

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.**

Wednesday, August 13, 1958.

The SPEAKER (Hon. B. H. Teusner) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

**QUESTIONS.****STRATHALBYN RESERVOIR.**

Mr. JENKINS—Following on the dry season and the lack of intake into the Strathalbyn reservoir last winter the department searched for a suitable bore to supplement the water in the reservoir. Can the Minister of Works say whether the department found water and, if not, what provision has been made in case of drought next summer?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The Mines Department has been requested to make a geological examination to assess the possibility of obtaining a bore or bores of large capacity in the Macclesfield area with a view to augmenting the supply in the Strathalbyn reservoir in the summer months. Arrangements for this investigation are in hand by the Mines Department and it is expected that the field work will be commenced shortly.

**MEDICAL BENEFITS ORGANIZATIONS.**

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I have received a letter from a country resident who claims that he has not received full benefits from a medical benefits organization, and it would appear from the letter that he heard the subject of unregistered insurance companies mentioned in a recent radio broadcast. The letter states:—

Since March I have sent accounts for payment, also written them, but they won't send a penny or even answer my letters. There are quite a number around here who are getting the same treatment.

Apparently the company has not met its liabilities in this matter. If I give this letter to the Treasurer will he investigate the operations of this company?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—This matter has already come to the notice of the Attorney-General, who has investigated its legal aspects. As a result of those investigations legislation may be introduced soon. The matter is being closely examined by the Crown Law Office at present to see what form of legislation would be applicable and I assure the honourable member that he will probably hear more about it this session. If he gives me the letter it will help to ensure that the legislation deals with the problem that has arisen.

**CONTROL OF SOURSOBS.**

Mr. GOLDNEY—Has the Minister of Agriculture a further reply to my question of last week concerning experiments conducted by the Agriculture Department in the control of soursobs?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I have received a report on this matter, but as it is too long to read to the House, I will comment briefly on some of its contents. Control measures against the weed may be grouped under three headings: cultivation, spraying, and pasture competition. Regarding control by cultivation, the most effective control is obtained when cultivations are given in late winter; August is usually the critical month. Regarding control by chemical methods, there is no known chemical treatment that is effective and economic for large-scale application. Non-selective chemicals may be used to eradicate soursobs from small areas, but the cost is prohibitive for extensive infestations. These chemicals cannot be used if it is desired to retain useful plants growing in association with soursobs. Concerning control by plant competition, recent work by the Department of Agriculture has shown that suitable pastures will enable a substantial measure of control. Species that are capable of rapid early growth are able to compete more successfully than slower growing ones. The Clare strain of subterranean clover and snail clover are two examples of pasture plants that get away quickly enough to deal successfully with soursob competition. It is also clear from this work that heavier seeding rates will assist considerably toward soursob control. This work also shows conclusively that pasture management has a marked effect on the balance of competition between pastures and soursobs. I will make the full report available to the honourable member.

**ACQUISITION OF LAND FOR SCHOOLS.**

Mr. TAPPING—I have learned that often when the Government desires to buy land to build schools exorbitant prices have been asked by the owners of the land. In some cases it has been over £1,000 an acre, which I consider most exorbitant. Will the Minister of Education explain the procedure in a dispute that may occur over the price of land to be purchased?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—By and large, the Government acts on the report and valuation of the Land Board, but if I, as Minister of Education, say I am willing and anxious to have land for school-building purposes the

board may consider that aspect of the matter and recommend a higher figure. Alternatively, Cabinet is sometimes willing to offer a somewhat higher figure—but not much higher—than the board's valuation. In recent years many owners of land we desire to buy have placed on it a value that is twice, and sometimes nearly three times as much as the board's valuation. If we still think it is necessary or highly desirable to obtain the land, we continue to negotiate as best we can, but if there is a deadlock we are obliged to withdraw. In a few cases Cabinet, with the greatest reluctance, agrees to my recommendation to compulsorily acquire the land in question, but even then we serve a notice to treat on the owner or owners and the whole matter is still wide open for negotiation.

#### THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN STORY.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Recently I received what I considered a very valuable book entitled *The Story of South Australia*, which traces the development of the State and describes its beauty spots. I believe it portrays South Australia in a right and proper manner. In other States I have been able to secure books of this type from tourist bureaux; they usually point out the advantages that can be obtained by visiting their States and what can be seen there. As I believe *The Story of South Australia* would meet the requirements of the South Australian Tourist Bureau and help advertise this State I ask the Premier whether he will consider that book, or one of the same type, being made available from the Tourist Bureau.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Does the honourable member desire to have the book made available free of charge?

Mr. Hutchens—No.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will have the matter examined on the basis that there would be some charge for it and that the Tourist Bureau would act as an agent for distribution. I think it is a good suggestion.

#### FUNDS FOR EDUCATION.

Mr. FRED WALSH—I wish to quote a statement appearing in the *School Post*, the official organ of the South Australian Public Schools Committees' Association, over the name of Mr. Colin R. Gargett, president of the association. It states:—

In his replies to the deputation which waited on the Prime Minister after the Canberra conference, in May last, Mr. Menzies stated that no Premier had asked for funds specifically for education. If this is the case, surely the time

has arrived when we must convince our Premier and his Ministers that the education system of South Australia requires huge sums to be spent to compete with present-day needs.

Has the State Government applied to the Prime Minister for funds for educational purposes? If so, what was the nature of the reply and if not, is such an approach contemplated?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I believe the Prime Minister's reply was correct in the sense that, when conferences are held in respect of money being made available to the State from taxation, we never apply for money under specific headings. The States set out their requirements, and every conference has emphasized the tremendous amount of money required for education—and of course, for hospitals and other services; so an important matter is involved in the question. Education is normally the function of the State, and money to be spent on it is voted by the State Parliament. If the Commonwealth Government, in allocating money to the State, proceeded to say that so much was for education and so much for hospitals it would largely take over the functions of this Parliament. The Prime Minister would not be correct in saying that the States have not emphasized time and again that they were not getting enough money for education and that they must have more money for it, but he was correct in saying that the States have never asked specifically as a conference for money purely for educational purposes.

#### WITHDRAWAL OF MANSLAUGHTER CHARGE.

Mr. LAWN—A report in yesterday's *Advertiser* stated that after a case before a court had proceeded a considerable way the Crown abandoned a charge against a man of manslaughter of a girl of 15. The accused pleaded guilty to dangerous driving. According to the press, the evidence showed that three hours after the accident the man was found apparently asleep at his home and under the influence of liquor. A woman gave sworn evidence that she was a passenger in the motor car and that the driver seemed to lose his reason, drove erratically and fast, and ignored her requests to stop. Will the Minister representing the Attorney-General obtain a report from his colleague showing why the charge of manslaughter was abandoned?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I shall be pleased to do so, but I take this early opportunity of saying that in my opinion it is an unprofitable and unpalatable practice to discuss in this House proceedings which are

taking place or have recently taken place in a court of law without our knowing all the circumstances and what prompted the judge to take the course he did.

Mr. Lawn—No, it was the Crown.

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Or the Crown either. I think it is better to obtain a detailed report before we enlarge on our discussions in this Chamber.

#### GAWLER ADULT EDUCATION CENTRE.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—As the Minister of Education knows, the Gawler Education Centre is now a big centre and doing fine work. It is getting bigger because it is now serving the Barossa Valley as well as the district formerly served, and I am particularly interested in its cultural activities. In the next week or two an opera will be produced and I think it will be a fine performance, but the centre is hampered by a lack of adequate facilities. Its various buildings are scattered in odd places throughout the town. Some time ago land was purchased with the idea of building an adult education centre there, and I ask the Minister whether plans have been prepared for this building and whether he will regard its erection as a matter of urgency.

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I endorse all that the honourable member has said concerning the high standard of the work conducted at the Gawler Education Centre, and I share his high regard for the outstanding qualities and abilities of its officers. I also realize the great need for further buildings, but the formulation of the Loan works programme is the prerogative of the Treasurer, and I think I heard him say in the House yesterday that the programme was complete, subject to some alterations. As it is close to being presented I would rather that the details be disclosed by the Treasurer than that I should anticipate them in this regard or in regard to a variety of schools and additions to schools.

#### INEBRIATES' HOME.

Mr. DUNSTAN—On many occasions I have raised the question of the appointment of some institution under the Inebriates' Act as a home for the compulsory treatment of alcoholics. Can the Premier say whether Cabinet has considered the establishment of an inebriates' home and the declaration of the home under the Act?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I would like to refresh my memory as to what

action has been taken. If the honourable member will remind me next week I shall endeavour to have complete information for him.

#### PORT AUGUSTA POWER STATION.

Mr. RICHES—Has the Premier obtained a report on the erection of a chimney at the A power station at Port Augusta and the effects the engineers hope to achieve thereby?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have received the following report:—

Tenders have been called for a new stack for the Port Augusta "A" power station to have a nominal height of 260ft. The purpose of this stack will be to emit the smoke at a height which will keep it clear of down-draughts and eddies caused by the presence of the power station buildings and so carry it clear of the town of Port Augusta. In order to obtain full information on this matter a scale model of the power station is being constructed by the Aeronautical Research Laboratories of the Department of Supply in Melbourne and this will be tested in the department's wind tunnel. The Chief Engineer of the trust will be attending the tests on Thursday this week. From the result of these tests the final height of the stack will be determined. When Port Augusta "B" power station, which will be provided with electrostatic precipitators, is in operation the amount of coal burnt in the "A" station will be appreciably reduced and, in conjunction with the higher stack, it is expected that this will eliminate the dust problem under normal meteorological conditions. It is not feasible, except at a prohibitive cost, to install electrostatic precipitators in an existing power station.

#### SOUTH-EAST HARBOUR WORKS.

Mr. CORCORAN—The construction of a slipway at Beachport has been in hand for some time, as has the building of a jetty at South End to provide for the needs of fishermen in that locality. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether these works are proceeding according to plan and, if so, when they are likely to be completed and ready for use?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I will get a full report on both matters.

