement that the interests of the B.H.P. are necessarily identical with the interests of Australia as a whole." I want to make it plain that I have the greatest admiration and respect for Mr. Essington Lewis. I believe he is an honourable gentleman and I agree with the Premier that South Australia is losing somewhat in sympathy from the directorate of the company because of the death of Mr. Darling and the retirement of Mr. Essington Lewis.

I believe that the B.H.P. Co. was genuinely interested in establishing a steelworks, but there was one strange coincidence. Mr. Essington Lewis, when giving evidence to a Select Committee, said that a steelworks and coke oven

would inevitably follow the establishment of a blast furnace. He said that this was the pattern all over the world and he also said that ancillary industries would be established at some points on Spencer Gulf, namely, Port Augusta, Port Pirie and Wallaroo. The Hon. R. L. Butler also said that industries would be set up at Port Pirie and Wallaroo. There was much unemployment in those days and two members of the Select Committee who challenged the advisability of passing the Indenture Bill represented Port Pirie and Wallaroo. I have been in politics long enough to wonder whether there was any coercion in mentioning those ports, or whether they were named for a special purpose. I am convinced that both parties to the agreement visualized the establishment of steelworks. Last week the Premier went to great lengths to show that the construction of the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline had nothing to do with any promise of a steelworks. The indenture increased the amount of royalty that the company paid on iron ore from 3d. to 6d. a ton, but the additional 3d. was earmarked for the provision of a water supply for a steelworks, as set out in clause 13 of the agreement. When the construction of the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline was referred to the Public Works Committee it was a statutory reference, and the committee's general report for 1938 stated:—

Section 3 of the Broken Hill Proprietary Company's Indenture Act embodied a reference to the committee in the following terms:—

(1) The Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works shall, as soon after the passing of this Act as is convenient, inquire into and report to the Governor upon the possible methods of improving the water supply of the Northern Water District, and of the lands extending north of that district as far as Port Augusta; and in framing its recommendations the said committee shall have regard to the possibility that a supply of water may be required at or near Whyalla for the purpose of enabling the Broken Hill Pty. Company Limited to establish and operate coke oven plant and other works for the production of steel as mentioned in clause 13 of the indenture set out in the schedule to this Act.

The Committee reported:—

The Committee has not yet been able to act on the direction conveyed to it by section 3 of the Broken Hill Proprietary Company's Indenture Act, namely, that it shall inquire and report on the possible methods of improving the water supply for the Northern Water District and of the lands extending north of that district as far as Port Augusta, and in framing its recommendations shall have regard to the possibility of a supply of water being required at or near Whyalla for the purpose of enabling the Broken Hill Pty. Company to establish and operate coke oven plant and other works.

The committee will proceed with the investigation so soon as the Engineering and Water Supply Department has collected essential data and formulated schemes with estimates of costs thereof. The department has already taken preliminary levels for the purpose of ascertaining the most effective route for a pipeline from the River Murray to serve the areas concerned. Not for several months to come, however, will the department be in a position to submit definite proposals to the committee.

Mr. O'Halloran—That was in 1938 before the tinplate industry was thought of.

Mr. RICHES—Yes. In its report to Parliament on the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline project the Public Works Committee quoted from evidence given by Mr. Jones, representing the Broken Hill Proprietary Company. In the meantime, as the Premier explained last week, war broke out, and the company said that it was unable to proceed with the tinplate industry at Whyalla, but that if a water supply were provided it would proceed immediately with the building of a shipyard and possibly a steelworks later. The report states that Mr. Jones, who I think is now the managing director, indicated that the establishment of the shipbuilding yards at Whyalla would be an added inducement towards the erection of a steel plant there. That evidence was adduced as the reason for the construction of the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline; therefore, not only did Parliament pass the Indenture Bill in 1937 on the understanding that the company would establish a steelworks at Whyalla, but it confidently believed that a steelworks would be established there when it agreed to the construction of the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline three years afterwards, in 1940. The Public Works Committee's report on that project states:—

Mr. Jones indicated that the establishment of the shipbuilding yards at Whyalla would be an added inducement towards the erection of a steel plant there. He said that if an adequate water supply were already established at a point it might easily be the deciding factor in the erection of a plant but otherwise there may be conditions which just balanced the proposition of whether there should be an expansion at Port Kembla or Newcastle, or a new departure at Whyalla. Mr. Jones' evidence continued:—

1905. It would appear in order to give an assured supply of water to Whyalla to enable the Company to establish these additional industries a plant capable of supplying 1,000 million gallons of water a year would be necessary.—Yes, taking the long view of possible developments there.

1906. That means that it would cost the South Australian Government about £3,000,000

to give that assured adequate supply of water. We are concerned as to whether we are to gamble on the Company's establishing these works at Whyalla by spending £3,000,000, or whether we can afford to wait until the Company makes a definite request to us for a supply of water? Development in the steel industry, when it is required, is required rapidly and if the circumstances are such that additional capacity is required in Australia, it is usually required at the shortest possible notice. I think it can be quite envisaged there again that if the water were not at Whyalla, Whyalla may still miss the steel plant at any particular time, due to the time factor in not being able to get the water supply. We now have the blast furnace and the step from a blast furnace to a steel plant can be done fairly rapidly.

1907. If you decided to establish steelworks at Whyalla, how long would it take? Twelve months.

1908. Once the Company had decided upon its establishment, it would be much more rapid if the water were there? Undoubtedly.

1909. Would you consider it a good gamble on the part of the South Australian Government to take the water to Whyalla? I think so.

1910. Would your Company take such a risk? I think it has taken greater risks than that. It is taking one now with regard to shipbuilding.

