

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, August 9, 1961.

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

QUESTIONS.**LONG SERVICE LEAVE.**

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Last session the Premier agreed to have investigations made into certain aspects of long service leave, particularly for ex-railway employees who had served in the Railways Department until the First World War and who, because they did not work for the department for a certain time and could not prove that they had applied for re-engagement other than through the Government Labour Exchange, had been denied long service leave. I know that these investigations were made, but will the Premier consider amending the Act to provide that, where a person was retrenched and later re-employed in the service, so long as he had 20 years' continuous service after re-engagement, the previous period of service shall be included for long service leave purposes?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will not give the Leader a definite reply now, but my feeling is that Cabinet will not introduce an amendment along those lines. The purpose of long service leave was, first, to encourage continuity of service of the officers, and secondly, to enable officers who had had a long spread of duty with the Government to get some recreation leave to enable them to come back and continue their work efficiently. Over a period of years with many officers it has gradually become a retiring gratuity and, in the case the Leader has mentioned, that is probably what he is interested in. However, I shall have the matter examined, and advise him further.

ELECTORAL ROLLS.

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister of Education ascertain from the Attorney-General and inform the House when the electoral rolls, which are usually printed about this time, will be available to members?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: Yes.

EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION.

Mr. JENNINGS: Has the Minister of Education considered reserving, or trying to arrange to reserve, one of the still vacant television channels in South Australia for the purposes of education some time in the future? I understand that television channels are still

available in South Australia and that in other countries of the world a tremendous amount has been done for all grades of education, including adult education. If an arrangement is not made early to reserve channels for this purpose the opportunity may be lost forever. I do not know what arrangement could be made to finance something in the future, but has the Minister of Education considered the matter?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: I have considered the matter and discussed it informally from time to time with principal officers of the Adelaide University, the Institute of Technology, and the Education Department, but it is obviously a matter of high Government policy, so it will be for the Government to consider in the future if and when it proposes to do anything in relation to the matter.

TRANSFER OF PRISONERS.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on July 26 regarding the transfer of prisoners in remote areas?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have the following report signed by the Commissioner of Police:

A note has been made of the matter raised by Mr. Loveday and it is therefore no longer necessary to retain the correspondence in this office. For the time being a Land Rover is being provided by the department as a means of transport at Woomera.

Mr. LOVEDAY: My communications with the Chief Secretary were about providing a cage on the Land Rover used for removing prisoners in the outback. This was prompted because two aborigines escaped from a police vehicle at Andamooka and, as a result, a girl was shot. It has been suggested that a cage would be dangerous if the vehicle overturned, but I point out that a cage has been used in Whyalla so that should be no valid objection. Will the Premier obtain for me an adequate answer to the real point of my correspondence because all that has been said is that a Land Rover has been provided at Woomera, and there has been no further explanation?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I obviously do not know whether the Land Rover has secure detention provisions, but I will investigate the matter for the honourable member.

POLLING BOOTHS.

Mr. TAPPING: My question relates to the badly lit polling booths used for State and Commonwealth elections. Because a Commonwealth election will take place later this year

and, I believe, a State election about next March, will the Premier suggest to the Electoral Office that in selecting halls for polling booths it sees that the lighting is satisfactory in order to avoid the casting of informal votes, particularly by people with bad eyesight?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I shall be pleased to do that.

PENONG POLICE.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on August 1 regarding the police position at Fowlers Bay?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Commissioner of Police reports:

This information is of particular interest in view of the fact that a recommendation that the Fowlers Bay police station be closed has only just reached me from the inspector in charge of the western division. There is insufficient work to justify the retention of a police officer at Fowlers Bay, which is 20 miles off the main road, and investigations reveal that this work can easily be handled by the officer at Penong, without additional assistance. A recommendation for the closing of Fowlers Bay will be forwarded to the Chief Secretary at an early date.

ENCOUNTER BAY WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. JENKINS: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of last week concerning a water supply for the Encounter Bay Water District?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The honourable member asked for a progress report on this scheme, and I have one from the Engineer-in-Chief as follows:

All of the smaller mains incorporated in this scheme have been laid and the new pumping main from Goolwa to Victor Harbour is nearing completion. Contracts have been let for the main pumping plants at Goolwa and for the permanent boosting plants near Victor Harbour. Portion of the units for the permanent pumping plant near Victor Harbour have been delivered, and it is hoped to have this station operating in the coming summer, but the main pumping plant at Goolwa will not be operating by that time. Tenders have closed for the construction of the concrete surface tank near Victor Harbour, and a contract will be let very soon. The complete scheme should be completed for operation in the 1962-63 summer.

BUSH FIRES ACT.

Mr. RALSTON: I recently asked a question of the Minister of Agriculture regarding the provisions of the Bush Fires Act and in particular those dealing with the methods of computing compensation payable under the Act in the event of an injury to or the death of a

fire fighter. I understand the Minister now has a report on this matter.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Crown Solicitor has advised that he considers this section somewhat general and difficult to apply.

Mr. Ralston: I agree on that.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: He goes on to say:

The overall purpose of the section, however, seems clear enough, and the difficulty which I find in dealing with the honourable member's question is in understanding what he means when he says, "The interpretation of some authorities is that the maximum amounts payable under the Workmen's Compensation Act could be the minimum amounts payable under the Bush Fires Act." I am unable to discover in the Act warrant for any interpretation which could be expressed in this way. It seems to me that the difficulties and doubts which have assailed the honourable member's constituents are just the sort of thing upon which the advice of their own private solicitors should be sought. However that may be, before I can obtain any advice as to the law I must receive from the honourable member a much more detailed set of circumstances which, it is claimed, create the legal difficulties adverted to, together with (if possible) a reference to the particular subsections (or part thereof) which are believed to give rise to the ambiguities and uncertainties mentioned.

Mr. Ralston: We have heard a lot, but we have not got much information yet.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I shall make a digest of the report. The Crown Solicitor has not enough information from the honourable member to know what the honourable member is talking about.

Mr. Ralston: I have asked for an interpretation of the provisions of the Act. Apparently, the Crown law authorities are not sure themselves.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I pointed out earlier that this amendment was put in as a result of the insistence of the Opposition and against the advice of Sir Edgar Bean.

Mr. Jennings: But we haven't got the numbers.

Mr. Ralston: Did we force it on the Government, or did the Government agree to it?

The SPEAKER: Order! This matter cannot be debated.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Crown Solicitor has given me a report, most of which I have read. Perhaps I should read the first few lines of that report which I summarized rather than quoted. The report commences:

Having now further studied section 36 (3) of the above Act I can well understand Sir Edgar Bean's opposition to this amendment. It is far too general in its terms to be easy to apply.

I then went on to read the next few lines. If the honourable member studies the *Hansard* report of this reply he will see that the Crown Solicitor does not know what the honourable member's problem is. However, if he gives me an explanation of his doubts and the ambiguities he is talking about I shall be glad to take the question back to the Crown Solicitor and discuss the section with him to see whether anything should be done about it.