#### COMPENSATION FOR ACQUISITION OF PRIVATE PROPERTY.

Mr. JENNINGS—Yesterday the Minister of Education replied to a question I had asked previously concerning land acquisition in my district, but I was thoroughly dissatisfied with his answer and I have a faint suspicion that he, too, was somewhat dissatisfied with the reply supplied to him by the Attorney-General. Will he refer the matter back for another answer?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I shall be pleased to comply with the honourable member's request to refer the matter again to the Attorney-General, but I do not know the reply he requires. However, we will do our best to accommodate him.

#### DAIRYING PROSPECTS.

Mr. BYWATERS—Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked on July 30 relating to Dr. T. H. Strong's gloomy forecast on our dairying prospects?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I have a report which is too lengthy to be read completely, but its effect is that Dr. Strong's comments related mainly to the export market and overall Australian dairy production rather than the local situation. During the past six months returns for butter and cheese on the U.K. market fell below cost of production. However, in recent weeks prices have recovered. Cheese prices have risen by over 20 per cent and prospects are that they will continue to firm. South Australia is the second largest cheese producing State in the Commonwealth and production of top quality cheese has been a factor in the recovery of cheese prices. South Australia is an importer of butter and only exports token quantities of butter not required for local use. This State produces approximately 90 million gallons of milk each year. If produced evenly throughout the year, and utilized according to needs, it would be just sufficient for all requirements. However, production is seasonal and because of this there are shortages of butter and liquid milk in some areas at certain times. As the population increases more and more of South Australia's milk production will be used as liquid milk and for cheese. Officers of the department are available for advice on husbandry practices aimed at improving dairy production. I think it will be agreed that the prospects for the South Australian dairy industry are not as gloomy as Dr. Strong's comments imply.

#### MOUNT GAMBIER NORTH PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. RALSTON—Yesterday a report of the Public Works Committee was tabled recommending the construction of a primary school at Mount Gambier North. The need is urgent. Is it the intention of the Minister of Education to commence construction this financial year?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I cannot say whether it is my intention but it is my desire. The member asked me a somewhat similar question about a fortnight ago and I went as

far as humanly possible in the circumstances to give him as favourable reply as I could. He mentioned the tabling of a report from the Public Works Committee yesterday, but I remind him that it was only one of 15 reports tabled. I have not had an opportunity of discussing this matter with the Premier since his return, so I do not know how many of these schools will be included in the Loan programme, but I am an incurable optimist.

#### SOLDIER SETTLEMENT.

Mr. STOTT—Can the Minister of Lands state whether there is any alteration in the Government's policy regarding approved soldier applicants for land in view of the fact that the Commonwealth Government has now practically abandoned the soldier settlement scheme in South Australia. I am referring more particularly to single-unit farms in irrigated areas. Some applicants for these farms have already been approved. What hope have they of getting single-unit farms or other blocks in irrigated areas?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I take it the honourable member is referring only to irrigation blocks. It is true that only a small number of settlers are eligible under the soldier settlement scheme for irrigation blocks. The Federal Minister has said that group schemes will not be proceeded with after next year, but the Premier has stated—and I agree entirely—that we hope the Federal Government will agree to single-unit farms. With that in view the State Government is making a considerable sum of money available for development of single-unit farms up to a certain stage so that when they are brought to that stage they can be offered to the Federal Government as single-unit proposals. That applies to dry lands as well as to irrigated. We will proceed immediately with the development of some of those areas with a view to submitting them to the Commonwealth for approval.

#### RAILWAY EMPLOYEES' APPEALS.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—In May last I introduced to the Minister of Railways a deputation consisting of representatives of the Trades and Labor Council and different industrial organizations with employees in the South Australian Railways. It requested that the law on the right to appeal against dismissals should be tidied up by some amendments and that a right of appeal against promotions should be provided. The Minister subsequently

wrote to me, and one paragraph of his letter said:—

I will undertake to make the necessary arrangements with the Railways Commissioner, Mr. Fargher, upon his return from overseas, to meet a suitable deputation upon this matter. Can the Minister of Works inform me whether any further discussion has taken place between the unions and the Railways Commissioner on these two rather important subjects, and if not, whether discussions in the near future are contemplated?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I am not conversant with the matters raised, but I will direct the inquiry to my colleague and ask him to supply the information.

#### CONTROL OF GRANITE ISLAND.

Mr. JENKINS—As the Premier is aware, Granite Island is under the control of two or three authorities for administration and the keeping up of its appointments. It is beyond the capacity of the Victor Harbour Corporation to bring the appointments up to the desired standard, and in order to get some clear picture, will the Premier ask either the Director of the Tourist Bureau or some other competent official to visit Victor Harbour to inspect the area with me so that something may be done to rehabilitate the Island's appointments?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I am rather a believer in these various activities being under local control, because I think very much is to be gained from having their supervision conducted locally. I would be prepared to make available the Director of the Tourist Bureau to go to Victor Harbour to consult with the honourable member's council with the object of having the Island vested in that body as a place of recreation, and we might even give him a small grant to take it over. This would probably be the best way to control this lovely place which gives pleasure to many citizens throughout the State. I will have this done.

#### OUTBREAK OF GASTRO-ENTERITIS.

Mr. TAPPING—Last week I directed a question to the Minister of Works about an outbreak of gastro-enteritis, and I believe the Premier has obtained a reply.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have a reply which I am prepared to give the honourable member in full, but it is not necessary to incorporate it all in *Hansard*. The newspaper report to which he referred mentioned some hundreds of cases, but that

appears to be an exaggeration. The report I have obtained shows that there is rather an unusual number of outbreaks for this time of the year—actually 46 have been reported in the three months—and of those some 30 are still being treated, I believe, at the Adelaide Children's Hospital. No cause has been ascertained for the outbreak, which comes in isolated cases and not in groups, but the department is making a survey of all cases to see if it can trace them back to some common origin at some place or other. The report emphasizes that there is no cause for alarm. I assure the honourable member that the department is taking every possible action to trace the cause of the spread of the disease and have it removed. Incidentally, the disease is notifiable, which helps considerably in tracing any common origin.

#### PRESERVATION OF NATIVE TREE.

Mr. QUIRKE—My question concerns a unique tree that grows in two places in Australia—one in an area in Clare and another in Victoria. Although I do not know its correct name, it is known locally as the pink cored stringy bark, and it belongs to a long-past age when the flora of this country was entirely different from what it is today. Many people desire that an area of this tree should be preserved, but although the matter has been raised before, no action has been taken. Will the Minister of Agriculture obtain a report as to the method of preserving at least a small area of this unique item of flora?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—This type of tree is quite new to me, old as it is, but I will investigate the matter and let the honourable member know the outcome.

#### NEW ERA PRISON FARM.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Will Cabinet give early consideration to a prison farm at New Era?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—As the honourable member probably knows, a project was submitted to the Public Works Committee and was reported upon favourably, but the department subsequently decided that the activity originally submitted should be increased in size. Consequently, matter was referred back to the committee and was the subject of a report furnished to the House this week. I hope this matter will be dealt with in time for this year's Loan Estimates.

# MARION ROAD RAILWAY CROSSING.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Has the Minister of Works a further reply to my recent question concerning protection for a drain at the Marion Road railway crossing?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The Minister of Roads states:—

The Commissioner of Highways has advised that Marion Road is a district road under the care and control of the Marion Council. At the time of inspection, sighter posts had been re-erected alongside the drain, which should obviate the trouble complained of.

# WANBI RESEARCH STATION.

Mr. STOTT—Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether his department intends to put down a deep bore at the Wanbi Research Station to determine the capacity of the lower sub-artesian basin in that locality and the consequent possibilities of irrigating the area for lucerne and other grazing grasses? Further, if the department intends to do so, when will the project be started, and will he ascertain what capacity, per hour, of the bore is considered an economic unit to maintain the growth of, say, 25 acres of lucerne?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I will get a report for the honourable member as soon as possible.

# APPROACHES TO FERRIES.

Mr. BYWATERS—Prior to the disastrous River Murray flood in 1956 money was allocated for the raising of the approaches to the ferries at Walker's Flat and Purnong, but owing to the flood the work was postponed and I was promised that it would proceed soon after the flood subsided. Some time has elapsed since then and residents are concerned because the work has not been proceeded with. I wrote to the previous Minister of Works and was told that the work would be done when money was again made available. As the river is low at present and this would be an ideal time to do the work, can the Minister of Works say when it is likely to commence?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I will ask the Minister of Roads for a report.

# ERADICATION OF MISTLETOE.

Mr. RICHES—It has been suggested previously that the possible elimination or at least the arresting of the ravages of mistletoe in the Flinders Ranges be investigated and several methods, including the importation of possums, have been suggested. The Minister of the day said that, by arrangement with the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organ-

ization, the Agriculture Department was interesting itself in possible methods of eradication. Will the Minister of Agriculture obtain from the C.S.I.R.O. a progress report on this matter?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—Yes.

# MARGINAL LAND LEASES.

Mr. STOTT—Some time ago many marginal land leases were transferred back and many settlers who took up these leases now find it extremely difficult to get an advance from private banks and other financial institutions because these institutions are not happy about advances on such leases. As this matter is causing serious concern in my district because of the restriction of credit and the dry season last year, will the Minister of Lands take up with Cabinet and his department the possibility of transferring the leases back so that the settlers will have a security of a value more in line with that required by the banks so that they may obtain advances to do essential developmental work?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—Some years ago land was aggregated to make living areas and the Commonwealth Government from time to time has made available large sums to assist the men on these blocks. Further, the Lands Department makes available to them from time to time advances for water, fencing, clearing and other items. If the honourable member has any settler in mind and gives me his name, I will have the case investigated.

# ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from August 12. Page 349.)

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra)—I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the speech with which His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor opened this fourth session of the 35th Parliament. Since his passing, many nice things have been said about my late colleague and friend, Mr. John Fletcher. When he was with us everyone spoke well of him, so what has been said after his decease has been only a repetition of what people, and particularly members, said about him in life. He was a good friend and a good representative of the district of Mount Gambier. We all mourn his passing, and I offer my sincere sympathy to his widow and family. I congratulate the new member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Ralston) on his election. From what we know of him so far he seems to be a straightforward type of man,

who will give adequate representation to the people of Mount Gambier and I trust that when he has finished serving his constituents they will be able to pass the same verdict on him as they have on his predecessor. Some people in this place will look forward to his defeat at the elections, but that depends largely on how he does his job for the district he represents.