Surely that is sufficient to substantiate the claim that Parliament was given to understand that the company, having obtained those rights over our iron ore leases, intended ultimately to establish a steelworks at Whyalla. Again, in 1940, we were led to believe that a steelworks would be established later, and in 1947, in delivering the Joseph Fisher lecture at the University of Adelaide, Mr. Essington Lewis reiterated the company's intention to establish a steelworks there. Now, however, we are told that this matter was not included in the agreement, but that the strict letter of the agreement included only the establishment of a blast furnace. It must be remembered that this important natural resource is being used to such an extent that within 15 or 20 years, according to the experts, our high grade ore deposits may be seriously depleted and, if Australia is then thrown back on the necessity of producing steel from low grades ores, the repercussions in the price structure will be serious, therefore, the experts advocate that Parliament should consider this matter.

We are told that the company has refused even to consider the establishment of steelworks until 1960; even then we have no guarantee that it will establish it. The company has stated that by 1960 it will examine the situation in the light of the known iron ore resources available to it. This situation is

alarming to the people of South Australia. This is one of the most important problems facing the State at present and surely deserves a much higher place than paragraph 24 in His Excellency's speech. I must give the Premier credit for his activity in this matter. Frankly, I cannot understand some of his replies to my questions; indeed, I believe that he has led me around in a complete circle. I have considered every word he has spoken in his replies, and I am now right back where I started. In referring the House to some of those replies, I do not criticize the Premier personally; I believe that he gave them in all good faith. I point out, however, that he now seems to regard as a sacred document the indenture agreement about which he was not enthusiastic in 1937 and about which, I believe, he is not very enthusiastic today. How can a document produced under those circumstances become sacred? Any attempt to look at the situation from the point of view of the State is stated, by the Premier, to be evidence of a desire to repudiate the contract, but I stand behind the Leader of the Opposition and the Premier when they say they do not stand for repudiation. On the other hand, however, I claim that the B.H.P. Company has repudiated the spirit of the 1937 agreement. Under those circumstances, when we look at the moral issue, as we have been invited to do by the Premier, we must realize that we have a moral obligation to South Australians to see that what has happened in other mining ventures does not happen in this area near Whyalla, and that the heritage of all South Australians is not entirely shipped overseas. We are told that the present deposits of iron ore near Whyalla, which are astronomical in quantity, cannot be worked because they are uneconomical, and in view of the fact that the company has broken the spirit of the agreement, if not the strict letter, the situation merits the fullest possible investigation on the highest level. I believe a public inquiry is necessary.

I now refer to the negotiations that have taken place. In 1953 I moved that a Select Committee be appointed to investigate this matter, because I believed that experts should be called to give evidence publicly so that the public might know their mind on the matter. I still believe that we should appoint a Select Committee. When this was mooted in 1953 the Premier objected to it on two grounds: firstly he doubted the effectiveness of a Select Committee, and secondly, he said a steelworks could not be financed. At that stage he seemed to have complete confidence that the company

would honour the spirit of the agreement. The late member for Mitcham (Mr. Dunks) said he believed that a steelworks should be established at Whyalla and that it was not in the interests of Whyalla to have only one industry, but, as he was not willing to vote for the motion, he moved an amendment. The member for Alexandra (Mr. Brookman) could say nothing against a Select Committee, but he could not see how a steelworks could be financed. Finally, on the grounds of financial impracticability, Government members voted against the proposal; but only one year afterwards the Premier, in his reply to my last question on the matter last session, said that I seemed to think that finance was the obstacle, but that it no longer was. In reply to another question last year, the Premier told us to have patience, that a proposal had been submitted to the company, that negotiations were proceeding satisfactorily, and that we should not press the issue beyond that point because it would not be advantageous to negotiations to make any pronouncement at that stage. Members will remember that answer. I think it was a reasonable request and so do my colleagues and we accepted it. We have confidence that the Premier was speaking for the State in continuing the negotiations. His last reply in the last session was that negotiations were continuing satisfactorily. He felt that agreement was almost reached on the establishment of an industry, but that the B.H.P. Company reserved the right to determine what particular kind of manufacture would be undertaken.

Then we come to the position where the Premier is rebuffed in that letter to which he quite rightly takes exception. He did not deserve the treatment he received at the last interview. He has been a good friend to the company in past negotiations, and we had reason to believe that the negotiations had been amicable right through. The rebuff came as a shock to the people of the State. The Premier tried to justify the stand the company had taken right up to the last rebuff. On the opening day of this session, when he gave us the benefit of a statement concerning the type of negotiation which had taken place, he said that in the rebuff the company had been guilty of a retraction. It is getting down to a fine point to distinguish between retraction and repudiation. I say that the company has repudiated the spirit of the agreement as everyone understood it; and I believe the then chairman of directors, Mr. Essington Lewis, genuinely believed that the company

would establish a steelworks. It has retracted and the State must take notice of that. We cannot accept that situation. I think the interests of the State would be best served if a Select Committee were appointed. The company obtained the leases in the first place on the understanding, as we believe, that our iron ore deposits would be used to support a South Australian industry, and as the company has broken away from the spirit of that agreement by establishing works at Port Kembla and Newcastle instead of at Whyalla, I say that is a breach of the agreement with South Australia. Therefore, it cannot rightly object to other interests coming in to establish steelworks here.