Mr. RALSTON: In his reply the Minister agreed that the provisions of the Act were rather obscure. I am pleased that he said that; I think the reply from the Crown Law Office was equally obscure. Three methods of computing compensation payable are set out in section 36, and it is the third method that seems to be causing the bother. Section 36 (3) provides:

. . . or shall be computed on the basis of the average weekly earnings of that person for the 12 months next preceding the date of death or injury as the case may be, whichever amount shall be the greater.

The council is a little perplexed at this and wonders what its liability would be. For instance, if an injured person is receiving an average wage of £25, is the council under any legal liability to ensure that he will receive £25 a week during his incapacity? If that is not the interpretation, is the council liable only to the maximum amount (if that amount is applicable) provided for wages under the Workmen's Compensation Act, which I think from memory is £14 5s.?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I shall refer the question to the Crown Solicitor.

TROTTING REGISTER.

Mr. QUIRKE: Has the Treasurer a reply to my recent question regarding the trotting league's attitude towards a compulsory contribution to an Australian trotting register?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have received a long reply from the secretary of the league and I think it will be sufficient for the honourable member's purpose if I read extracts from it. If the member for Burra or any other honourable member desires to use the reply or quote from it he may have access to the full text. The report reads:

At the annual meeting of the Inter-Dominion Trotting Conference, a body constituted by representatives of each State controlling body, held in June, 1960, Mr. Bruce Skeggs, a prominent trotting writer and race-caller, submitted a plan for the publication by the Cabon Publishing Company of Ivanhoe, Victoria, of an Australian trotting register and year book of Australian trotting. When the matter was

being discussed by the conference it was pointed out that to publish such a national newspaper would not be easy and the cost would be very high, and it was suggested that each State should collect from each licensed person £2 per season in addition to their licence fees, as a subscription to the "Register". In return each licensed person would receive forty copies of the "Register" per season through the post. The matter was considered by conference but as it directly affected each licensed person it was referred back to the States for deliberation and ultimate decision. The executive committee of the League considered the matter at a meeting held on June 20, 1960, at which Mr. Skeggs was present to personally outline the project. The delegate from the Breeders, Owners, Trainers and Drivers Association supported the project and, as these were the people concerned, the executive committee approved of the scheme. As all States gave their approval an agreement was entered into between the Inter-Dominion Trotting Conference representing the States and the Cabon Publishing Company, and it was immediately adopted as the official organ of all States including Queensland and Tasmania in lieu of their respective existing publications. Payments were made by the various States to conference for transmission to the publishers.

At first the paper was received favourably by the trotting fraternity, but during the season the standard of the "Register" deteriorated and some of the licensed persons objected to compulsory subscription. The executive committee decided at a meeting held on May 8, 1961 to discontinue compulsory subscription after July 31, 1961. Mr. Skeggs was invited to discuss the problems with the executive committee at a meeting held on June 5, 1961, when it was decided to support the "Register" for another year with compulsory subscriptions, provided all other States did likewise. At the annual meeting of conference held on June 13, 1961, all States agreed to continue to support the "Register" for another 12 months.

PARKING METERS.

Mr. RYAN: On June 24 of this year the following article headed "New parking proposals" appeared in the press:

State Cabinet is to consider introducing legislation to allow the Adelaide City Council to accumulate revenue from parking meters over the years so that a fund can be built up for the financing of off-street parking. At present parking revenue has to be spent in the year it is gained. The Minister of Local Government (Mr. Jude) said yesterday that a draft Bill on this subject was being prepared for examination by Cabinet.

Will the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Roads in this House, inform me whether this proposal will be extended to other municipalities where parking meters have been set up? I believe that Port Adelaide so far is

the only city outside the City of Adelaide having parking meters.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will obtain the information for the honourable member.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION.

Mr. LAWN: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about workmen's compensation?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes. The Under Treasurer reports:

Provision respecting special employment arrangements for infirm workers was repealed from the Workmen's Compensation Act in 1947. With regard to the last question of including hernia in the schedule to the Act, I am advised that, where a workman's earning capacity is impaired by injury by hernia in the course of his employment, he may claim for lump sum compensation under the general provisions of the Act. It is accordingly not necessary to include such an injury in the schedule to give an injured workman a right to compensation. It is, furthermore, impracticable to list hernia in the schedule for a specific sum of compensation as the injury obviously may reduce the earning power of different people in greatly differing degrees. No other Compensation Act includes hernia in the schedule, probably mainly for this reason.

SOLOMONTOWN OVAL.

Mr. McKEE: Can the Treasurer say whether the Government has reached a decision on providing financial assistance to the Port Pirie council for improvements to the Solomontown oval?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I cannot take my answer any further than the one I gave the honourable member some weeks ago. The proposition was examined by the Education Department which stated that, as the Port Pirie authorities had been extremely generous in making the oval facilities available to school-children, it believed that some assistance was justified. Upon receiving that information I wrote to the local authorities asking them what their proposal was, but up to the present, as far as I know, no reply has been received. It will be considered when it arrives. It may have arrived and gone to another source, and not come through my office. I will have that angle investigated.

TAILEM BEND WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. BYWATERS: I recently asked the Minister of Works a question about the Tailem Bend water supply being controlled by two authorities: the Railways Department and the Engineering and Water Supply Department. I also pointed out the lack of fire hydrants in the street. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have the substance of the question in mind and I have seen the docket on this matter since the question was asked. The Engineer-in-Chief's conclusions are not finalized, but the matter is before him for consideration. Departmental officers have made investigations and reported thereon, but the Engineer-in-Chief has not had time to make up his mind about what should be done. As soon as his report is available I will bring down the information for the honourable member.

FREIGHT RATES ON WHEAT GIFTS.

Mr. CASEY: I have been informed that some members of the Returned Servicemen's League in my district want to help the War Veterans' Home at Myrtle Bank by supplying the home with free bagged wheat. However, as rail freight is charged on these gifts, will the Premier, representing the Chief Secretary in this House, examine the matter to see whether this bagged wheat cannot be transported free of charge?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: For many years the Government has accepted a debit upon the railways for commodities sent to certain charitable organizations. It is, of course, something that has to be watched administratively, because it could so happen that not very valuable articles were sent hundreds of miles, involving high freight costs. Without committing the Chief Secretary, I believe that the type of donation the honourable member has mentioned would come within the present scheme, but I will check up and advise him.

CLARE HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. QUIRKE: In reply to a question by me yesterday regarding the Clare high school, the Minister of Education said that plans for its requirements had been submitted by the Education Department to the Public Buildings Department. I have not yet found any trace of them, and I should be glad if the Minister of Works investigated the position to see what has happened to the reference to the Public Buildings Department, because, of course, the people at Clare are greatly interested in the proposal.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I shall be happy to do that. I should like to comment that the requirements of the Education Department are very substantial, and as the honourable member will know from his experience on the Public Works Committee, another very long list of public buildings has just been approved by the committee. It is impossible for the Public

Buildings Department to handle them as expeditiously as the Public Works Committee handles them, or the Education Department itself. The real work of establishing schools falls upon the Public Buildings Department. It has been the practice of the Education Department, when lists of schools are referred to the Public Buildings Department for the preparation of plans, specifications, working drawings, tenders, etc., to indicate some priority. When a list of schools is sent along at any time the department indicates its priorities—those that are the most urgent and for which it can pay. That matter may have some application to the present inquiry of the honourable member. I will go into the matter and see where it rests with my department at the moment, and also whether the Education Department has indicated any particular priority for this school.