Another member has old associations with this House. I refer to the member for Albert (the Hon. Sir Malcolm McIntosh). I cannot let pass this opportunity of expressing my thanks for the great assistance he has given me over the many years I have been in this House and like other members I want him to know that his outstanding service here will always be prominent in the annals of government in this State. It is our great loss that he has had to resign from the Ministry. He worked very hard in serving the State so well, and we trust that his years in retirement will be pleasant and marked by the satisfaction that comes from a job well done. I congratulate the member for Flinders (Hon. G. G. Pearson) on his elevation to Minister of Works and Marine. This is the second portfolio he has had in a short time, and it is no small thing for a man to be elevated to the Ministry. We are apt to overlook that in a vast organization such as the British Commonwealth of Nations, it is impossible to have administration from one centralized point, say, London, so administration must be decentralized and become part and parcel of the various components of the Empire that was and the Commonwealth that is.

The members of the Cabinet have an exalted title. They are Ministers of the Crown; in other words, the responsibilities of the Crown are entrusted to them, and I am certain that all members, and the people, agree that our Ministers are able and worthy holders of their portfolios. The Minister of Works is not the least among these gentlemen, and during the Premier's absence on duties overseas the House was gratified by the way in which he, as acting Leader of the House, carried out his duties. The Minister of Agriculture (Hon. D. N. Brookman) comes from a family that has been closely associated with agriculture for generations. I well remember his father, the late Mr. Norman Brookman, who knew that the soil, on which the livelihood of our people depends, is a medium of production that is unfathomable in its mysteries. He was a man of great wisdom, and that

wisdom now resides in his son, who is no less interested in what is necessary to promote the fruitfulness of the soil. He is an honest man, and no greater tribute can be paid to him than that.

During this debate some things have been said that, upon reflection, those saying them would not have said. For instance, the member for Hindmarsh (Mr. Hutchens), in congratulating the new Minister of Agriculture on his appointment, said, "He is an extremely honest gentleman, which leads me to believe that politically he is hopeless." I think the member for Hindmarsh thinks he is a very able politician. That is the obvious inference, but I do not think the member for Hindmarsh realized just what he was saying, and we must remember that what we say here can be used as evidence against us, even long after we have left. The mover of the motion (Mr. Hambour) and the seconder (Mr. Harding) made thoughtful contributions to the debate. No matter how much criticism can be levelled against them on Party lines, the fact remains that, although unsuccessful attempts have been made to belittle what they said, no constructive criticism has yet been offered of the points they put forward. However, the member for Hindmarsh (Mr. Hutchens) did say this:—

The Government has a peculiar habit of trying to select members to perform certain duties in the session immediately preceding an election and, as a result, a bee man was chosen to second the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and a shopkeeper to move it. No doubt the shopkeeper was chosen to put on a display, and what a display it was! In the opinion of most it was an outstanding display of political neurosis.

That is just plain nonsense, and as a neutral observer I deprecate using a man's background as a method of insulting him. I have had a lot to do with pigs and have milked cows and am not ashamed of that background, but would the honourable member insult me because of it? He knows quite a lot about rabbit skins, but we do not criticize him for that. I do not know why he should criticize a shopkeeper or a beekeeper. Beekeeping is an honest occupation with plenty of sting in it. It is extremely pleasant, highly educational and important from a nutritional point of view although not very profitable. We should not insult members because of their occupations, or encourage what happened in this Chamber yesterday when a member attacked a person who was unable to defend himself. The person who made the attack also stated that we

should uphold the dignity of Parliament. If he was upholding the "dignity of Parliament" during his attack I apparently do not know the meaning of the phrase.

The agricultural season is much better than we thought possible a few weeks ago, but whether the harvest be good, bad or indifferent, depends on the future. A dry spring could be disastrous from the agricultural point of view and also from the point of view of fruit-growers because it is usually the herald of devastating frost visitations which have such an adverse effect on horticulture, viticulture and like avocations. I hope the season will be good and that we will have sufficient rain to ensure a good harvest.

The member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) wisely urged farmers to undertake greater fodder conservation, but his remarks could be interpreted to mean that the farmers do not conserve fodder and are guilty of indiscretion in their husbandry. I remind members that for the last two years farmers have had to handfeed their animals and have had to rely on fodder that has been conserved. The condition of the stock at present redounds to the credit of the farmers. If we have a dry spring this year farmers will be unable to build up big reserves which are vital in the early autumn for lambing ewes. From the appearance of the grass it appears to me that there will not be a heavy flush of feed and I believe we are carrying too many stock. Indeed, unloading in some areas is vital. It is better to unload and take a small margin of loss now than to carry on and make a severe loss later. Most farmers are aware of that and are waiting for that bloom that will come on to their animals as a result of the rain before discreetly placing them on the market. We cannot continue to expect the wonderful bounty that we have had and it could happen that this year is the precursor of an even drier year next year. I hope that does not happen, but any person with large numbers of stock would be wise to anticipate such an eventuality.

Mr. Hughes seemed to have some doubts about rainmaking and suggested that it was against nature and, consequently, dangerous. I do not think so. We are taking uranium from the earth at Radium Hill; coal from Leigh Creek; spraying to eliminate weeds from our crops; infecting rabbits with myxomatosis; spraying blowflies; and spraying codlin moth with D.D.T. and doing many other things that represent an interference with nature.

I do not think there is any difference between raising coal, which is one element, or a complex arrangement of many elements, from the ground and striving to make rain. I cannot see how that is against nature. It is certainly giving nature a prod along, but the C.S.I.R.O. does not claim in its report that it has had any success in rain making, although it claims it has had the basis on which to work in order to achieve success in the precipitation of rainfall, admitting all the time that you cannot get it from an open blue sky, but must have the clouds there before it is possible, by seeding in various ways, to cause rain to fall.

Of course, you can get in a bit of bother with this rainfall. If I have a nice crop of currants just ready to be smashed by rain and the man next door wants to have rain on his lucerne, and it falls on my currants, there will be some trouble. Even now, nature does not consider anyone, because it can send down a hailstorm that will ruin the currants. On page 162 of *Hansard* Mr. Hutchens made this statement about agriculture:—

I have not seen any great prospects of a bountiful season. I wish to goodness there were but in the most prosperous areas I have seen with regret poverty making a mockery of people who paid high prices for land and who are working to try to overcome their difficulties.

Difficulties they may have, but as to poverty making a mockery of people—that is just not correct. There is no poverty in any of the rural areas of South Australia anyhow. There are people with overdrafts, but that is not poverty; it is a normal way of doing business. Perhaps there are people who have difficulty in increasing their overdrafts, but where is the poverty that is so rampant in South Australia? That statement is not correct and should not have been made. We should not write South Australia down like that. Good heavens, that is not our job here. We should write it up. There is not a farmer in South Australia who does not resent an implication that he is a bad farmer, and that is what such a statement means, because if there is any poverty in rural farming areas it is due to the farmer himself. He should not be there if he is poverty-stricken today. We can forget the honourable member's statement and not be worried about his concern for the Party line in making it.

The recent compulsory X-ray examination has shown that notwithstanding all we are doing tuberculosis is still increasing. The member for Port Adelaide (Mr. Stephens) is



looking in my direction, so I should indicate that this increase has occurred despite free milk for schoolchildren. Sooner or later we will have to give them some good orange juice instead of milk. I have often wondered whether there is some relationship between the incidence of disease and the high prices of protective foods, such as eggs and butter, which guard the human body against the attacks of the elements whose duty it is to destroy—and nature always destroys the unfit. If human beings or animals become devitalized it is axiomatic that nature sets out to destroy them. The way to prevent that destruction is to see that the resistance is such that the human being or animal can fight or ward off the attacks of those elements which are there for the express purpose of destroying. To do that we must have protective foods, such as butter, eggs, fruit and vegetables, all of which are getting into the high price bracket.

I have often wondered if there is any relationship between the increase in hire purchase on motor cars and things now considered necessary in the home, coupled with the high cost of productive foodstuffs, and disease. This is something we should investigate. We have a restriction on the manufacture of margarine. Admittedly it is a good foodstuff, but it is in competition with butter. The member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) will be looking up in a minute, but he need not be distressed by the proposal that was put to me. Both margarine and butter are protective foodstuffs. One is animal fat, and the other can be animal or vegetable fats. In England and other places margarine can have a butter content; in other words, the fat has a butterfat content. We are finding some difficulty with our butter exports, and it would be possible to increase the consumption of margarine if the price were reduced by making it with a proportion of butter. I do not know the economics, but this is an extremely good protective foodstuff that could be sold more cheaply than butter, and might in that way enhance local butter sales. I am putting this forward for investigation because it would help dairymen by having more butter sold, and there would be a reduction in price which could lead to a greater consumption of a highly protective foodstuff. I leave it to others to decide whether this is worth considering, because it would have to be ascertained if my suggestion would work.

Another matter that has concerned me since 1949 is the effect of the cockchafer larvae. I have referred to this matter before, and I shall

refer to it again because it is important, but again research is necessary. This grub is one of the factors that has reduced production in the South-East, and it is becoming common throughout Australia. We have had it in Clare, and in places there are vast numbers over small areas. In the South-East it is working over not small areas but hundreds of acres, making bare earth where once there were strong pastures. There must be a reason for that. These things do not happen merely because the food there is good for it; there is some other fundamental reason why that pest congregates and breeds in such vast numbers.

Members will recall that when the Minister of Agriculture was asked a question relative to the depredations of this cockchafer grub I added a question by saying, "Does that infestation occur on the strawberry clover country?" Strawberry clover country is alkaline country; it is not acid but somewhere around the neutral point of pH7. The reason that subterranean clover is used is that it will grow on a highly acid soil, even on soil round about pH4.5, but at that degree of acidity there will be no grass. We have to come down closer to the pH7 before we can get grass into the pastures at all. Subterranean clover is a highly nitrogenous plant and, if it is used as a mono diet, it brings in its train all the stock diseases that occur in the South-East. I am perfectly certain of that. People down there who had the natural cover, be it only banksia and scrub oak and other growth, knew perfectly well that if they wanted stock to recover from attacks of disease and they had a lot of undeveloped country, one way to cure the animals was to turn them out on that undeveloped country and they got better without the ministrations of veterinary surgeons, chemical formulae and so on. I remember speaking to that pioneer of production in the South-East, Mr. Schinkel of Kybybolite. I asked him, "What are you doing with these paddocks; why are you not developing them?" and he said, "In there, subterranean clover is a weed; they are my hospital paddocks," and so they were. This way they would recover from the effects of a monodiet of clover, and that soil was put down to subterranean clover when it was so highly acid that it grew nothing but sorrel and had to be written off as an economic possibility. The advent of subterranean clover saved that country because it would grow on acid soil.