Negotiations should take place immediately on the basis that the company should make available some of its leases so that the State could obtain enough high grade ore to mix with low grade ore as a basis for another industry. If the company refused the public should know its attitude right through. I should like a couple of the clauses of the indenture agreement examined by Queen's Counsel and the Government advised as to whether Parliament is legally justified in signing away for so long and so definitely the rights of the people over these valuable deposits. The last clause in the agreement is a most extraordinary one. It binds Parliament for 99 years. No Government shall in any way interfere with any of the rights that have been given to the company. Perhaps it is well for us to understand just what rights the company really has. Any South Australian citizen who might discover an iron ore deposit would be required to abide by the mining laws of the State, man the leases and do some work on them; but the B.H.P. Company is exempted. It does not have to man its leases. The population of Whyalla was taken into account to meet the requirements of the mining regulations. The law has been altered to suit the company. People who want to establish a salt works at the head of Spencer Gulf are told they can put in a jetty at their own expense and that after 21 years it will become the property of the Government; when the B.H.P. Company wanted a jetty it built it, but it will never become the Government's property. South Australia has met this company generously on every occasion, and the rebuff the Premier received when he last met it was totally undeserved and is resented by all sections of the House and by the State as a whole. The Premier hopes that continued exploration outside Iron Knob will be fruitful in discover-

ing sufficient quantities of high grade ore to warrant the establishment of steelworks independently of the B.H.P. Company. We all join fervently in that hope. We have to face the facts and the facts, on the evidence of the Premier's statement, are that at the moment the situation is not hopeful. In a current report issued by Dr. Miles on the geology of the iron ore reserves of the Middleback Range area he has this to say in his summary of conclusions:—

All known high grade iron ore deposits in the Middleback Range area were found prior to the recent geological survey and they are being held for exploitation. The present survey has disclosed no new deposits of economic consequence.

That does not make good reading.

Mr. O'Halloran—What is the date of that report?

Mr. RICHES—It is just hot off the press. It is dated 1955. It is the last report available to us, but is not generally available yet. Dr. Miles draws attention to the rapid depletion of the high grade ore deposits in that area, and gives them a life of 20 years at the outside. He says that South Australia should embark immediately on an attempt to develop the low grade ores. The effect of the change-over from producing steel from high grade ore as against low grade ore should be cushioned to avoid a major economic upset. As I understand his recommendation, it is that the low grade ore should be used in association with the high grade ore. There is urgency in the matter and it cannot be delayed indefinitely, as it is of major importance to South Australia. I sympathize with the Premier because of the situation in which he is placed. He told us frankly that he does not know the next step. I listened to the speeches of several of his Party and they seem content to let things drift. Therefore, I can understand his dilemma. I suggest that he consider setting up a Select Committee which could take evidence publicly from all interested parties, because I believe these deposits are the natural heritage of the State, and the State should benefit as a result.

A situation has developed at Quorn because of the altered railway policy for conveying coal from Leigh Creek to Port Augusta. I believe the people of the State sympathize with the residents of Quorn, and I give credit to these residents for their attempts to see that their township does not suffer any more than is absolutely necessary. The position has been brought about by circumstances over which they have no control. If ultimately it is found that the people must lose their homes,

or suffer severe losses through having to take employment elsewhere, they should have a claim on the sympathies of the State, the same as when people lose their homes because of bush fires or some other circumstances over which they have no control. I express gratification that the Premier has agreed to set up a compensation fund. The last thing the people of Quorn want is that a fund should be used for individual payments of compensation to people leaving the town; rather they would like to see it used to bring into Quorn some other industry to take the place of the one it will lose. There are raw materials available around Quorn on which small industries might be based, and which would induce them to go to Quorn. There have been two or three meetings of citizens and they have considered steps which might be taken to preserve the township as it is today. It is a thriving town and beautifully situated and I do not think anyone would wish to see such a town disappear. It deserves much better than that. Anything the State can do to retain Quorn as we know it should be done. The people of Quorn think that a compensation fund should be established and that it should be used at this stage for the purpose of encouraging an industry to go to the town to take the place of the railway. They believe that the provision of an adequate water supply, by storage or by pipeline, could be the basis for dairying and pig and poultry raising, and provide some alleviation.

There are growing industrial populations at Port Pirie, Port Augusta and Whyalla, and these towns have to draw on vegetable supplies from the city. Milk supplies are obtained from the district of Angas and sometimes they have come from as far south as Taillem Bend. If an adequate water supply could be provided at Quorn there would be a ready market at Woomera, Port Augusta and Whyalla for all the dairy products that could be produced. If improved railway facilities were provided between Stirling North and Quorn many of the people now living at Quorn could travel to their place of work at Stirling North. Many people live at Gawler and come to Adelaide each day to work. With the diesel vehicles available to the Commonwealth Railways the trip from Quorn to Stirling North could be made in about half an hour. Many city workers travel for a longer period to and from their place of work. The Commonwealth Railways are asked to provide a better rail service. It has been said

that the narrow railway line from Quorn to Brachina should be retained until such time as the standard gauge reaches Alice Springs. This would avoid transshipment of stock at Brachina. It could come through from Marree, be spelled at Quorn instead of Brachina where there are no facilities at present, and the Quorn stock markets could be preserved. The district might be explored from the point of view of encouraging permanent tourist traffic. The lower Flinders Ranges are rich in scenic beauty. Because of the fine winter climate there could be a source of interest to tourists from all southern Australia. There is no attraction to equal it from the point of view of interest and beauty. A week or a fortnight's holiday, incorporated with a visit to the largest smelting works in the world, the power station at Port Augusta, and the shipbuilding yards at Whyalla, with all the beauty of the now known resorts to the Tourist Bureau, but not accessible to the public through inadequate road facilities, would enable a tourist industry to be built up comparable with that now existing at Katoomba, the Grampians and similar places in other States.

Mr. Brookman—What is the accommodation like?