ABATTOIRS BOARD.

Mr. STOTT: Can the Minister of Agriculture reply to my question of July 25 regarding the alteration of market days at the abattoirs for calves and pigs, and whether the ring selling of cattle should be abandoned in favour of pen selling? Has he any later information on the question and can he say whether the board has considered the proposed changes and, if so, whether they will come into force, and when?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I am kept in touch with developments up to a point, but I have not a detailed summary of what is to be done. The board is still considering some of the measures to be introduced, and until these are finalized I cannot give a statement of much use to the House. However, I shall try to obtain a report for the honourable member tomorrow that may at least bring him up to date. I have already approached the chairman of the board regarding some reports that were discussed (the other matter mentioned by the honourable member), but I have not yet received a reply officially. I shall attempt to get more complete information from him tomorrow.

BREAD WRAPPING.

Mr. LAWN: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about the wrapping of bread?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Director of Local Government (Mr. Jackman) reports:

As mentioned by the Premier, councils are empowered to make by-laws in terms of the Local Government Act "for the compulsory wrapping of bread by sellers thereof and for

prescribing any matters incidental to such wrapping." Many of the 142 councils in the State have not made any by-law on this subject. Some have adopted the model by-law published in the *Government Gazette* of March 22, 1951, whilst others have a more elaborate by-law in which provision is made for delivery to be taken at the shop in a plastic or linen bag or other suitable container provided by the customer. Prices orders respecting sales by retail of bread wrapped in various types of paper and otherwise are issued from time to time by the Prices Commissioner. The maximum retail price of wrapped bread varies with the type and size of the paper used.

PORT AUGUSTA HOSPITAL.

Mr. RICHES: The Port Augusta hospital is an old building that has served the district well, but it is inadequate to meet the needs of the town and district now. For instance, it is still not possible for a woman patient to have a private ward. A good deal of work is required at the hospital, but the consensus of opinion is that it would be wrong to incur any great expense on the present building. Some time ago a master plan was drawn up and the local board was given to understand that all work done at the hospital would fit in with that plan. In association with the master plan, some two years ago plans were submitted for a new hospital. These were examined by the doctor and matron and recommendations were made, and we understand they were approved by the Public Buildings Department, but nothing further has been heard. A discussion earlier this year with the Minister of Health led the local board to believe that this hospital was still on the list of works to be considered, but we could not be given any information on what progress was being or was likely to be made on building the new hospital. Will the Premier obtain a considered report from the Minister of Health so that the people of the district can be advised of the present situation?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: These matters, of course, are all bound up in the urgency of a particular activity and the priority that can be awarded to it by the department concerned; the Minister of Works answered a question concerning this aspect a few moments ago. Many projects are being requested and priority must be given according to the urgency of the work. I have no particular knowledge of this hospital, but point out that Government hospitals in the country get a big advantage over subsidized hospitals as the whole of the obligation of raising money for them falls on the central authority whereas for subsidized hospitals the local

authority provides one-third of the cost of the buildings. Although I have made these general observations, I shall nevertheless have the matter examined, and I shall advise the honourable member later.

SPRAY IRRIGATION.

Mr. STOTT: On July 26 I asked the Minister of Agriculture a question relating to spray irrigation at Waikerie and he promised to obtain a report. Has he obtained that report yet?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The question referred to charges levied during the 1959-60 season. Some adjustment was required. There had been either overcharging or some wrong assessment, but, in any case, the matter has been adjusted and the settlers are to be credited forthwith with overpayments made.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption, which Mr. Frank Walsh had moved to amend.

(For wording of amendment see page 140.)

(Continued from August 8. Page 315.)

Mr. RYAN (Port Adelaide): I support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition, not purely and simply because it was brought down by a member of the Labor Party but because of its merits. I believe that this State was the first State to apply to the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission for a reduction in wages and living conditions for the workers. The Government asked the commission to reduce wages and I believe the ultimate decision of the commission held up to ridicule the application made by the Government. Two submissions were made by the Government. The first was for an overall reduction in the basic wage, which the commission did not grant because it ultimately granted an increase. The second was for a reduction in the wage applying to country workers. This was rejected because the commission said that rate should be at least on a par with the rate paid in the city.

I should very much like to forget the speech made by the member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) in this debate. We should treat it with the contempt that it deserves, because he branded members on this side as Communists and said we were actively allied with Communists. We would be failing in our duty if we did not reply to the allegations. Some time ago, on the initiative of Commonwealth and State Labor

members, it was said that the salvation of Australia's trade was the market available in Red China. The people who advocated trading with that country were branded as being allied with Communism. Mr. Hall is a farmer and I wonder whether he will be accused of being allied with Communism because some of his produce is sold to that country. The people who trade with Red China do not believe in its form of government, but deal with it for trade purposes only, and they cannot be regarded as being allied with Communism. Mr. Hall delivered the greatest tirade of rubbish ever delivered in this place. During the 1955 Commonwealth election the Communists put the Liberal Party in power in the Senate.

Mr. Hall: That was the year of the Hobart conference.

Mr. RYAN: No. The honourable member professes to know something about that, but it was perhaps what someone told him because he would not know much about the conference. In the 1955 Commonwealth election a person mentioned by Mr. Hall was a candidate. I refer to the secretary of the federation of which I was an active member at one time. The three Communist candidates were Healy, Davis and Connor. Healy received 112,154 primary votes, which, when distributed, resulted in the Liberal candidate, McCallum, getting the third seat. Of the votes cast for Healy he received 82,132 and the Labor man 30,022. If all of Healy's second preferences had gone to the Labor candidate the Labor Party would have controlled the Senate, and the controversial Banking Bill would not have been passed. The composition of the Senate would have been Liberal 29, Labor 29, and Democratic Labor Party two. This would have given a vote of 31 against the 29 of the Government, but because of the way Healy's preferences were distributed the Liberals had 30, Labor 28 and Democratic Labor Party two. It is about time that Mr. Hall really did some homework and ascertained the facts. Yesterday Mr. Loveday pointed out that many Liberals at Port Adelaide had voted for the Communist candidate instead of the Labor Party candidate. If there is any link it is between the Communists and the Liberals, not between the Communists and Labor. It is all very well for the member for Stirling to smile. It is time he woke up for a while. He accuses people who have spent a lifetime opposing Communism and says that they have done nothing to combat it.

Mr. Jenkins: I have never accused anyone.

Mr. RYAN: The honourable member had a smile on his face just now.