When I was travelling through that country with the Land Settlement Committee 15 years

ago I passed through the Kybybolite Experimental Farm which the year before had had a grass fire through it which had burned the fences around the plots. The sheep had access to the whole of that land. There was a legend in front of every little acre paddock. One paddock of one acre was eaten so close to the ground that it appeared white underneath, very similar to the colour of ground when a massive amount of vegetation is removed. One legend was as follows: "Fertilized for the last 10 years with 1cwt. of superphosphate, for 10 years previously a half a ton of calcium carbonate." Ten years afterwards that acre of land was eaten down to the dirt by the sheep that had free access to it, but the surrounding pasture was three inches high. There must be a reason why that small block was more palatable to the sheep than the surrounding country. Animals know what is good for them. They knew that the growth on the acre block was good for them, therefore they ate it until it was impossible to get any more off it. It had had a half a ton of calcium carbonate on it 10 years before.

In 1949 I asked what must have been the record question of all time because it occupies two pages of *Hansard*, starting from page 1609. I asked for leave to have that question inserted without being read, and the then Speaker, with some doubts, gave me permission. It is an extremely valuable document today. I do not propose to read it all, but I ask those who are concerned with the South-East and higher rainfall districts of South Australia to make a note of that *Hansard* reference and read the report which came from the then Director of Agriculture, Mr. Spafford. It is in the form of a series of answers to a series of questions. One question is as follows:—

What areas in South Australia are in need of lime applications?

The answer was:—

The provision of lime for application to soils has been so terribly expensive in South Australia up until now that not a great deal of it has been done, and because of the costliness of the job it can only prove an economic proposition where very big increases in production are brought about as a result of its application. There appears to be no doubt that anywhere in South Australia where stringybark, yacca, and bracken formed an appreciable proportion of the natural scrub, or where sheep's sorrel appeared thickly on cultivated land and persisted for some years, there is a marked shortage of lime, and that the making good of the shortage would lead to considerably increased production and better health of the livestock being maintained.

Apart altogether from the question of whether we increase production, increased health of livestock is increased production because if we keep on this highly developed pasture say four sheep to the acre, as people boast they are keeping, and it costs two sheep to keep that four there, that is not full economic production; we may have four sheep, but they are four indifferent sheep and it costs the price of two to keep them there. Mr. Spafford's report continues:—

The areas in the State which would benefit from applications of lime are the heavy rainfall districts of the Adelaide hills, volcanic areas of Mount Gambier and Glencoe, red gum country of the South-East, ironstone soils of lower Eyre Peninsula, and the ironstone soils of Kangaroo Island, but costs are too high except where the shortage is so great that sheep and cattle are unthrifty.

The time has long passed when we can refuse to make full-blooded application to this problem. We know now that one young officer has found out that on those very soils named by Mr. Spafford in 1949 the way to get anything to grow is to put a little calcium carbonate in with the seed. That is done now and is rated as a new discovery, but it was known to be necessary long before 1949. It is said that it is not economically possible because of its cost. What about the cost in New Zealand, where millions of tons of it are used on their high rainfall area. Ground calcium carbonate or limestone marl is used and so valuable is it that the railways of New Zealand carry it free of charge for the first hundred miles—at least they did so when I last investigated the position.

Is it worth while using it to save these disease-ridden parts of the South-East? Is it worth while taking an acre of the worst cockchafer beetle ridden ground and dressing it with half a ton of calcium carbonate or ground limestone rock to see whether under those conditions this beetle flourishes? This reduces the ground's acidity and brings it down somewhere near neutral. It is necessary not to bring it down to the condition where subterranean clover will not grow, but to have strawberry clover and subterranean clover together. Vast areas in the South-East are so acid that strawberry clover will not grow, but any soil can be brought to the condition where strawberry and subterranean clover will grow together. That experiment is well worth while because of the terrific cost of what is happening in these disease-ridden districts.

Today there are dangerous and deadly sprays with which recently there have been

accidents. Use of them is one method of making good the loss. We have these choking gases manufactured in case they had to be used in the last war. So deadly are they that people cannot use them unless they wear respirators, and yet we are putting them on the ground with selective weedicides to kill weeds and let the wheat grow. By their actions they can distort plants and make them look horrible, as though they have become just a vast cancerous growth. We are using those things and at tremendous cost, but without investigating those first basic principles of good production, the ordinary sweet elements that are the basis of all production. Why are we having these visitations when we know full well that nature destroys the unfit? Let us consider that for a start and we shall get down to a realization of these problems.

I come now to housing. From time immemorial, right down through the history of the human race, from the days of paleolithic man living in a cave on the hillside, from the time when he sheltered there and painted on the inside of his cave the animals then existing, man has needed shelter, and he first found it in a primitive way. He went into the holes in the hills. Others gradually learned to build huts. Our own primitive aborigine learned only to put up nothing much more than a windbreak. He learned to use hardly any article of clothing. He was a real primitive man, neolithic or further back—neolithic because he polished his weapons of war and the instruments he used, whereas paleolithic man used crude broken stone weapons and utensils. Ever since those days, the human race has striven perpetually to shelter itself against the elements. It has been a constant fight and struggle on the part of either the two people living together or the whole community that set up and maintained the propagation of the human race. One of the greatest difficulties facing man has always been the sheltering of his family from the elements.

In these days, so many thousands of years removed from those primitive conditions, we can overcome that problem. We are living on the lip of a volcano, for at any minute by misdirection or misjudgment the world may go up in a holocaust of flame and death. We can spend hundreds of thousands and millions of pounds upon those elements of destruction and yet we have not solved the problem with which the caveman was confronted 10,000 years ago. That is what it amounts to. We have

certainly made progress but today there are worthy citizens who need and cannot get houses. I do not speak on this from a political angle because it matters not which party is in power; each is equally at fault on this issue.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—We house fewer people per cave nowadays.

Mr. QUIRKE—Probably, but New South Wales has the same problem. It is here and everywhere. It is not tied up with the party in power but with three things—men, materials and finance.

Mr. Jennings—This difficulty does not arise in Queensland and Western Australia.

Mr. QUIRKE—There were certain proposals in Western Australia where they have a migration problem. We have it here and in New South Wales. That makes it a fair distribution of political effort. How is this problem to be tackled? With all the money in the world but without the gear, you cannot do it. No frustrations should be allowed in the matter of materials, manpower and available skill. They should all be used to the limit; money should not enter into the picture. It is entering into it less and less. There is a sketchy realization of what is necessary to be done today, but we shall not solve this problem until that is done.

The whole thing is cumulative. If you start building houses and making money available, you automatically make available more materials because the people interested in producing those materials will see that they are available, and there will be a greater production of them. If there is insufficient manpower here, it can be imported. These homes can be built. Year in and year out I am all the time seeking an expression of opinion in this House, and one good sound reason why what I have put forward cannot operate; I have never had it yet. If the idea is humanly and materially possible, there is no reason why it should not be financially possible. Over the last two years there has operated in Australia a policy of restricted finance, Federal in its origin. I said at the time it was initiated that it would bring retribution. I have analysed the unemployment figures. I believe that every man able and willing to work should be entitled to, and I do not think anyone in this House would disagree with that statement. It is not a thrust at the Government. Then why have we more than 5,000 unemployed in South Australia at the very time we need houses? At June 30 last there were 3,548 male and

1,534 female unemployed persons. This total of 5,082 included many unskilled men and many married women. One might say that the married women could be left out of our consideration. If a married woman has children, unless there is some reason why the male breadwinner cannot earn a livelihood she should not be employed while her youngsters are either left home or running round the streets after they come out of school.

Provision should be made so that the family unit can function without the wife having to go out to work, but there are various reasons why married women work. I will not try to analyse those reasons, but I consider it highly undesirable that the mother of young children should go out to work to the detriment of her family. Whatever method is adopted, let this problem be overcome; but I point out that these figures include many married women without children. Possibly some of them cannot have children and if they can take their place in industry, provided male breadwinners who can do the work are not deprived of a job, let those married women do the work. Although 5,082 were unemployed at the end of June, only 1,594 men and 673 women were receiving unemployment benefits. In other words, 2,815 unemployed persons were not receiving benefits.

Mr. Davis—How many more unemployed would not be registered?

Mr. QUIRKE—I do not know; I am giving these figures from *Facts and Figures* (No. 57) and I will not give supposititious figures. We know, however, that a big percentage of those who are registered are not drawing unemployment benefits. Surely, if anyone has to suffer the pangs of hunger or has his home life torn apart because he is not working, he will go to the place where he can register and let it be known that he wants a job; so I do not take seriously these suggestions that there are three times the number of registered persons unemployed in South Australia. According to these figures, 1.4 per cent of the work force of this State is unemployed, and this compares with the following percentages in the other States: New South Wales, 1.7 per cent; Victoria, 1.4 per cent; Queensland (where they have all the houses), 2.2 per cent; Western Australia, 2.3 per cent; Tasmania, 1.7 per cent. Victoria and South Australia are equal lowest on the list. Many factors influence this problem and the blame cannot be laid in any one place. Although the position is not extremely bad today, that is no comfort for the chap who wants a job and who cannot find one.

There was a time when, if a man advocated the use of bank credit, people looked on him as a sort of tame maniac who should have a collar around his neck and be shackled to a stake. Today, however, such a policy does not earn that opprobrium, because one can quote statements such as this one by Sir Arthur Fadden, quoted in the booklet *Facts and Figures* at page 13 under the heading of "Central Credit Bank Policy":—

The Central Bank had therefore, made no further calls to special account and had released £15,000,000.