Mr. RICHES—It is not suitable at present. Accommodation and accessibility to tourist resorts are matters that must be dealt with. The Premier has promised another investigation and I hope it will include a photographic investigation, because the photographic material now available to the Tourist Bureau, good as it is, does not do justice to the magnificent scenery that can be seen at Alligator Gorge, Mambray Creek, Hancock's Lookout and the Warren Gorge. These places are all of interest because plants grow there that do not grow elsewhere in the world. They are also of interest because of the feature films that have been produced in the Ranges. Most of the holiday centres in Australia have to base their programmes on three months of the year, but in the Flinders Ranges the climate is suitable for about nine months. In the winter the climate is unequalled anywhere else in Australia. There are possibilities which should be exploited to the limit. I hope very great things will result from the Premier's promise that the Tourist Bureau will make further investigations. The Commonwealth Government should be told that the retention of Quorn will be to its advantage. It should be associated with the compensation fund and provide an adequate rail service to

enable people to travel from Quorn to Stirling North. The Commonwealth Railways should be asked to examine the possibility of work to be taken from Quorn being replaced with a different kind of railway work. The workshops are available, but is there not some branch of railway work that could be carried on there instead of the present running work? Perhaps there could be the making of rollingstock and component parts of engines. It should not be beyond the capacity of the engineers to work out something that could be done at the workshops. There is an obligation on the part of an authority that changes policy to the detriment of a centre, and where people have given the best part of their lives in building up a community service, to see that that service is not wasted. What has been built up should not be destroyed, but retained. I support the motion.

Mr. TEUSNER (Angas)—I congratulate Mr. Millhouse, who moved the motion, and Mr. Heaslip who seconded it, on their very thoughtful contributions to the debate. From the maiden speech by the new member for Mitcham, and from conversations I have had with him, I feel convinced that he has already a sound knowledge of the economic and political problems of the State. I am certain that he will go far in his Parliamentary career, and I wish him a long and successful one. I associate myself with other members in expressing sorrow at the passing of two valuable members of Parliament. I refer to the late Honourable Reginald Rudall and the late Mr. H. S. Dunks. Mr. Rudall was a scholar and a statesman, whose scholastic achievements gained him in 1908 the coveted Rhodes Scholarship. He graduated in both law and literature and gained the degrees of Bachelor of Laws and Bachelor of Literature. He subsequently became a lecturer in constitutional law at the University of Adelaide. He entered this House in 1933, and in 1944 the Legislative Council. He was for about nine months Chairman of Committees in this Chamber, and his rise soon after he entered politics was meteoric. He subsequently held the portfolios of Minister of Lands, Minister of Education, Attorney-General, and Minister of Industry. I feel certain that as a constitutional lawyer his advice, particularly during the war years, was invaluable to Cabinet. This Parliament is the poorer for the passing of both these gentlemen. Mr. Dunks had a very long association with this House. He occupied the position of Chairman of Committees for about 16 years. By his fine personal qualities, his outstanding knowledge of the Standing Orders, and his sound interpreta-

tion and tactful application of those Standing Orders to the various questions which arose from time to time for decision by him, he gained universal respect. Honourable members have elected me to fill the vacancy caused by his demise. I express to honourable members my appreciation of the confidence they have reposed in me and also my sincere thanks for the kind references that have been made in this debate to the appointment. I feel that my task, following in the footsteps of my predecessor in office will not be easy. Whilst I am fully cognizant of the responsibilities of the position, I am not unmindful of my shortcomings. I am, however, fortified and comforted by the knowledge that members have always striven by their compliance with the Standing Orders to uphold and maintain the dignity of this Parliamentary institution, whose main forms and procedures were bequeathed to us in days of yore by the "Mother of Parliaments whose strong pulse still throbs and tingles to the far fingertips" of the British Commonwealth of Nations. Referring to the impartiality of the British judiciary, an eminent Englishman once stated that there was no individual whose smile or frown, there was no Government—Liberal, Conservative or Labor—whose favour or disfavour could start the pulse of any of our judges on the bench, or stir by even one hair's breadth the even equipoise of the scales of justice. Of such impartiality you, Mr. Speaker, and the late Mr. Dunks as Chairman of Committees, have been exemplary exponents. To emulate you in this respect and to discharge my duties conscientiously shall be my earnest endeavour. With these few remarks I have very great pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh)—I desire very briefly to support this motion, the purpose of which I take it is to thank the Lieutenant-Governor for being so gracious as to present the speech that was undoubtedly prepared by the Government for presentation to this House. We are fortunate to have as Lieutenant-Governor one who has proved himself worthy to serve in that office, that noted and highly respected person Sir Mellis Napier, a man of whom we are all proud. I hope to see the day when more of our sons will be appointed as direct representatives of Her Majesty in this State.

I join with others who have expressed their sympathy to the relatives of members of this Parliament who have passed to the great beyond in recent months. Many fine tributes



have been paid to the late Mr. Dunks. On one occasion last year I said that I respected him for his very direct honesty, although he was one who had political ideals and views quite contrary to mine. I am proud to think that he was always honest in his ideals and always supported them. That is part and parcel of our democracy and although his views were contrary to mine that is the right of every individual, provided that he is consistent and honest in his views. Outside this Chamber he was a very kindly man in every respect. I have learnt since his death that he rendered valuable service to many deserving causes, and I express my appreciation of that. The State is much the poorer for his departure and will be much the richer in years to come for his services. The Hon. R. J. Rudall was known to me to a lesser degree, but in the short time I knew him I admired him for his friendly attitude towards all members. His record will be long appreciated, and I express to his relatives my sincere sympathy. I congratulate the honourable member for Angas on his appointment as Chairman of Committees. Due to the unfortunate illness of my colleague, Mr. Tapping, I was closely associated with Mr. Teusner last year. I found it very pleasant to work with him and I was very grateful for his fair attitude. I am sure that he will have the sympathy and co-operation of every member in his task.