Mr. Jenkins: Are we not allowed to smile, or do you want restrictions?

Mr. RYAN: I do not want restrictions on anything. I am proud that I belong to a section of the Waterside Workers' Federation that has never been controlled locally by Communists, and if I have any say in the matter it never will be.

Mr. Hall: What about the Commonwealth side?

Mr. RYAN: We are bound to abide by the majority decision. Most of the electors in South Australia want the Labor Party to govern, but that cannot be because a minority of the electors returns a Liberal and Country League Government.

In connection with unity tickets, we hear from the Bolivar sewerage plant a lot of rubbish that does not hold water. I was on the Australian Labor Party's executive that recently expelled some members because they allied themselves with Communists. We take no responsibility for people having their names on unity tickets when they know nothing about it, yet such people are accused of being associated with Communists.

Because our Governor is new to his office he can be put on the right or the wrong track, according to how he is advised. The first time that I had the honour to meet His Excellency I listened to a fine address and he said that he intended to visit the whole State and that eventually he would be in all the districts represented by members of Parliament. He first visited Port Adelaide. He went there with a Minister of the Crown, but the Government did not have the decency to invite the Parliamentary representative for the district. I bring this to the notice of the Government. If the Government intends to rubbish the people's duly elected representatives in this way, it is about time somebody voiced a complaint about it. The Governor went on an official visit with a Minister of the Crown, and the member for the district was not invited or told of it. He did what the majority of members on this side of the House do: he read about it in the press next day. I sincerely hope that the criticism I offer on this matter is brought to the Governor's notice, so that he will at least be steered along the correct path in the future.

Mr. Lawn: He may not know the proper procedure.

Mr. RYAN: That is so, and he can only be guided by his political advisers. Any criticism of the sort I have made must come from a member.

Another matter that concerns other members and me is that members of Parliament on many occasions (and they devote much of their time to it) have to defend other people and fight for amenities for the people they represent. The amenities for members of this Parliament have been so whittled away that, unless some strong comment is made, they will disappear altogether. I refer to a point raised by the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) concerning parking facilities for members. The only facilities members have for parking their cars are at the front of this building and at the back. In the front there is parking space for about 25 cars, but I believe the number of cars on the list of those entitled to park there is over 70. Looking directly at the Premier I can make this accusation: practically every Minister of the Crown almost every day breaks the law, for the Premier is prepared to see the amenities of members of this House whittled away because he takes no action against people who are not entitled to this privilege. Practically every lunch-hour nearly every Minister's car is double-ranked in front of this House because there is no other room for those cars to be parked. I bring this before the Government's notice because only this morning a Commonwealth Minister's wife drove up and left her car in front of the building and walked into the streets of the city. Shortly afterwards, the wife of a Supreme Court judge left her car in front of the building.

Mr. Jenkins: They are not the only ones.

Mr. RYAN: No, there are a great many others. Unless these things are ventilated they will never be improved. It is up to members to voice their opposition to what is going on. In front of the Supreme Court there is a place reserved for Supreme Court judges; I could not park there.

Mr. Lawn: What about your wife?

Mr. RYAN: Of course she could not. We could not park even if we had business to do there, but judges and their wives are allowed to park here. Can anyone tell me of one Supreme Court judge who has official business in this House when he parks his car here? Certain public servants are in the same category: they can drive down and park in front of Parliament House. Last night I went home at the tea adjournment and when I returned there was no parking space either at the front or at the back of the building. I was left stranded, and I finished up some distance away and had to wait there until somebody took his car away from the front.

Numerous committees are appointed by this Parliament, and those committees sometimes meet in the precincts of this building. If they meet here they claim the rights and privileges of members themselves to park in front of the building. A member must be at Parliament House for most of his time and the necessary parking facilities should be available to him, but in practice it seems that he has to find a parking space where he can. The State Traffic Committee, which was created by Parliament, met in the basement of the Legislative Council, and each member parked his car in front of the House. Practically every day for weeks on end I used to see a notice in the Legislative Council basement indicating that the Fruit Canning Committee was sitting, and they were occupying the parking space in front of the House.

Mr. Bywaters: That is about all they did.

Mr. RYAN: The member for Adelaide mentioned that a certain member of Parliament had four cars on the list and that at times they were all parked in front of the building. A privilege of that sort was never intended. I bring this complaint before the Government as forcibly as I can, in the hope that the amenities we have will be held. Members should fight for the preservation of these amenities.

One of the most important subjects concerning all members of Parliament today is that of unemployment. I for one do not intend to sit down and take the message that is contained in this morning's *Advertiser*: that people who grizzle and groan about unemployment do not know what they are talking about and are delivering a lot of rubbish and hot air to the disadvantage of Australia. I remember that in February of this year Government members were some of the biggest groaners and moaners about what was going on in Australia at that time. I invite members to cast their minds back to Monday, February 13, when Government members were so doubtful about and critical of the Commonwealth Government's policy that they requested the Prime Minister to come to South Australia and allay their fears about the future. The member for Barossa (Mr. Laeueke) spoke of the rosy position we were in. I believe that at Centennial Hall on Monday, February 13, he was elected chief hand-clapper to welcome and thank the Prime Minister for the great job he was doing. That was only six months ago. When we said that the unemployment situation in Australia was becoming worse we were accused of being disruptionists. On that

occasion the Premier—and I notice him smiling—supported the Prime Minister in his remarks about the development of Australia and the ultimate employment position and moved the vote of thanks to the Prime Minister because he had allayed all their fears about the future of this country.

Mr. Lawn: He always kisses in the Prime Minister's pocket.

Mr. RYAN: Of course he is in the Prime Minister's pocket. On February 10 the Leader of the Opposition (my colleague, the member for Edwardstown) raised this matter publicly and requested the Premier to ask that top-level talks take place in an effort to arrive at a solution of the unemployment problem. On that occasion he was ignored, yet the Premier had the audacity the other day to accuse the Leader of not being sincere in his demands for some action to overcome the unemployment situation. As far back as February 10 the Leader requested that top-level talks take place, and three nights later the Premier was meeting the Prime Minister in the Centennial Hall and congratulating him. According to the press, 2,500 people attended that function. It reminds me of the *Advertiser* every Friday morning after the Premier has announced, for instance, some gigantic new industry that will employ 5,000 people. Somebody, unfortunately, seems to have put two noughts on the figure. On that occasion he was one of those on the band wagon who believed that everything in the garden was rosy and that unemployment was no cause for worry. I should like Government members to hear some stories that I hear every day. Last week a constituent of mine—a really good type of individual—told me he had not had a day's work since Holden's dismissed him in January. However Government members here and in Canberra say that such people are squealers and disruptionists who don't know what they are talking about and who will have forgotten about it in 12 months' time. I should like to see some of those members unemployed and without a penny in their pockets for six months. It is all right to be on the band wagon when things are good but when this problem hits home to the individual it is a different proposition.