That is the special account in which all banks must place surplus funds. What are these surplus funds? When the central bank releases £15,000,000 what is the result? When the banks come into possession of £15,000,000, on today's policy they can lend four times that amount. Is there any doubt in anybody's mind that that is so? If anyone challenges that statement I will prove it, but I do not think that is necessary at this stage. The ratio of four to one is defined by the Central Bank and means the creation of new money. Anyone trying to disprove that statement must also try to disprove Sir Arthur and the Governor of the Commonwealth Bank because they make similar statements. How much money exists at any one time? The publication continues:—

In a statement in the House of Representatives on March 12 the Treasurer (Sir Arthur Fadden) said that the bank had a general responsibility to promote the economic welfare of the community, in particular by regulating monetary conditions, including the total supply of money—

Therefore, the Commonwealth Bank, under Commonwealth Government direction, can regulate the total amount of money available in this country at any time it likes. The publication continues:—

... by regulating monetary conditions, including the total supply of money and the level and broad direction of bank lending. In doing so it took account of such factors as the level of employment, the state of industries such as the rural industries and building, and changes in the overseas balance of payments. It influenced the economic situation principally through its powers to regulate the volume and distribution of bank lending. The principal instrument for regulating the volume of bank lending was the system of special accounts established under the Banking Act, 1945-1953, whereby it at times called on the trading banks to deposit with it money in the special accounts and at other times it released money from the accounts to the banks, thus immediately affecting the banks' liquid reserves and their ability to lend.

Certain sums of money, as they are called, are pinned down in a special account. What are those special sums of money? Are they in the form of stacks of securities and bank notes, or are they just figures in books that we are told we must not release, but may be released somewhere else? As has been said here a dozen times, the amount of money that all the banks of Australia have in their hands at any one time is probably not more than about £30,000,000, though the deposits of the Savings Bank of South Australia are well over £100,000,000. If we went to their coffers today we would find the bank had not £1,000,000 to meet them. Banking is based on confidence. The system works well enough, but we shall only get the houses required today by making money available. That money should be made available on a costless basis because it cost nothing.

Many people hold up their hands in horror at such an idea. They say we would have inflation, but we would not if the money were advanced on a proper basis. Inflation can have dire effects upon the economy, but we cannot have progress without some inflation. If more materials are required we must have money for their manufacture, for money is required for material and to pay the employees who produce them. Many people say that the pound is worth only 7s. 6d. now, but that is absolute nonsense. The pound is worth what it will buy, and what it bought 30 years ago is quite irrelevant. I would subsidize every house built today by £1,000, no matter who built it. Many will lift their hands in holy horror at that, but it can be done without increasing inflation by more than the profit taken in the supply of materials, and that profit is taken in any case. Do that and we shall really get a start on building the houses that are needed. Today it takes our young people a lifetime to pay for their houses. In addition they have to pay hundreds of pounds to keep their houses in liveable condition, and when they have finished paying principal and interest what are these houses worth? They have been slaves to the houses they have had to find to cover themselves against the elements.

Children are the greatest assets Australia can have, and I would deduct another sum from the amount owed on a house every time a child is born to the owner. What does it cost us to bring migrants from Europe? If we used a like amount for the benefit of our own people when a child was born we should have a happy and contented race. We should

have economic prosperity, not inflation, because the payments made would be advanced directly against the materials supplied. The only impetus to inflation would be the profit represented in the supply of those materials. I would not lend the money on the house so that it would go to a building organization which could re-lend it and exact more profit. We should get down to the fundamental things required for a house, such as the iron, timber, tiles, and plumbing requisites. We should subsidize such things as those, and therein lies the success of what I hope will be a policy to house the people without causing an inflationary spiral.

Today we cannot house the people because we are afraid of further inflation. What is the use of talking about the necessity to build homes unless we have the necessary men, materials and money? Until we consider this problem in that light we shall have thousands of young people who should be rearing their families under their own roof still looking to the Housing Trust. That organization is doing a magnificent job, but it is years behind and cannot hope to cope with the problem. Let people build their own houses, and give them the wherewithal to do it. The Government proposes to advance about £3,000 to people building houses, but let us consider the charges they will have to face. If the interest rate is 5 per cent they will have to pay £3 a week with no redemption of principal, which will cost another £1 a week. Maintenance, insurance and other items will cost another £1, making a total outgoing of £5 a week.

It has been said that a working man can afford to pay only a fifth of his income for shelter. Therefore, a man will need a wage of £25 a week to afford a home for which he will be in debt to the tune of £3,000. Is it not cheaper to adopt the way I have suggested? I shall now quote from the *Monthly Summary of Australian Conditions* issued by the National Bank of Australasia on July 11, 1958. It states:—

At present there is some slackness in internal business conditions and a small degree of unemployment. During the business setback of 1951-53, when a somewhat similar degree of unemployment appeared, Treasury bills were run up by the Commonwealth Government to a considerable extent. Between June 1951 and June 1953, there was a net expansion of credit from this source of approximately £117,000,000. Admittedly, in 1951-52 there was a huge overseas balance of payments deficit of over £450,000,000, but there has been a deficit of the order, maybe, of £50,000,000 for 1957-58, and all the portents suggest another and larger deficit in

1958-59. In these circumstances it would appear that some net increase in Treasury Bills would be justified, and on the surface it looks as though a ready outlet for channelling extra cash into the community will be provided by war loan redemption payments.

The only snag is that, under our present system, these Treasury bills must be repaid. Can anyone imagine anything more fruitless or hopeless than that? Out of the blue we haul £115,000,000, and out of the pockets of the taxpayers we pull £115,000,000 to pay back something which never existed until it was hauled out of the blue. That is the way we keep down inflation. It is about time people thoroughly understood this, but unfortunately people here and elsewhere do not do their homework. A young man seeking a house is happy because he can possibly get an advance of £3,000, although he can only afford to repay 50s. a week. He will be required to repay at least double that weekly. In order that he may meet this commitment are we going to increase wages to £25 a week and have inflation of the worst type? Perhaps we will cheapen the articles people want so that the wage spiral is not accentuated.

I am always inclined to laugh when I hear the Commonwealth Bank described as the "people's bank" because it strips more from people than any other business organization in Australia. On March 18 it announced that it would lend a further £500,000 immediately to co-operative building societies for home building and purchase. Assuming that a house costs only £3,000, that represents 166 houses throughout Australia. Can that be described as magnanimous?

Mr. O'Halloran—How much do private banks make available?

Mr. QUIRKE—They do not go in for long-term lending. Such loans have to be secured from the Commonwealth Bank or the State Savings Bank. The twenty-ninth annual report on Bankruptcy by the Attorney-General was tabled in the Federal Parliament on March 25. This report lists the number of sequestration orders and other bankruptcy matters since the Act first came into operation and it reveals that in 1956-57 there were 1,200 bankruptcies—only two less than during the depression period of 1931-32. These bankruptcies are consequential on the disastrous Federal policy last year of reducing expenditure on housing. I have suggested that we should subsidize every house by £1,000 and that a deduction should be made from the capital cost for every child that is born so that

parents will not be overburdened and their children will have a chance to succeed in life. Child endowment is always mentioned, but from experience gained since its inception it is obvious that it is completely inadequate.

I congratulate the South Australian Housing Trust on what it has done. I appreciate its limitations, but it does not merit the type of criticism levelled at it by the member for Hindmarsh. He said:—

I suggest they should have another look at it, for there is nothing Socialist about it at all: it is the most vicious form of State Capitalism I have ever seen. Members have to go cap in hand to the trust and bend the knee in order to get a house for a constituent.

That is not correct. Mr. Hutchens has been guilty during this debate of many flamboyant and unsubstantiated statements. Members do not go cap in hand to any officers of the South Australian Housing Trust nor do they bend the knee. I suggest that if it were a socialistic institution members would have to go down on both knees and thump their heads on the ground because they would not get anything by bending only one knee. The Housing Trust is a devoted group of people and there is nothing officious about the organization. It has limitations beyond the control of its officers and these people should not be spoken of in that vein in this House. I trust that there is never a repetition of such accusations.

Decentralization has been hammered around in this Chamber. If it were compatible with the best interests of the country then no-one would wish for decentralization of industry more than I. Recently the Advisory Committee on Country Sewerage came to Clare and we gave it as complete a story as we could and suggested that there could be no decentralization into country towns until they were sewered. We should only consider decentralization when country towns are sewered and have an adequate water supply. Radium Hill and Leigh Creek are the only country centres with these services. This is an immense problem and it is no good any member saying that we should have these services provided in country towns immediately because the money bug comes into the question again. It would not matter if members on this side were on the Government benches next year they could not provide sewerage in the country unless the money was available. From 1940 to 1950, at least, there was no possibility of this being done. Only since 1950 has there been any chance. Taperoo and other metropolitan areas are in need of sewerage, but who gets it first? Clare would be willing to go without

until Taperoo got it, but let us not talk about decentralization until we have the three amenities to which I have referred, because no one will go to a country town to start an industry employing 100 people, of whom 50 per cent are females, under the present obsolete method of night soil collection. Let us concentrate on getting sewerage in country areas.

I think that those members who talk about decentralization are more concerned with the decentralization of population than of industry, although I suppose these two things go together. No place in South Australia is more in need of an industry than Wallaroo, and no effort should be spared to entice one there. Wallaroo, Kadina and Moonta were built upon the vast national asset of copper. However, copper production has ceased and there is now an aggregation of population in those three towns above the capacity of the hinterland to carry. Hundreds of men who had been employed in the mining industry there now have no other employment to take its place. Kapunda and Burra have had a similar experience. There is a small industry at the latter town, but at the top end of Yorke Peninsula there are three towns, and that aggravates the problem. I hope the member for Wallaroo will soon realize his ambition and by persuasion or some other means—not by compulsion, which cannot work—get an industry established at Wallaroo of sufficient magnitude to provide for the population which has been displaced because of lost industries.