I congratulate the newly elected member for Mitcham. Many of the members supporting the Government have been high in their praise of the election of a young man to this House and I join with them in expressing joy that young men are gradually being elected into Australian politics. However, Liberal policy still maintains an unjust embargo upon young men entering the Legislative Council. A young man can come into this Chamber and serve with every degree of satisfaction, so it is only reasonable to carry this policy into another House. I am glad that the election of Mr. Millhouse has proved conclusively that the Liberal Party has been wrong in its contention that young men cannot serve. I did not have the pleasure of hearing him make his speech, but I have studied it and have read between the lines, and it appears to me that he was very humble and made a very wise speech. I noticed that he went to quite a degree of trouble to say to the House, and particularly to the members of the Government, that prior to entering the House when he was a member of the Young Liberal movement he did a certain

amount of growling about a certain matter. However, he assured members that now he is here he will be content to be the Liberal tail and wag the tail according to the dictates of the top dogs of the Party. I hope, however, that he will change his attitude as time goes on.

In his long defensive speech the Premier complained that the Opposition has made much reference to policy and its political objectives. I will talk about the policy of the Australian Labor Party because I believe it is the only one that can effectively put S.A. in a state of prosperity. It has been so effective that the Liberal Party has been very anxious to try to make some imitation of the planks that we desire to put into operation. I can appreciate the Premier or any Minister having a very definite desire that members of this House should refrain from talking about Party policy because I can appreciate what would happen if members supporting the Government made some attempt to become involved in the policy of the Liberal Party. The Premier brought forward a rule book of the Australian Labor Party as if it were in the nature of a document J, and quoted from it. Although the honourable member for Port Adelaide made a very satisfactory reply I point out that there is some difference between Labor Party and Liberal Party policy in the selection of candidates for political honours. In my Party some service to the Party is demanded before one is endorsed as a candidate.

The Hon. T. Playford—But surely you have heard of the card system. You can get by pretty easily.

Mr. HUTCHENS—If the Premier thinks that, it could be introduced in the Liberal Party, because he has not missed any trick to see that he has been returned to this House on every occasion. One rule of the Liberal Party Constitution is as follows:—

Any person who is and has been a financial member for not less than thirty days immediately preceding the date on which nominations are due, and who is otherwise eligible to contest an electorate and desires to receive the support of the L.C.L. at any State or Federal election, shall be nominated on the prescribed form by at least four financial members of the district concerned, and shall state thereon the name of the branch of which he is a member and that he believes in the principles of the league and its platform. The sum of £5 shall be contributed with each nomination.

I have noticed that when the Liberal Party is looking for a candidate it chases around until it finds someone who has been a good footballer, bike rider or the mayor of some town. It then whispers in his ear, he gets the 30 days' membership and he is then brought in to represent the Party in the House. Recently I was in the Newcastle district, where the Liberal and Country League was conducting a pre-selection ballot for that seat. In company with the member for Prospect I met one of the candidates, who started to tell a gathering of the abominable electoral system in South Australia. He said it would be altered and that far more seats would be given to the metropolitan area and fewer to the country. When we explained the position to him he seemed to lose interest. He was not the candidate selected, but my main point is that many people in that district who have never been interested in politics joined the Liberal and Country League. To my amazement I heard there was much interest in the pre-selection ballot, but the merits of the various candidates were of little concern. It was a question of "What are your church affiliations?" That was the line on which the pre-selection was fought, and I have it on good authority that one ordained gentleman had been very busy enlisting members for the L.C.L. so that they could support a certain candidate. I have felt justified in bringing this before the House because of the criticism that has been levelled during this debate at the Labor Party.

The old policy of window dressing was again followed in framing His Excellency's Opening Speech. The old fabrics, faded and covered with fly specks, were again brought out, the dust having been removed, and they were all skilfully displayed by the use of the modern ray lamp to give a somewhat socialistic appearance, but many of the goods displayed were borrowed without permission. Much was said about the good seasons that we have enjoyed in the past few years. The Premier seemed to claim credit for this, and I believe it is acknowledged the world over that he claims the credit for our good seasons. I recently went to an Australian-American Association dinner and heard the guest of honour comment on South Australia's good weather. He said that no doubt the Premier would tell us he was responsible for that. Possibly there is some justification for the Government claiming credit for good seasons because I do not think Providence would inflict

two evils on South Australia at once—bad seasons, and the present Government.

During this debate we have heard a good deal about the advantages that science has bestowed on rural production, but one can say that science has been used only for the development of lands that have been highly productive. His Excellency's Speech stated that 30,000,000 bushels of wheat and 18,000,000 bushels of barley were produced last season, but the areas planted to our chief cereal crops were only about one-quarter of those sown in 1915-16. Again, in 1938-39 the cereal production per head of population in South Australia was 79 bushels, but it was only 68 bushels in 1953-54. This is a matter for concern. Our overseas cereal markets are uncertain, but what a glorious chance has been missed by the short-sightedness of the Government. The Secretary of the Mill Employees' Union (the Hon. F. J. Condon, M.L.C.) said recently that in 1922-23 South Australia exported 142,000 tons of flour, but in 1953-54 that figure was down to 81,000 tons.