The member for Torrens, when moving the motion, said the Government had announced a sharp increase in the number of Housing Trust houses to be built, but I do not know where the member obtains his figures. As long as members opposite can say something to praise the Government that is good enough for them.

Often during the last 18 months I have been a member of a deputation complaining to the Premier about the terrific fire risk suffered by tenants in temporary houses. Ultimately, the Premier said that he "had had it as far as temporary houses were concerned." He said that there was only one answer—demolition. That is all very well: that is what we want. We do not want slums but if the temporary houses are to be demolished will that mean that there will be even one house less for every temporary house demolished? The Premier said, "No", but that is not true.

The Government intends, according to the Premier in a press statement in about June last year, to allocate an additional £1,000,000 to enable the Housing Trust to demolish temporary houses and put the tenants from them into brick houses. I ask members to note that the £1,000,000 was to build additional houses above the Housing Trust's normal programme. Let us examine the figures. In the year ended June 30, 1959, the Housing Trust completed 3,140 houses and in the year ended June 30, 1960, it completed 3,174 houses. That is a terrific increase! Although thousands of people are waiting for houses, the Housing Trust lived up to its reputation: it increased the number of houses built by 34—a marvellous effort! In the year ended June 30, 1961, the trust did a mighty job and completed 3,314 houses, an increase over the previous year's total by nearly 250.

People say that figures do not lie but they should go to Hollywood. I doubted whether the figures quoted indicated the true housing position and I asked the trust to tell me how many people had been evacuated from temporary houses and placed in permanent rental houses. I was told that to July 22, 1961, 819 emergency dwellings had been evacuated.

Mr. Jennings: To provide for demolitions.

Mr. RYAN: To the end of the financial year about 750 people were transferred. Let us now have a look at the true figures. The Housing Trust completed 3,314 houses and 750 temporary houses were demolished. If we deduct the number of demolitions from the number of houses completed that does not reveal a very satisfactory figure to work on because it would make the tally one of the lowest in the trust's record. Yet we have the member for Torrens saying that the Government has announced a sharp increase in the number of Housing Trust dwellings.

Mr. Jennings: It would be over 600 down!

Mr. RYAN: Yes, on the previous year; but members opposite say what a wonderful record

this is. I have received many letters from the Housing Trust because in my electorate housing is one of the greatest problems confronting the people. I became entangled in some serious cases in my district and I referred many of them to the Housing Trust for consideration. This week I received a letter, dated August 8, from the trust which really shows the wonderful housing position in this State. I do not criticize the Housing Trust—

Mr. Shannon: Not much!

Mr. RYAN: —but I do criticize people who falsify figures and tell us what wonderful housing this State enjoys. This is what the Housing Trust had to say in answer to my problem:

I refer to your letter . . . regarding an application . . . the person concerned applied to the trust for rental accommodation in the metropolitan area in 1957 . . .

It is now 1961—that's not long ago! The letter continues:

. . . I am afraid that the person concerned is not yet in line for a house—

The place that he is now living in is to be taken down for a farm that the landlord owns. Continuing:

. . . the need for accommodation is extremely urgent. It has, however, never been able to keep pace with the demands made upon it for rental houses and at the present time there are a large number of applications outstanding which were lodged at a much earlier time than the one I am referring to. Many of the applications are from families that are also living under the most unsatisfactory conditions. I regret therefore that at this stage I can hold out no hope that the trust will be able to give early assistance in this case.

That is one of hundreds of letters I have received from the trust, and yet members are told that everything is rosy regarding housing, and that this Government has done a really magnificent job. When we analyze the figures, however, we find that the number is about 600 down compared with the previous two years. That is the rosy position we are in.

The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) also said that the Government had put forward a positive programme to take up the slack in unemployment. The Premier himself has now decided that the Opposition six months ago was correct in its application for high level talks and he has suggested that such talks should now take place to try to remedy the unemployment position. My colleague, the member for Semaphore (Mr. Tapping), and I have many times voiced our complaint about the safety of the Jervois bridge. We find that the Public Works Committee, after long and

serious deliberation, realizing the importance of the project it was asked to consider and the possibility that the connecting link that was to be replaced was in an unsafe condition, took it upon itself to bring down an interim report on alternative crossings. It recommended that a causeway or low level type of bridge be built to relieve traffic congestion and to be an alternative means of communication across the river in the event of some new bridge taking the place of the Jervois bridge or of the collapse of that bridge.

That interim report was brought down on Tuesday, January 31 of this year. It is now August and two departments—one a Government department, the other a non-Government department—are still arguing amongst themselves and considering further what type of bridge it shall be and when it will be possible to start on it. The Premier talked about relieving the unemployment position. I do not know the number of men that such an important, urgent and absolutely necessary project could employ.

Mr. Quirke: Is the honourable member criticizing the safety precautions being taken?

Mr. RYAN: Yes, I am, very much so. But, if this project, one of many that the Premier himself has been authorized by Cabinet to approve, had been put into operation instead of being debated by departments having nothing to do with the project, a number of unemployed could have been used on it. What has the Government done? The same as it has done with many other projects—absolutely nothing, and the way it is carrying on nothing will be done.

For the benefit of members of this House, I want to impress upon them that I do not want to see the same mistake made with any bridge to be built in that area that was made years ago. Some people say that history repeats itself. As far as the deliberations of the Public Works Committee are concerned, I believe that history has repeated itself in these two projects. To amplify that point, I must refer to what has happened. On the occasion of a proposal for a new Birkenhead bridge, the committee met and, after long and serious deliberation (as has happened in recent years), it decided that a bridge should be built on a certain site (and that is important), only to find that many a year later the Government interfered. It did not agree with the proposal of the Public Works Committee and brought down an Act of Parliament to build the Birkenhead bridge where it now stands. Practically everybody now realizes, as some people

tried to point out on that occasion, that it was a terrific mistake to put that bridge where it now stands. It is because of Government interference, its not accepting the proposals and recommendations submitted by the committee, and its overriding that committee and taking the law into its own hands that this position has come about.

Mr. Shannon: The honourable member may be wrong in his facts there.

Mr. RYAN: I am not; I am right.

Mr. Shannon: I know a bit about what happened.

Mr. RYAN: So do I.

Mr. Shannon: Were you on the committee?

Mr. RYAN: No, I was not, but access to what the committee did is available to those who want to see it. For the benefit of the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon), I shall cite some of the things that happened. On January 24, 1927, a Labor Government (a long time ago but we did have Labor Governments in those days) . . .

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: We soon got sick of them!