It has been said in this House and during the recent Mount Gambier by-election campaign that but for the Gunn Government the State would not have had pine forests in the South-East. As a matter of fact, that Government had nothing whatsoever to do with this venture. That sounds strange after what we have heard here. What happened was that Mr. F. E. H. W. Krichauff introduced a Bill to encourage the planting of forest trees. It provided for payment by the Government of £2 an acre for every acre planted under specified conditions. That was in 1871. In 1875 a forest board was set up with power to proclaim forest reserves. In 1876 afforestation commenced and soon afterwards eucalypts and pines were planted at Bundaleer and at Wirrabara. The first planting of pines near the Mount Gambier lakes was in 1877. It was only a small area, which was afterwards handed over to the Mount Gambier district council as a reserve. In 1884 there were plantings at the foot of Mount McIntyre in

the Mount Burr forest reserve of 25 acres of *pinus radiata* and 65 acres of eucalypts.

*Pinus radiata*, which had previously been known as *pinus insignis*, was imported from California in 1867 by Dr. Schomburgk, the first director of the Botanic Gardens, and planted in the Botanic Park. In 1902 large scale experiments with *radiata* began in the northern forest reserves, and in 1907 plantings of pines were made at the Mount Burr and the Caroline forests. From 1915 to 1918 Mount McIntyre pines, then 31 years old, were felled and yielded 82,400 super feet an acre, or an average annual increment of six tons of timber an acre. This highly satisfactory result gave further impetus to plantings, which sharply increased from 1920. The first State sawmill was established in 1903 at Wirrabara and soon afterwards others were set up at Bundaleer, Mount McIntyre, Cave Range, Kuitpo and Caroline. The object was to meet the local demand for softwoods. In 1915 there were large-scale experiments in treating *radiata* chemically for use as railway sleepers. It does not matter what Government is in office, afforestation goes on just the same once it is started. By 1924 an area of 10,000 acres had been planted on the three reserves at Mount Burr, Penola and Caroline. With cheap money available under the development and migration agreement planting commenced at the Mount Gambier forest in 1924. The impetus began in 1925.

Mr. O'Halloran—I think the land was acquired in 1924.

Mr. QUIRKE—Yes. Between 1877 and 1924 the Woods and Forests Department was financed out of revenue but since then it has operated almost entirely on Loan money, and all receipts have been set off against the indebtedness. According to the 1955-56 report the total area planted was 29,150 acres and the number of super feet of timber produced 51,962,000. About 68,000,000 super feet were sold to private saw mills, 10,600,000 for pulp manufacture, 2,500,000 for peeling, and the total of imported soft woods in addition was 58,000,000. There is not the slightest doubt that with the continuation of this industry Mount Gambier will not look for more industries. There is any amount of scope for subsidiary industries to accrue from this vast enterprise.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke said that the man who buys under the hire purchase system does not care a rap about the interest rate, but he does; he has no alternative. He must either meet the interest charged or go without the goods.

Every woman is entitled to a washing machine, a refrigerator and other things in her house but there is no need for the outrageous and murderous exaction of interest that takes place. Mr. Clarke said the remedy was in the hands of the buyers but if everybody said he would not buy goods under hire purchase for 12 months, what would be the effect on employment? The income of the people for three years ahead is being used to purchase this year's production of goods.

Mr. Heaslip—They have mortgaged their incomes?

Mr. QUIRKE—Yes. I think almost £400,000,000 has been booked up. If people did not buy this year and production ceased, how would that £400,000,000 be met? It is nonsense to suggest tackling a subject of such importance in this way.

Mr. Clarke—Have you compared the amount of money spent on hire purchase business with that spent on semi-luxuries like beer and tobacco?

Mr. QUIRKE—The man who has a schooner or bottle of beer and a couple of ounces of tobacco is the greatest taxpayer we have. If we go without these things there will be no revenue from that source.

Mr. John Clark—You cannot buy those things on hire purchase.

Mr. QUIRKE—That is so but Mr. Geoffrey Clarke's suggestion is not the remedy. Mr. Hambour earlier said that many houses had been blown out of the exhaust of motor cars, and it is true. Today's price of a Holden motor car is £1,250. Many a young man is buying a Holden when he should be using his money to build a house. Without an income of about £50 a week a man cannot build a house and run a Holden motor car at the same time. About £600 of the cost of the Holden is covered by profit to the makers, commission to the retailer and Government tax. This leaves about £600 on hire purchase and over three years it amounts to another £300.

Mr. Hambour—No.

Mr. King—What about the insurance? It is not included in the terms cost.

Mr. QUIRKE—The monthly payments over the three years include an insurance charge. I have an actual case which I could cite for the honourable member. In any event at the end of the three years, because of depreciation, a £1,250 Holden, even with the best of treatment, is worth only £800. This means that

about £750 of the house cost has been blown out through the exhaust of the motor car, and there is a cost of about £5 a week without any running at all. I do not know the remedy for that.

Mr. Hambour—Buy a bike.

Mr. QUIRKE—That is one. The cost is terrific, and I will now quote an actual case. After trading in another vehicle and making a cash payment, a person who bought a vehicle on hire-purchase had to pay £116 12s. on a loan of £386 for three years, and this charge was exclusive of insurance. An answer to the problem would be to retire a certain amount each year. If for instance, £600 is borrowed for three years, the borrower repays £200 a year, plus interest on the full amount for the whole period. Instead, the amount paid each year—in this case £200—should be retired at the end of the year and interest paid only on the balance remaining. Even then the actual interest rate would be higher than the rate quoted because although the borrower would be repaying by monthly instalments he would be paying each month interest on the amount owing at the beginning of the year, but not on the full amount for the full period. He would pay interest on £600 in the first year, £400 in the second year and £200 in the third year, which is far better than paying it on £600 for the whole period.

Mr. Stott—Hire-purchase always works that way.

Mr. QUIRKE—Of course it does, and it is exploitation. There is no necessity for it, nobody can excuse it and not one single argument can be advanced in its favour, yet it goes on. The only answer is in the hands of the buyer, who need not buy under hire-purchase.

Mr. Heaslip—No funds would be available on your suggestion.

Mr. QUIRKE—Competition is the answer to that, and if the Commonwealth Bank had a grain of sense and was not prepared to be completely subservient to these interests, and if the South Australian Savings Bank entered into competition, the ground would be cut from under the feet of these people. I see no reason why people investing money should get 10 per cent.

Mr. Hambour—The first in the field was the Commonwealth Bank.

Mr. QUIRKE—And they retracted it.

Mr. Hambour—No, they are still in it.



Mr. QUIRKE—But not to a great extent. They are pulling out all the time.

Mr. Hambour—The trade unions are in it too.

Mr. QUIRKE—Good luck to them, but who would lend them money? They provide the money themselves.

Mr. Stott—The Commonwealth Bank is charging 8½ per cent simple interest.

Mr. QUIRKE—I am not going to spend much time talking about schools because I realize the extraordinary difficulties created by the upsurge of young people needing education. We can criticize what has happened as much as we like; if there has been any dereliction of duty, that has gone, and we have to remedy the situation. We want more teachers and different types of teaching—by people who are prepared for this new era of electronics and whatnots that are coming. It is outside my scope, but scholars today are getting the same type of education I had 50 years ago. Indeed, it is not as good in many cases. So much is crammed into education today that many useful essentials that give an appreciation of things later in life have been cut out.

Mr. John Clark—And to a great extent they are the things that matter.

Mr. QUIRKE—Of course they are. If members visit technical schools they will see groups of young girls with pieces of cloth in front of them learning to iron with an electric iron. In another room they will see girls rolling bits of pastry around a sticky mess and calling the result a pastry.

Mr. Davis—Your mother had to do that in your time.

Mr. QUIRKE—That is the point. Whose responsibility is it to teach girls household duties—how to iron a shirt or a frock?

Mr. Davis—Most shirts are now drip dry.

Mr. QUIRKE—Then there is no necessity to teach them how to iron a piece of rag. There are a thousand and one things that it is essential for school children to know. If we had everything, then carry on with these things, but these buildings cost an enormous amount of money, and the mothers of the children were not in the main taught that way. Also, they cannot be taught in these places unless they have every electrical gadget it is possible to install, and when they leave school and do not have these gadgets, they will burn water. It is all right if they can have them, but it is unnecessary for the State to take over the responsibility of parents to teach girls to cook.

However, if this is part of the educational system, I suppose we cannot do anything about it.

School transport is a terrific burden to the State today. The more transport that the State supplies, the less the inclination to walk a yard. That is all right on main roads, because they are dangerous to small children, and I do not disagree with the provision of transport, but I want to make a plea here. The Government has agreed to transport children to private schools on school buses provided it does not cost anything and there is room for them. In some cases this does not function because there is no room, so it is a sort of Irishman's rise. If this is acceptable to the Government, provision should be made to take them. If it is necessary to have a bigger bus we should have one, because it would be right and proper. Justice must enter into this, and everybody knows that to deny those children that opportunity is to deny them justice. Private schools have people who are transporting children at their own expense. First one and then another picks up children and takes them to school because those people conscientiously believe that they should do it. Are we going to say that conscientiously they are wrong? That transport is the right of every youngster.

Mr. Heaslip—Would there not be a public school available?

Mr. QUIRKE—I am asking that the child be enabled to go to the school selected by its parents. This is a principle, and it has to be enunciated once and for all. They have the right to say where their child shall go, and if they are Catholics or Lutherans and they want their child to go to the school of their choice, they have the right to transport the same as any other children. It is time we made that fact known, and I make it known here today.

Mr. Heaslip—You would have a public school half full of children and transport children to another school?

Mr. QUIRKE—Exactly, and it would not matter if the school were only a quarter full. The fundamental principle is there, and it is that a child goes where its parents desire.

Mr. Heaslip—You say transport is a Government responsibility?

Mr. QUIRKE—Absolutely. If provision is made for one school it should be made for all others.

Mr. Hambour—It is.

Mr. QUIRKE—Yes, provided there is room on the bus and it does not cost any more. I understand that something has been done,

but we do not want to accept a minor improvement as a major satisfaction. I know that this transport is very costly. The schools of one particular denomination are worth £50,000,000, obtained in the main in pennies and through the subscriptions of the kiddies who go to those schools. If we are a civilized country and have a civilized outlook on these things, we will do the same as they do in Canada where there is no discrimination. I have no apologies for bringing this matter up. The Government has been helpful and has consented to these children being carried provided there is room on the vehicle and it costs no more.