Mr. John Clark—He knows what he is talking about.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Certainly. It is alarming to hear of that decrease of 61,000 tons of flour exported. Recently I visited a town where I lived many years ago, and I was disappointed at the decline in the production of the area. That town once had two blacksmith shops, a coach building industry, and flour mills, but those industries have disappeared. It was rapidly becoming a ghost town and dozens of houses were falling into disrepair. A few people had bought up most of the small farms and consequently there were fewer landholders in the district. Land had increased tremendously in price. A farm, purchased in 1911 for £2 an acre and resold in 1917 for less than £4, had recently been sold for £14 an acre. Where only a few years ago there had been nine farms of between 1,000 and 2,000 acres, today they were owned by the one landholder, and some were lying idle. Despite the large sums spent on land settlement in recent years, there are today 3,000 fewer holdings in South Australia than in 1937. We have heard much about the benefits of the Playford era, but members should study the figures that were not quoted in His Excellency's Speech. In 1947, 46 per cent of South Australia's population lived in country areas, but today only 38 per cent live there.

In reply to this challenge the Government's plea will probably be, "Give us time." I

remind honourable members, however, that it is a long road that has no turning. No doubt the Premier will continue with his window dressing and give us more talk about the wonderful industrial activity in this State, but every civilized country has seen industrial development since the war. There may have been far more in this State than in the eastern States, but I point out that after a boy has grown into manhood his development is not as perceptible as it was previously, and this principle may be applied to industrial development in the various States. Real progress in this State has been retarded by Liberal interests. In the 1920's there was a plea by the late Mr. John Fitzgerald, Mr. William Harvey and others who supported Labor principles for industrial development. In those days, however, there seemed to be a real desire to keep South Australia a rural State, and it was not until that great Australian, the late Right Honourable J. B. Chifley, started to implement the Labor Party's decentralization policy that the present State Government woke up to South Australia's possibilities. The Playford Government, however, has proved to be quite incapable of keeping pace with the glorious start given it by the Federal Labor Government of the 1940's, and people are rapidly waking up to its shortcomings. Today's *News*, under the heading, "Henley Fed up Over Railway," contains the following report:—

Henley and Grange Council was "fed up" with the delay in starting construction of the new railway linking Grange and Henley Beach, the mayor, Mr. Newlands, said today. Last night the council decided to ask the National Safety Council to inspect the existing railway between the two towns. The line, running along Military road, with numerous crossovers, was dangerous, Mr. Newlands said. "The Government can find men, materials and money to build a line to serve the new Burbank factory area, but not for the deviation line Henley people have been waiting for for years," he said. Deputations from the council and the National Safety Council had unsuccessfully asked the Government to make an early start on the new line. Mr. Newlands said the existing line had been re-constructed and was much improved. But the only way to provide comfortable riding for passengers and to avoid dangerous crossings was to build the proposed new deviation line on a route to the east of the present line.

In view of this report it is interesting to read the following paragraph from His Excellency's speech in 1951:—

My Government's policy of improving the railways has been continued. The proposals for the electrification of the suburban lines, involving the duplication of the line between Wood-

ville and Henley Beach and the construction of an electrified railway from North Terrace to Glenelg, were favourably reported on by the Royal Commission on State Transport Services and are now before the Public Works Standing Committee.

In 1952 His Excellency's speech contained the following statement:—

My Ministers will seek legislative authority for the electrification of the suburban railways. A Bill will also be introduced, after the completion of any further inquiry which may be necessary, to authorize the duplication of the line between Woodville and Henley Beach. Today when I walk out of my home in the morning and see a plane overhead I wonder whether the prophet was right when he said, "They shall mount up on wings as eagles"; but when I look at the metropolitan railways I have in mind what was written about the creeping things of the earth. I am sure the writer had the South Australian railways in mind. Today Mr. Heaslip criticised one of our railway services and mentioned the deplorable state of the carriages. A rhyme is extant and it is not uncommon to hear people in the metropolitan area say:—

Little idea, where did you go?

Out to deceive, wacko!

What did you achieve in this affair?

I put the Premier back in the chair.

The Public Works Committee is continually having more work thrust upon it. From 1927 to 1948, a period of 21 years, it presented 111 reports, whereas in the following six years it submitted 134. Many of the projects are recommended and mention of them is made particularly on the eve of an election to convince the people that something really effective is going to be done.

We have heard of the wonderful job being done by the Housing Trust. I have nothing but the highest praise for its officers and members of the Public Service. Many things are preventing the trust from achieving even a better job. To say that the housing position is satisfactory is an exaggeration. It is becoming more precarious every day. Members have many more people coming to them now than for a long time. Due to the relaxation of the Landlord and Tenant Act many are being forced out of their dwellings and have nowhere to go, and are therefore compelled to live under unsatisfactory conditions. In my electorate are a number of dwellings known as Hollywood flats. These two storey buildings at Bowden are unsound, damp and dingy and look most uninviting. No-one would want to live in them if they could go elsewhere. I know of young

women with children compelled to live in abominable hovels. I have before me a certificate issued by a medical officer, who wrote as follows:—

Concerning the housing of Mr. and Mrs. —, they and their three children are living in damp, cold crowded conditions. The children suffer from repeated respiratory infections due to this. The baby is pale and undernourished. When the door is open an icy blast sweeps through the rooms. When the door is shut there is not sufficient light to see by in the daytime. There is no effective electric light. An immediate improvement in their housing conditions is necessary if their health is not to be permanently affected.

These people have been applicants for a long time with the Housing Trust, but as others are living under far more unsatisfactory conditions they cannot obtain a trust home. A number of aged widows are being forced into the street for which the Government and the housing authorities are not wholly to blame. I view with disgust the attitude of some people toward their aged parents. I know of one man who has made two trips overseas and owns two valuable motor cars, but his poor old mother is in an institution that is unfit for a human being to live in. One old soul I know has occupied for 18 years a most unsatisfactory type of dwelling and is sick, and when it rains she is obliged to put a tub in the room to catch the water that seeps through. She is being forced out of this home and has nowhere to go because the Government is incapable of providing all the housing requirements of a developing State.