Mr. RYAN: We should have more of them. In 1927, under a Labor Government, Cabinet decided that the Public Works Department should construct a bridge on the Commercial Road site. In March, 1927, still under a Labor Government—and, when I refer to "Labor Government," I do so to show the trend of interference as it has occurred—Cabinet resolved that the Commissioner of Public Works should negotiate with the Railways Commissioner for the construction of the abutments. A general election intervened at that time, however, and no further action was taken until the new Government referred the question to the Public Works Committee. It is important to amplify the accusation I made of Government interference (and wrong interference, as history has proved), so I will read the report of the Public Works Committee as it was brought down. It is a report on the "Port Adelaide-Birkenhead Bridge," dated August 12, 1930—once again, strange as it may seem, at the time of a Labor Government. As the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) has mentioned the safety aspect, and I am concerned with that, he should listen to this. The report reads:

The Jervois bridge, which was imported from England, has been in use for 52 years. This was in 1930, so it means, of course, that it is only 83 years of age in 1961! The report continues a little lower down:

The principal objection to the bridge, which is now a very busy thoroughfare . . .

and, remember, this was in 1930—

. . . is that in extremely hot weather, owing to the expansion of the iron, the movable span does not open and close satisfactorily, and occasionally the traffic is held up for hours.

This was back in 1930, so what is the condition of the bridge today, 31 years later? The report continues:

It is not necessary, however, to operate the movable span so frequently as formerly when there was more shipping business south of the bridge.

That was back in 1930, and the Harbors Board is now trying to interfere, saying that the upper reach is an important part of the Port River. It says, "Do not close it because it will earn thousands of pounds for the State." They put up the same arguments in 1930. When the committee brought down its final report on November 25, 1935, a Liberal Government was in office, but the findings were unchanged. The following appears in the report:

Although the Commercial Road site would best serve trade and commerce, and would be most convenient for the use of traffic, the committee might have been prepared to place these considerations aside if it could have been shown that the operations of the Harbors Board would be considerably hampered by the erection of a bridge at Commercial Road and that it would receive no compensating advantage. There is no doubt, however, that an added value would be given to the Harbors Board Birkenhead property, and in the opinion of the committee this is sufficient to outweigh any navigational difficulties and depreciation of the value of wharves above the bridge.

Later the report stated:

After inspecting the alternative sites, and thoroughly considering the matter from all angles, the committee feels that it can come to no other conclusion than that the best site for the bridge is in alignment with Commercial Road, Port Adelaide, linking up with Elder Road on the Birkenhead side of the river.

Among its findings were:

1. That it is advisable to construct a bridge directly to connect Birkenhead with Port Adelaide.

2. That such bridge should be built in alignment with Commercial Road, Port Adelaide, on the south side, and link up with Elder Road, Birkenhead, on the north side.

That was the committee's recommendation after long and careful deliberation. However, on November 11, 1936, the Hon. S. W. Jeffries explained the Highways (Birkenhead Bridge) Bill, which authorized the construction of the bridge at a site other than that recommended

by the Public Works Committee. The Government decided not to accept the committee's recommendations, even though the committee's members had become expert over the years they had taken to consider this proposal. In his speech the Minister pointed out that the Public Works Committee had also decided, after hearing further evidence, that the alternative site was preferable. It is interesting to note why the site was changed. The conclusions of the committee on this matter were given during the Minister's second reading explanation as follows:

The committee is now of the opinion that the Nelson Street site is preferable to the Commercial Road site for the following reasons:

1. The disclosures now made by the Harbors Board that several months prior to the committee's submitting its report recommending the Commercial Road site, the Government and the Harbors Board had entered into an agreement with the Adelaide Steamship Co. Limited, wherein certain rights in the vicinity of that site were conferred on the company.
2. That such rights may be prejudiced if the bridge be constructed at the Commercial Road site.
3. That the documentary evidence placed before the committee by the technical committee, together with a demonstration by the chairman of that committee (Sir William Goodman), indicates that the difficulties of navigation created by the construction of a bridge across the Port River would be less at the Nelson Street site than at the Commercial Road site.
4. It is considered that any navigation difficulties that might result from a bridge at the Nelson Street site would not be sufficient at any time seriously to hamper navigation, whereas there is a strong probability that a dangerous situation might arise with a bridge at the Commercial Road site.

Mr. Crosby interjected, "What is the reason why the evidence was not submitted at the previous inquiries?" and the Minister replied, "I do not think any reason was given." Is not that typical of what happens today? The agreement entered into with the Adelaide Steamship Company Limited would have been prejudiced. In those days that was a powerful shipping company, but it was shown up in its true light when H. C. Sleigh wanted to buy it out. The marvellous Adelaide Steamship Company has almost disappeared and now it is only a small company, and is so regarded by shipowners.

Mr. Coumbe: Do you think that is a good thing?

Mr. RYAN: It didn't do Port Adelaide any harm. The reasons advanced for siting the bridge at Nelson Street no longer exist,

because large passenger ships do not run on the Australian coast. The unsatisfactory conditions at Port Adelaide today arise from the Government's interference in over-riding the original decision of the Public Works Committee. The Government, realizing the progress of Port Adelaide and neighbouring districts, referred to the Public Works Committee a proposal for replacing Jervois Bridge. After wise and thoughtful deliberation that committee brought down a report on August 14, 1956, recommending that Jervois Bridge be replaced. However, once again the Government would not accept the committee's recommendation and referred it back for further consideration. The Harbors Board, which objected to the Birkenhead bridge proposal in 1930, demanded that the committee's recommendation be not proceeded with, advanced similar reasons, and claimed that terrific progress was to be made in the southern reaches of the Port River. If the Government had accepted the recommendation the bridge to replace the Jervois Bridge would have been completed and operating, ensuring safety for persons in the area. Let me refer to the interim report brought down by the Public Works Committee, with which I agree because—

Mr. Shannon: You are trying to get sweet again.

Mr. RYAN: I do not have to get sweet with anyone. We must have an alternative route for transport to and from the area concerned. We know that the Birkenhead bridge cannot cope with all the traffic on only one route. A progress report of the committee was brought down on January 31 last and, as required by Statute, was forwarded to you, Mr. Speaker, and you endorsed having received it on February 2. On the same evening, amazing as it may seem it was a Thursday, the Playford fantast faced the television screen. There was only one copy of the report.

Mr. Lawn: How do you know?

Mr. RYAN: I was informed that there was only one copy. The Speaker received it on February 2 and on the following day appeared an article in the press under the heading "Bridge for Old Port Road". The Premier's television broadcast that evening concerned this very matter. He informed the public on what was going to be built. This is what he said:

The committee is satisfied that these works must form part of an overall plan to meet the future traffic requirements of the area. The low level bridge would be approached by extensions of the Old Port Road and Grand

Junction Road and would provide access to the western side of the Port River for traffic which would otherwise have to pass through Port Adelaide.

The Premier said what kind of crossing it would be yet only a fortnight ago I read in the press that the Harbors Board—once again the interfering department which upset the Public Works Committee's recommendations on two previous occasions—and the Housing Trust had stated that it was only considered in August, 1961, what type of bridge was to be built—whether it was to be a causeway or a low level type of bridge. I do not know where the trust comes into the building of bridges. It should not have a decision in building a bridge across the river.

In February last, when the Leader of the Opposition brought to the notice of the Government and the public the position of the unemployed people and requested the Premier to call a top level conference to alleviate the position, we found that he announced that a bridge was to be built immediately; but six months afterwards there is no sign of activity in that area and no sign of the bridge. The present structure is deteriorating every day. If the Premier and his Government were sincere and wanted to alleviate the unemployment position, this project, among others, would help, but they have not done anything about it and do not intend to do so until their hands are forced.