The northern areas of this country, particularly the electorate of Frome, my own district of Burra, and the country further west, have not a yard of bitumen apart from the stretch on the road to Jamestown. Bitumen is being extended this year as far as Hanson on the Burra road, which is all to the good. At the same time colossal expenditure is being incurred on roads in the southern part of the State. I know that is necessary or will ultimately become necessary, but I maintain that the areas in the north have been starved to provide money for roads in the south. Some of the roads have been constructed very quickly, and the one over Accommodation Hill is reputed to have cost £50,000 a mile. Those sort of roads can be constructed now, but it takes three or four years to get 20 miles of road in the north-eastern areas, which is neither right nor fair. There should be a more equitable distribution of the money available. The Highways Department is helpful, as far as I can see, but we are still not getting these badly needed roads in the north-east. I can think of two areas in which lateral roads are needed, because they would be a distinct advantage to the country.

The member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) said that the Premier was not a man of vision. I have been in this House for 18 years. I do not suppose the Premier has anything to thank me for particularly; I opposed the establishment of Elizabeth, but despite my protestations it came into being. I maintained that that city should have been built nearer the sea coast where the soil was not half as valuable. Elizabeth today is an established fact. I am now prepared, in face of a statement like that and after 18 years of association with the Premier, to say that Mr. Hughes' statement is not true or based on fact. Anybody that came in when I did nearly 18

years ago and now looks back over those years, can see that the Premier was a man of vision, and can see the consequences of his distant vision in the massive accomplishments that are today the pride of this State.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River)—I support the motion moved by the member for Light and seconded by the member for Victoria. Unfortunately I was on the sick list at the time and was not able to hear their speeches, but I have read them and regard them as good. I extend sympathy to the relatives of the late Mr. Fletcher, who endeared himself to all in this House who knew him. Throughout Mount Gambier one can hear the expressions of regret and can realize the good opinion they had of him.

I congratulate also the new member for Mount Gambier, Mr. Ralston, and hope he will make valuable contributions to our debates.

Mr. Davis—I can assure the honourable member that he will.

Mr. HEASLIP—I cannot appreciate the electors of Mount Gambier returning a member of the Opposition, in view of the amount of work done for them by the Playford Government.

Mr. Davis—The electors of Mount Gambier did not think that.

Mr. HEASLIP—No town in South Australia has received more help or made more progress than Mount Gambier, and it has all been under the administration of the Playford Government. While I am dealing with the Mount Gambier visit, I should like to join in what has been said about several statements made by the Leader of the Opposition in that campaign. The first dealt with the pine plantations. The honourable members for Unley and Burra have cleared up the point about who was responsible for the planting of those pines. I do not argue about that, but the people of Mount Gambier and of South Australia agree that the Playford Government can take the credit of having built a mill there to use the material growing, thus giving employment to the district and town of Mount Gambier. I do not care who planted the pines. The Playford Government has seen to it that they are processed and thus has brought about much employment to Mount Gambier.

The Leader of the Opposition commented on the expenditure of £7,750,000 on the broadening of the South-East railway and said that it was brought about not through the Playford Government but through Mr. Chifley. I do

not agree. Every State in the Commonwealth had equal opportunity to take advantage of the offer made by Mr. Chifley, but only one State availed itself of it: that is, that the Commonwealth Government was prepared to pay seven-tenths of the cost, which has to be repaid, of course over a period of 50 years. No other State availed itself of the offer, and what is the use of opportunities if not taken? The Playford Government can take full credit for that. The people of Mount Gambier and of the whole of the South-East today have a service of which they can be proud, but which they would not have had if the Playford Government had not taken advantage of that offer.

I extend my congratulations to the new Minister of Agriculture, the Hon. D. N. Brookman. He is young and progressive and a man of the land. I feel sure that under his administration the high standard of his department will be maintained. To the ex-Minister of Agriculture and the present Minister of Works, the Hon. Mr. Pearson, I also extend congratulations. We know of his ability as Minister of Agriculture for a short time and of his work as Leader of the House during the absence of the Premier. He has already proved himself and we can look forward to further advancement for him.

I am pleased to see Sir Malcolm McIntosh here today and agree with what has been said about him. The people can be grateful to him for what he has done in the years during which he has been associated with this House. We realize he has been here for a long time and done a good job and now he wants to be able to relax a little and enjoy life. We trust that he will enjoy the rest of his time in this House with us.

Good and bad speeches have been made on the Address in Reply. The good are greatly in the majority, but there were a few speeches that brought no credit to this House. They were not constructive. They tended to pull down everything and were of a personal nature, not the type of speech to be made on an occasion that lends itself to the putting forward of the problems of our individual electors to the Government. Some speeches did anything but that. The member for Burra evidently put much thought and time into his speech, which was one of the good ones, although I did not agree with much of what he said. He referred to

the member for Wallaroo, who said that in the long dry spell he appealed—to primary producers to have the energy and determination to plan for the future by storing up fodder reserves.

If any section of the community has had the energy and determination to store up fodder reserves, it is the primary producers. Over a period of years they have put time and energy into storing up fodder, and this is not the first, but the second dry year. There was very little opportunity last year in many instances to store fodder. So, for two years they have carried their stock and carried it well. Strange to say, stock in the State is in good condition, generally speaking, and most of it has been hand-fed for a long period during this dry year.

The honourable member for Burra also cited some figures of unemployment and said that there were 5,000 odd people unemployed in South Australia, of which 2,000 odd were receiving benefits. In any State or country there is always a certain number of unemployables and probably over-employment for so many years has brought about more unemployables. People have been able to get jobs irrespective of whether or not they were skilled. Such workers have not troubled to learn a trade, and today it is the skilled man who is in demand. Many unemployed people are unskilled and others do not want to work. Three or four men were recently brought from Adelaide to my district to work on the roads, but the contractor was so glad to get rid of them that he made a special trip into the station to send them back to Adelaide. They were objectionable and spent too much time in the hotels. We will, unfortunately, always have a number of unemployables such as those.

The member for Stirling (Mr. Jenkins) emphasized the need for reticulated water, and the member for Chaffey (Mr. King) spoke of the importance of irrigation to his district. All members appreciate that without water no life could exist. Much of the district represented by Mr. Jenkins enjoys a high rainfall and much of that represented by Mr. King has access to an important source of water, the River Murray. I believe that the Government is spending much money in the high rainfall areas, for instance, in those that supply the needs of the metropolitan area, and that sufficient attention is not paid to the dangerous position of our northern water supplies. True, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. O'Halloran) referred to this problem and the needs of Terowie, Orroroo, Quorn, Appila and other

centres; but he did not mention Melrose, although the Government is to be commended for its efforts to find bore water so that that town may be supplied. It is far cheaper to use local supplies than to pump water hundreds of miles and every opportunity should be taken to exploit such supplies. Having referred to the satisfactory water supply enjoyed by Leigh Creek from the Aroona Dam in an area receiving only seven inches a year, Mr. O'Halloran said:—

I suggest that a thorough examination be made of all possible sites in that area for the construction of another dam similar to Aroona, or perhaps a number of dams, with a view to obviating the necessity of duplicating the pipeline and the heavy pumping cost involved. Although I believe that all such possibilities should be exploited and reservoirs constructed in such places so long as they can be filled, I cannot agree with Mr. O'Halloran when he says that the necessity of the duplication of the pipeline may be obviated. After all, the rainfall in these areas is spasmodic and such reservoirs, irrespective of size, will be dry for certain periods. What would be the effect of such irregular supplies on the big industries of Port Augusta, Whyalla and Port Pirie? Surely reduced production would result.

I have frequently inquired about the state of our northern reservoirs, and my latest information from the Minister of Works was that Bundaleer, with a capacity of almost 1,500,000,000 gallons, held 524,000,000 in July this year—about the same quantity as 12 months ago. Had it not been for the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline pumping 24 hours a day for the past 12 months, that reservoir would be dry. Baroota, with a capacity of 1,371,000,000 gallons, held 244,000,000 gallons in July this year, whereas in July last year it held 774,000,000 gallons. During the past 12 months 530,000,000 gallons has been drawn from Baroota and, if the same consumption takes place this year, Baroota, which is a big reservoir, will be dry by mid-summer.

A similar position obtains in respect of Beetaloo reservoir, which has a capacity of 819,000,000 gallons: in July last year it held 533,000,000 gallons, but this year the quantity held is down to 201,000,000 gallons. In other words, during the last 12 months 332,000,000 gallons—more than the quantity held today—has been drawn from that reservoir. That reservoir will be dry before next summer is over. According to the Minister's reply to my question, Mr. Dridan stated:—

Since the above report of the Engineer for Water Supply was written, good rains have

occurred, with the result that water consumption in the northern areas has fallen considerably and more water is available from the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline to build up the supply in the Bundaleer reservoir. Despite the fact that no intakes have yet been received, it is not expected that any serious difficulties will be experienced in maintaining unrestricted supplies in the northern areas during the coming summer.

I wish I could feel as confident as Mr. Dridan does.

Mr. Frank Walsh—You would not refute what he said?

Mr. HEASLIP—I would not argue the point with him, but I am fearful of what might happen in the coming summer unless we get heavy rains soon or thunder storms later. It is now the middle of August, so the winter has really passed. We shall not get the run-offs from any further rain that we would have got during the winter. In the northern areas the subsoil is still not wet, though it may be in other parts of the State. It will take a big rain to give any appreciable intake into the northern reservoirs. Although we have had some rains, we have not had any intakes of any consequence in the northern reservoirs. In a few years there will be a big steelworks at Whyalla, which will necessitate the deviation or duplication of the Morgan-Whyalla main, and I believe the Government should go ahead with that work now and give the northern areas a secure water supply instead of taking the gamble of their being without water in the summer.

We have had a succession of good years, but we could have another dry year after this one, and again we would be out of water in the summer in the north. There is no danger of Adelaide being short of water. It is supplied by a main from the Murray and several reservoirs. In addition, the South Para and Myponga reservoirs are being constructed, and even if there were water rationing in Adelaide what would it mean? The gardens and fruit trees could be lost, but that would not matter greatly. On the other hand, if the north were very short of water the stock would have to be sold, and when there is no water they have to be sold at a huge loss.

Mr. Frank Walsh—Do you want another pipeline in the north?