I shall mention another matter because if I did not it might be thought that I am satisfied with the conditions in my electorate. I refer to the conditions of roads, particularly in the Housing Trust areas. The following is a copy of a letter I have received from a constituent, and it is in keeping with the number of complaints one gets from those areas:—

Writing as one of your constituents and on behalf of the owner-occupiers and tenants of the South Australian Housing Trust Estate here at Gleneagles, would it be possible for you to bring pressure to bear on the Woodville Council to do something to improve the appalling state of the so-called roads of this area. Dumfries, Ballater and Lanark Avenues are impassable today. They are reservoirs for the surface water from Tapley's Hill Road, and are a system of holes (left from last year's rains) some of which are two feet deep. These holes cannot be located, of course, under a sheet of water. Leven and Selkirk Avenues are a system of slightly shallower holes, with the clay showing through the cinders laid some three years ago. At the junction of Lanark and Selkirk Avenues the road level changes

abruptly approximately 1ft. 6in., and a stream runs across this junction, draining water from Lanark Avenue and Selkirk from Balcombe Avenue direction. Balcombe Avenue, too, was passable at the entrance only over a strip of gravel 1ft. wide in the roadway centre, with a similar condition turning into Selkirk. In the summer with a breeze and traffic black dust is the order of the day in the home; in winter the conditions are the foregoing. This is the third year of existence of the estate and it seems that many years will elapse before the roads and crescents (beds of noxious weeds) will be attended to. Anything you can do will be greatly appreciated and I can assure you will earn our everlasting thanks.

I wrote to the Town Clerk of Woodville about the matter and the following is part of his reply:—

I acknowledge receipt of the copy of letter from Mr. — of the Gleneagles area regarding roadways and admit that the drainage of this area is extremely bad. In view of these circumstances it is economically unsound to construct roadways until such time as the drainage of surface waters has been attended to. In addition to this, of course, the area in which Mr. — lives has been developed by the Housing Trust and up to June of last year it had been the policy of the Highways Department, under instructions from the Premier, to make moneys available to local government on loan for the construction of roadways in these subdivisions to the extent of the difference between the actual cost and the road charges collectible. As far as possible, council in the past has endeavoured to carry out road construction works in Housing Trust areas out of its general revenue. However, with the rapid development caused by the trust it has been found impossible to carry on in this manner. During this financial year an approach was made to the Highways Department for a loan to carry out road works, but advice was received that no funds were available. Following this communication a letter was then forwarded to the Premier drawing his attention to the arrangements that had existed and advising him of the difficult situation in which the refusal had placed the council and asking if he could do anything in the matter. As you are probably aware, council has embarked on an extensive underground drainage scheme which is financed by way of loan from Savings Bank of South Australia on the security of a special rate as provided in the Local Government Act. It is admitted that council could raise moneys for the construction of roadways in a similar way on the security of the general rates of the municipality but hesitates to do this because of the fact that the ratepayers may eventually object to council continuing to raise moneys by way of loan. If this happened you can see that it would jeopardise the underground drainage problem. It is for this reason that approaches have been made to the Highways Department because council is not required to receive the approval of ratepayers when this procedure is adopted.

The difficulties of local government must be appreciated. Councils are doing a reasonably good job but they cannot carry out all the essential work. To give assistance now would be only a temporary relief, and a further investigation of the matter is necessary. We have far too many councils and there is too much overlapping. There is no co-ordination of drainage and other proposals. The Government should investigate the possibility of having a union of councils. Metropolitan area councils have a total rate revenue of about £1,900,000. Of this about 60 per cent is spent on services, 30 per cent in keeping roadways and footpaths in good repair, and only about 10 per cent on new works. Because many of the councils are called upon to do work in a short time, following on housing development, they get into difficulties. According to a local paper the Woodville council at present proposes to spend £13,566. on plant to enable some of the necessary work to be done. In addition, about £4,000 is to be spent on pumping equipment. The money must be found immediately. It is really beyond the council to do so, and the time is ripe for the establishment of a Greater Adelaide. All councils should be grouped together in order to get greater co-ordination. There should be a general planning system for all the metropolitan area, instead of councils fighting amongst themselves and adopting expediency plans in order to get industries in their localities, often to the detriment of residents. This co-ordination would help in connection with transport. As examples of what we should do, I cite Brisbane and the union of councils in the Blue Mountains, where the system has been in operation for some time.

Mr. RICHES—Are the members of the Blue Mountains scheme combined in one council?

Mr. HUTCHENS—Yes. I think the rate revenue is about £650,000, and although the councillors are paid officers the entire council costs less to run than it used to cost for clerks and assistant clerks. I put forward the scheme for consideration because we have no co-ordination now. The Woodville council is raising about £200,000 by loan for drainage, and if the Hindmarsh council decides to install a drainage system in the future it will have to overlay the Woodville drainage because no preparation has been made for a connection with it. The additional expenditure that this would cause is unnecessary. The urgent need for what I advocate was borne out by a statement made by the Minister of Roads

at a ceremony in my district recently. I know that sometimes Ministers are misunderstood and an incorrect construction is placed on their remarks. However, I made a check and have found that he was reported correctly. In the press the following appeared under a heading "Our Roads Worst in Nation":—

South Australia had worse roads and fewer schools than any other State, the Minister of Local Government (Mr. Jude) said last night.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—He does not accept that.