The job has been authorized. In February the Premier said Cabinet had considered the urgency of the matter and authorized an immediate commencement; but still there is no activity. The Government should be called the "No Action" Playford Government.

Mr. Lawn: It is all talk.

Mr. RYAN: All talk and no action. I received a report from the Minister of Works concerning the safety of the bridge, about which I am much concerned. If one tried to interpret the report, one would come to the conclusion that the bridge was not safe; and even Mr. Shannon admitted by interjection that anything could happen to this important link at any stage. I only hope that no-one is hurt if anything happens to the bridge. My conscience is clear because I have tried to impress upon the Government that it is playing with the safety of those who are forced to use this bridge. I have tried to impress upon the Government the urgency of doing something which the "Dictator of South Australia" said in February was going to be done.

The report of the Public Works Standing Committee concerning this bridge was brought down on Tuesday, January 31, and the Speaker endorsed it on Thursday, February 2. The Premier's television broadcast was made that night, and on the Friday morning I received numerous calls from people, including representatives of the local council, the press and radio and residents of the district, asking whether I knew what was in the Premier's mind when he made his telecast. I did not know that; only a vacuum cleaner could disclose that. As member for the district, I knew nothing about it and it was not until a week later that I received a copy of the report. About February 4 or 5 I saw copies of that report, although as member for the district I did not have one. There is something wrong when people outside can get a copy and the member for the district only receives his copy weeks afterwards. I hope that the Premier will read my complaint and take some action, even if it is only very little.

One thing to which we can attribute the economic crisis is the introduction of the hire-purchase system. I am not against hire-purchase, which is the poor man's overdraft. No criticism is levelled against companies or others who use overdrafts, but some people look upon hire-purchase as being low and undesirable. In my own opinion it is absolutely necessary. Unfortunately, a most important amendment of the law moved by the Labor Party was rejected by the Government, and this related to the high interest rates charged. When any legislation is introduced into Parliament we find that there are sharpshooters who are prepared to adopt any ways and means to evade the law. Evasions are taking place under the hire-purchase legislation. We find firms offering personal loans to people and these are drastic on certain individuals. Under the new hire-purchase laws the buyer has certain rights, but this legislation is being evaded by the use of personal loans, agreements to buy, and other things that we should not tolerate. The Government has often been told that this law is being evaded, but it has taken no action; it has merely said that if evasions are taking place it will amend the legislation. In the meantime hundreds of people have been caught. Hire-purchase legislation protects the buyer but, under the personal loan system, people sign agreements to borrow a sum equivalent to the price of an article and the consequences of non-payment are such that, if they knew what they were involved in, they would not have anything to

do with the agreements. This scheme was introduced by hire-purchase companies to evade hire-purchase laws passed by this Parliament.

Mr. Quirke: Why don't the people know what they are signing?

Mr. RYAN: So many are anxious to sign as a result of stories they are told by high pressure salesmen, only to realize their obligations later. When hire-purchase legislation was introduced it provided that conditions of agreements should be set out in print of at least a certain size, because so many clauses of agreements were in such small print that using a magnifying glass would not enable anyone to read them. However, there is no such obligation regarding personal loan agreements.

Mr. Quirke: If one loophole is closed they will open another.

Mr. RYAN: The Government should introduce laws to protect people and introduce further legislation to give signatories the protection afforded by hire-purchase legislation. It is failing in its duty if it does not do so.

Mr. Quirke: Some is all right, but you can't protect all fools from their folly.

Mr. RYAN: Then why was the hire-purchase legislation introduced? This legislation has been evaded. A personal loan agreement does not require a deposit; it is not a hire-purchase agreement, and is therefore not subject to the legislation. If the Government introduced an amendment to deal with this and to safeguard the people whom we represent, we would be prepared to accept it to protect the people from shysters.

Mr. Shannon: Do you think a deposit is the cure-all?

Mr. RYAN: The law of this State should be observed.

Mr. Shannon: I have grave doubts whether a deposit affects the treatment the customer gets.

Mr. RYAN: Goods are being sold without a deposit now, but on a different basis. Spokesmen of hire-purchase companies declare that they favour the hire-purchase laws and having a deposit on articles bought on hire-purchase. We passed this law and it must be accepted.

Mr. Jennings: We passed it and they by-pass it.

Mr. RYAN: Recently there has been much evasion of the Landlord and Tenant Act. Once again, after the Government has introduced legislation, people have found ways to overcome it. Last week a man who had been renting a house for 25 years told me his landlord said that he wanted the tenant

to sign a lease and that, if the tenant did not, the property would be sold, and he would realize what the consequences would be. Under the Act, provided that a landlord has given statutory notice, at the expiration of that notice (six months) he could claim a court order to sell the property, thus leaving the tenant unprotected.

Tenants usually enter into agreements or leases for specified periods, and the sums fixed in the leases are always much higher than the rentals they have been paying. Once they sign leases there is no control of rents; the only control is over the period of the leases. When these leases expire, the owners draw up fresh leases increasing weekly rentals. The only control over these leases is in cases where properties are bought cheaply for speculation, where tenants are forced to sign leases at exorbitant rentals, and where the leases contain hidden clauses whereby tenants are responsible for maintenance and upkeep. Some may ask why they sign these leases: once again, these things are in such small print that using a magnifying glass would not enable people to read them. The only protection against these sharp practices is in the provision that the Housing Trust, if its rent control office finds that these places are not of the required standard, can revoke the leases and insist on a fair rent until the owners place the properties in suitable condition for tenancy. Also, the conditions of the lease must operate. I have had brought to my notice a case where a tenant for 25 years was told that his rent would be increased 100 per cent and that if he did not pay he would be given six months' notice of the owner's intention to get a court eviction order. The tenant is left high and dry like a shag on a rock.

Mr. Hughes: Last week one member opposite said that certain people should have been shot for looking for work. Do they represent these sharp-shooting people?

Mr. RYAN: Yes. The Government should endeavour to overcome these problems. When a Government is in power for a long time, as has been the Playford Government, it becomes stale and makes no attempt to deal with anomalies in the law. I am concerned about the appointment of justices of the peace. A J.P. is appointed after his name has been submitted to the Minister by the member for his district, but sometimes I receive a courteous note from the Minister saying that although there was nothing against the person nominated it was not intended at that stage to appoint

him. That may be done because there are already enough justices in the area concerned. Once appointed to the position there is no compulsion on a J.P. to inform the authorities that he has changed his address. Recently I was approached by a police officer to recommend for appointment as a J.P. a man who lived near the police station. I did as requested; but later I was informed that the nomination was not accepted. I inquired and learned there were already enough justices in the area. I then tried to get in touch with all the justices in the electoral district of Port Adelaide, but could not as some had moved from the district.

Mr. Quirke: I don't blame them.