Mr. HEASLIP—We want a supply adequate to serve the northern areas that are already reticulated. We need sufficient water to carry our stock. The member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) said that the State is overstocked, and I agree with him. We have no guarantee that the north will not be short of water, and there

are prospects of being without it next year. There would be nothing lost by pushing ahead with the duplication of the Morgan-Whyalla main, thereby giving the security to the northern areas to which they are entitled. No town in the north has done more for itself than Orroroo. The people there have not gone to the Government, but have made full use of natural springs in the district and installed their own reticulation services. That provided an adequate supply, but under the decentralization policy of the Playford Government the town has grown. It is now so big that there is not enough water available locally, but there are unlimited supplies in the sub-artesian basin in that area. Unfortunately, it has not been possible to tap this water so far. The problem is that the sand silts up the streams and the flow diminishes.

I hoped the Government would have carried out experiments to tap this sub-artesian basin, for this has been done in other parts of the world. The method is to force gravel down bores, and this takes the place of the sand. The gravel forms a natural filter through which the water flows, and then it is possible to bring the water up. If experiments on these lines were successful large areas north of Orroroo could be brought into production by irrigation. As it is, I shall bring a deputation to Adelaide asking for a water supply for Orroroo from the Murray.

Last week the member for Ridley (Mr. Stott) spoke at great length on wheat. The growers asked for a stabilization scheme years ago, and under this scheme they have contributed not less than £190,000,000 to Australian consumers by accepting less for their wheat than they could have got for it overseas. When the stabilization scheme was originally introduced certain basic principles about cost of production were laid down. One was the term of years under which the average yield an acre was fixed. When the second five-year stabilization scheme was introduced the same divisor was used, but it is now proposed to use another divisor, though I do not know what it is. I do not know why the basic principle has been departed from, though some say it is on account of more modern methods of wheat production. That is true, but this has not raised production greatly. We have had such a run of good seasons that we have had increased yields, and this has been the biggest factor in getting increased yields over the last 12 years. I believe it is probable that in the next five years or so we shall have smaller yields than in the past, for we cannot

expect to go on having good seasons indefinitely. A lower average yield would result in an increase in the cost of production of wheat.

The Agricultural Council arrived at an average of 15.5 bushels to the acre. I do not know how it worked that out, but under the term of 20 years used previously the average was 14.3 bushels, which would give a cost of production of 15s. 4d. For a term of 15 years the average yield would be 14.8 bushels and a cost of production of 15s., so a much shorter term than either of those must have been used in fixing a basis of 15.5 bushels an acre. I do not know why there should be any argument over an extra 6d. or 1s. a bushel for wheat because, after all, it takes an increase of 2s. 2d. a bushel to raise the price of a loaf of bread by one penny. The same applies to wool. It is not the cost of the wool in the garment that causes a suit to cost between £25 and £30 because a suit only requires 2½ or 3 lb. of wool. Why should we deny wheatgrowers a profit? Why should they be expected to wait 12 months before securing an increased price for their product? Within 12 months a farmer might lose his farm. The farmer wants the increased price now and he is entitled to it. He is entitled to a margin of profit. Any secondary industry applying for protection is allowed a 10 per cent margin of profit and the farmer should receive similar consideration. I look upon decentralization as a hobby horse which is going to be ridden right into the earth by the Labor Party from now until March. I do not think it has the stamina to stand up to such riding. If I were a betting man—which I am not—

Mr. Davis—I will lay you the odds.

Mr. HEASLIP—I am prepared to take a risk and speculate because I think this hobby horse will break down before March.

Mr. Frank Walsh—He won at Wallaroo and Mount Gambier so he will be 3 to 1 on next March.

Mr. HEASLIP—He might start in the race but he will not see the distance. The member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) had much to say in connection with decentralization.

Mr. Frank Walsh—He has water in his district.

Mr. HEASLIP—His district requires more than water. He suggested that the Government should build factories out in the country.

Mr. John Clark—Isn't it doing that?

Mr. HEASLIP—If an industry is prepared to go to a country town the Government will

build a factory for it. I believe in decentralization wherever possible. The Government will provide water, power, housing and even build factories for industries that are prepared to establish in country towns, but it won't build factories on spec.

Mr. Frank Walsh—Who suggested it should?

Mr. HEASLIP—Mr. Bywaters advocated the Government building factories and then offering them to industries at a low rental or for nothing.

Mr. Frank Walsh—Will you ascertain from the Premier or the General Manager of the Housing Trust whether the trust is building factories at Elizabeth on that basis?

Mr. HEASLIP—The Government is not building factories in any part of South Australia and then offering them to industries. The Premier has just returned from the United States, but he didn't go there and tell American industries that the Government had built a factory at Jamestown or Peterborough.

Mr. O'Halloran—Do you know what he told the people of America?

Mr. HEASLIP—I do not.

Mr. Frank Walsh—Do you know what they told him?

Mr. HEASLIP—No, but I am sure that his visit will be of benefit to the people of South Australia of whom he is thinking all the time. He will not spend money building factories all over the country and hoping that they will be occupied. They would just be white elephants. Why is there all this ramming for decentralization? Why does the Labor Party want factories in the country?

Mr. O'Halloran—Because the people want them.

Mr. HEASLIP—That is new to me: I haven't heard that one before. We do not want to establish industries in country areas where they cannot compete with established industries and go broke as a result.

Do members remember a recent question by Mr. Loveday regarding engineering works at Whyalla which had employed 24 men, but owing to orders falling off nine had been dismissed? The proprietor could compete successfully for certain Commonwealth work, and has the impression that he cannot get State Government work on a competitive basis. Mr. Loveday asked the following question on July 24:—

An engineering works at Whyalla has been employing 24 men, but owing to orders falling off it has had to dismiss nine men. I have found the proprietor could compete successfully for certain Commonwealth work, but he

has the impression that he is unable to get any work in relation to competitive State Government tenders. Will the Minister of Works examine the procedure and methods of calling tenders for Government works with a view to making it as easy as possible for small engineering works and other manufacturers in country towns to place competitive tenders for work so as to prevent unemployment in country towns?

Is not that an admission of failure? Even at Whyalla, which is not a small country town, but a city, this firm cannot compete.

Mr. Loveday—It is not an admission of failure at all.

Mr. HEASLIP—In his reply the Minister of Works said—

All Government works are determined by tender and it is the Government's practice to give certain advantages, when considering tenders, to industries that are conducted wholly or mainly within the State. Local industries would have a distinct advantage in respect of tenders for works within their own localities. I am not able to say just how far the Government could go in protecting any particular concern or small industries when there are competitive tenders from within the State. I take it the honourable member was not referring to tenders for local requirements, but for works in any part of the State?

To this the honourable member said "Yes." In other words, when it came to competing outside Whyalla, because of the geographical position of that city this small industry could not compete.

Mr. Loveday—That is quite wrong. This firm made pontoons for the Harbors Board recently and got the contract against city competition. It is not a question of the ability to compete.

Mr. HEASLIP—You are not insinuating that when the Government calls tenders it gives preference to certain tenderers?

Mr. Loveday—If you examine the reasons you will find why they cannot compete.

Mr. HEASLIP—I think most honourable members will agree that all tenders for jobs are on a competitive basis, and the one who can produce the goods at the lowest price will get the tender.

Mr. O'Halloran—Government advertisements through the Supply and Tender Board state that neither the lowest nor any tender will necessarily be accepted.

Mr. HEASLIP—That applies whether it is a Government or a private contract. In his speech the Leader of the Opposition said how he deplored the drift to the city, and mentioned that in 1938 there were 321,500 people, or 54 per cent of the total in South Australia,

living in the city and that in 1958 the figures were 541,000 and 60.6 per cent. What is so terrible about that? In 20 years the population in the city has increased by 6.6 per cent. Is that anything to be alarmed about? Why should we worry about it?

Mr. O'Halloran—How much did the country population increase in that period?

Mr. HEASLIP—Naturally, by the same proportion. I am only quoting the Leader's figures.

Mr. O'Halloran—But you are not quoting them correctly. I want to know how much the country population has increased.

Mr. HEASLIP—In 1938 there were 274,000, or 46 per cent, in the country and in 1958 the figures were 351,100 and 39.4 per cent. The same thing has happened in all other countries. I do not think the drift to the city is as great as many think. If people want to come to the city, why stop them? If work, amenities and conveniences are available in Adelaide, why not allow the people to come here? Under conditions of modern warfare no part of the State would be safe; and if an industry were established at Whyalla, for instance, it could be easily picked out and bombed.

Mr. O'Halloran—It would be much better if the population were dispersed.

Mr. HEASLIP—But it would then take only about six shots instead of one. I fully agree with Mr. Quirke regarding our highways. We are spending thousands of pounds to create super-highways in certain areas. In my district I have only one main road, and apart from that there are only five miles of bituminous road from Caltowie to Warnertown, which carries much traffic. It appears that there is a shortage of money for country roads, but no shortage in the city.

Mr. O'Halloran—That is what we've been saying.

Mr. HEASLIP—Petrol tankers go across from Gladstone and it has become a very

rough road. The work on it should be completed. After retirement some people live in Orroroo. They build new houses and buy new furniture, but every time a motor car goes past it sprays dust over their furniture. If the road from the hospital on the south side to the northern approaches of the town are done it would be a great thing for the residents. Dealing with land settlement the Leader of the Opposition said:—

We see land monopoly in existence here. The only people who can purchase are those with already large holdings and fat bank accounts.

The Government has done a fine job in its land settlement programme. Every acre developed means increased production. Without primary production South Australia could not create credits overseas to purchase materials for secondary industries. The more we spend on land settlement, particularly in the South-East where the land is fertile and the rainfall assured, the greater will be our production. It would be foolish for people to go on to this land without having a fat bank account. Commonwealth taxation laws have enabled people to develop the land. It is good policy and I hope more of it will be done. A huge sum of money will have to be spent on the proposed drainage work in the South-East, but it will be money well spent. Again and again we read that lagoons and swamps in the South-East are filling up with water spreading out over the land, thereby reducing the carrying capacity. As soon as the money is available I hope the proposed drainage work will be done.

Mr. DUNSTAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### SUPPLY BILL (No. 2).

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.46 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 14, at 2 p.m.