Mr. HUTCHENS—The article continued:—

He was addressing about 250 Henley and Grange residents at a naturalization ceremony in the local council chambers. "It must be remembered that a growing State cannot have everything," Mr. Jude said.

The Minister said that Mr. Jude does not accept the first sentence, but I checked from reliable people present at the meeting who assured me that the article reports what the Minister said. There is no great disgrace in the remarks he made because they are factual, and there is nothing harmful in being truthful. I think I know why he made those remarks. He has been put in a position and charged with a responsibility, and the money has not been forthcoming, so in a state of frustration he said what he did. If we are to overcome this difficulty it must be by the co-operation of the Government, so I hope my suggestion will be considered.

I now come to a very important subject raised by the member for Gawler, and if there is anyone who can speak with authority on education it is he. He made a few claims about education, and drew attention to the seriousness of the shortage of teachers. It is interesting that when the Premier replied he travelled over the whole of the universe and picked out little parts from speeches to which to reply, but he did not say one word in reply to the member for Gawler. Why? Simply because the Government had no answer. That is a tragedy, for he was asked to say what will be the results of this extreme shortage of teachers. The future of this State and its progress depends largely upon two things, home and education, so this matter should be freely discussed. Recently a questionnaire was taken to ascertain what effects the shortage would have on the children. I will deal with one or two of the replies given. In a large primary school in a suburban area the headmaster found himself in great difficulties because during the course of the year about 130 days were taken up in sick leave. Owing to the shortage of teachers only temporary staff was made available for relief on 30 days. This meant that

in many cases classes were lumped together in a room that was quite inadequate, containing 70 children instead of 45. Desks, books and other things had to be moved, causing great inconvenience and strain on the staff, which was already overworked. When the teachers returned from sick leave they had the responsibility of teaching oversized classes and catching up with the work. One class at a school in the western districts last year had no fewer than 20 teachers for the year. Honourable members can imagine what effect this had on the students, because teachers have to get to know the peculiarities of each scholar to teach them effectively, and the scholars have to become used to the teacher. This sort of thing is happening in every school today, and the opinion expressed by the people who answered the queries was that the ultimate effects upon the scholars would be too great to estimate. These conditions will be to the detriment of their education and the State. Of course, this sort of thing is common not only to schools in the metropolitan area, but in the country too. A head teacher, on taking over a country school, found 52 pupils in grades VI and VII; in the next lower grade 50; in the next 50 again; and 44 in grade II. His teachers were changed rapidly, his head male assistant being transferred and never replaced, and he had to put many pupils into one class. A definite declaration of the Government's intentions will be required to convince people that a sincere effort is being made to overcome staffing problems.

A recent edition of the *Advertiser* stated that the Minister of Education had announced new school plans. The schools proposed were all in the south-western districts of the metropolitan area. I am concerned because many schools have been proposed for the western districts for a long time. In 1943 land was bought in West Croydon, bordered by Croydon Avenue, Torrens Road, Brown Street and Bedford Street for the purpose of erecting a boys' technical school. Ever since that time we have been told we were to get a permanent structure, but today we still have spread across that small area of 13 acres a number of cabins in which to educate our scholars. Every time I look at those wooden structures I am reminded of Uncle Tom's Cabin. I appreciate that teachers cannot give of their best under such unsatisfactory conditions. Because land in the Croydon area was allowed to be sold for housing the Government had to place a girls' school on that 13 acres, so now we have two secondary schools there. Perhaps I should not

say schools, but promised schools on that land. Does the district of Hindmarsh have to endure a long waiting period for permanent schools because the Government cannot get many votes there? Will people in borderline districts get schools first in order to get more votes for the Government? I fear that is the position. A few temporary buildings were erected in another part of my area as a high school, and teachers and pupils work under appalling conditions there. Of the 23 schools in my district 11 are public, and I express my appreciation for the work of the teachers. With few exceptions, they seem to have complete unanimity of purpose. They are willing to make the best of what are acknowledged to be unsatisfactory conditions.

One of the Premier's remarks cannot go unchallenged. He referred to prices in South Australia and in other States. He quoted a number of commodities that were selling more cheaply here than in Victoria and Western Australia, but he played politics cleverly. He was at least a little unfair, for he quoted the prices operating on one day in making his comparisons. The only fair way to ascertain whether South Australians are able to buy more cheaply than people of other States is to compare prices over a period of 12 months. The Premier quoted egg and potato prices, but shortly after his speech we found from the *Sunday Advertiser* that eggs had jumped 2d. a dozen in South Australia.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—But they are still far cheaper than in Melbourne.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Yes, but there was recently a change of Government in Melbourne and the price of eggs there is now very high. Taken over a period of 12 months South Australians would be no better off than people in other States. The Premier made his usual remarks that he would take notice of points raised by members. I think most members on this side are grateful to the Minister of Works for the prompt attention he gives to any matter raised. His attention far exceeds that of most Ministers, but it was interesting to hear the Premier's remarks because as a result of a little work I did last year in a temporary capacity I was able to count the number of speeches made in the House last session. The fact that last session Labor members averaged 24 speeches a member and Government supporters, excluding Ministers, only 14, proves beyond doubt that the needs of the people receive greater attention from Opposition members than from Government members.

South Australians have long appreciated that fact, and there is no doubt in their minds that Labor represents the majority and gives the most accurate representation in this House. South Australians look forward to the day when, despite the unjust electoral system, their party—the Labor Party—will govern in this State.

Mr. FRED WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE'S REPORTS.

The SPEAKER laid on the table reports by the Public Works Committee, together with minutes of evidence, on Hendon Infant School and Thebarton Infant School.

Ordered that reports be printed.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.03 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, June 8, at 2 p.m.