Mr. RYAN: On inquiring about one man I have learned that the site where he lived is now occupied by a supermarket. The J.P. has moved to another district without telling anyone. My point is that because this man did not report that he had moved elsewhere another man could not be appointed as a J.P. This lack of proper records is having much to do with the non-appointment of persons nominated as justices. When a J.P. moves to another district he should inform the authorities of his change of address. The Attorney-General should consider amending the law to overcome this difficulty.

I have heard much from the Government about its good government for the minority of the people in the State. Recently it was considered necessary to have additional court space at Port Adelaide, so the Government rented a building that had been vacated by the National Bank, which had moved in accord with the times and in accord with its profits. The vacated building was offered for sale and purchased by a speculator. Then the Government arranged with him to lease the property, which has now been converted into what is known as Court No. 3. I believe that the vacated building was purchased for between £7,000 and £10,000. The Government pays almost £2,000 a year in rent, yet the building could have been purchased for between £7,000 and £10,000. The Government spent £1,980 on alterations and additions, and entered into a lease for five years with the right of renewal at the end of that period. I do not think the Government would want protection under the Landlord and Tenant (Control of Rents) Act. People will say that the Government's action was good economically, but I do not think it was, for at the expiration of the five years the owner of the property will have had returned to him his original investment. That is not bad business.

I suggest that in one of the larger cities outside the city of Adelaide the Government should have obtained land and provided a court house instead of spending on a building so much money that must benefit only the owner.

The Address in Reply debate gives members an opportunity to indulge in a hate campaign and get various matters off their chest. Some time ago I inquired of the Prices Commissioner whether any complaints had been brought to his notice about the lack of price control on television maintenance. Television, of course, is comparatively new in this State, and as such is something in which the public could be exploited. I know that much exploitation has taken place. The Commissioner told me that he had received a number of complaints and that he agreed that they were justified. He suggested that the only way to remedy the position was for political action to place this matter under price control.

I conferred with the Premier and had much correspondence with him about this, and he advised me that after consultation with the Prices Commissioner he did not think it desirable to place television maintenance services under price control. He said that it was like other services in as much as these organizations had to spend much money in training their employees to become proficient in their jobs. I have here an account which was delivered to none other than the member for Port Adelaide himself. It is for a job done on July 27, 1961, and states "To checking television set and finding no apparent fault, £2 2s. 6d. labour." The Premier said that no exploitation was taking place, that the people concerned had to train their employees to become proficient in the job they were employed in, and therefore it necessitated their receiving a fair return for their outlay. No-one could say that a doctor does not have to do the same in order to become qualified, but a doctor has to visit a patient—and perhaps diagnose a complaint—for a fee of 25s., whereas these television people are allowed to charge much more. My own case is only one of hundreds that I know of. The Government refuses to take action, and as a result these people can charge £2 2s. 6d. for finding no fault with the set.

Mr. Hall: How long did it take?

Mr. RYAN: Five minutes. When the technician was asked to adjust certain other faults on the set he said straight out, "I wouldn't have a clue how to do that." These are the efficient men the Premier said it was necessary to educate and employ. If a doctor charged one £2 2s. 6d. for an examination

there would be an outcry from all sections of the community, yet we find that in television maintenance people are being exploited and there is no control. I am told that the nearest type of control to this is the control on electrician's labour charges of a maximum of about 16s. an hour. The Government should seriously consider this matter, because unless action is taken we shall reach the stage where people will laugh at the law and at the threats of the Premier that control can be implemented if necessary. In the meantime, these people can get away with everything except murder.

The new Bolivar sewerage scheme is of great importance to the Port Adelaide district. The acting managing director of the scheme is, I believe, a member of this House. A large portion of Ottoway—Gillman, a new area that has been reclaimed by a Government department for the purpose of setting up a new and essential industry—is not sewered. After numerous representations to the department concerned, people of the district have been advised that it will be sewered possibly in three years' time. This is a serial that never ends. The Government department concerned has now found a further loophole that apparently enables it to answer these complaints by saying that sewerage has to wait until the Bolivar system is connected. I have tried on numerous occasions to obtain from the Minister details of the division of the metropolitan area into four sections. I have been advised that the Bolivar scheme will take six years to complete and will involve the expenditure of about £13,000,000—big money in anybody's language. The first year's work is essentially a period of survey work; in the following four years the scheme itself apparently will be implemented in four stages by cutting the metropolitan area into four sections and connecting one section to the new system each year; and in the sixth year the final stages of the scheme will be completed. Local government authorities in my district are concerned with this problem and would like an assurance from the Minister or a spokesman of the Government about the four divisions of the metropolitan area.

Only the other night I was informed by a council that it is prepared to spend a great deal of money in the Ottoway district on roads, footpaths and kerbing if it can find out when that area will be connected to the Bolivar scheme. Everything is held up at present, and the council is certainly not going to spend money putting in these things only to find in a year or two that the Sewers Branch

will come along—as it has done in the past—and cut up the new roads immediately they are put down. This particular area should have a high priority; it has been reclaimed for essential industry, and if we are to have that industry we must have the necessary employees living in proximity to their employment. Industry, housing and council improvements in that area are held up pending a declaration by the Government on how the implementation of the Bolivar scheme will be brought about.

Mr. Hall: How many people living in that area are not served by sewers?

Mr. RYAN: I would say three-quarters of the area is not sewered. I want a high priority for this area because it has a high water table. The septic system is not effective, and it cannot be used there owing to the high water table. Most of the people there have said that the septic tanks are not effective and that they are not usable for much of the time. Other people are using the old-time system that should not be tolerated in this day and age—the old bucket system.

Mr. Quirke: We are not in Sydney.

Mr. RYAN: No!

Mr. Hall: And we have a different Government.

Mr. RYAN: Perhaps we have but I agree with other members and say that I believe the member for Frome will be a member of the Government after the next State elections and that the Opposition will go over with him. We will then have a Government working towards the progress of the State unlike the present 'No Action' Playford Government. I bring that matter to the notice of the responsible Minister because it is important. What is the purpose of creating new industries if they do not have the necessary facilities for employees living close to their work? The provision of these facilities is essential and a statement by the Minister on the establishment of the four divisions in the scheme will enable councils to go ahead and allocate their future expenditure.

I conclude my address by saying that I shall vote for the amendment to voice my disapproval of a Government which is prepared, near election time, to tell the people what wonderful prosperity the State is enjoying but which, at the same time, is two-faced as it joins in an application before the Arbitration and Conciliation Commission in an attempt to convince the commission that the prosperity of the State is a false prosperity and a pack of lies. By doing that it has attempted to obtain a reduction in wages paid to South Australian

workers. Therefore, the amendment is necessary to show our disapproval of the Government's action in supplying the necessary personnel to support the employers' claim before the commission.

What would be the reaction of the Government and its back-benchers—when they are awake—if the unions asked the Treasurer to make certain high public servants available to the trade union movement in support of an application for increased wages in this State? There would be a public outcry, yet the Government was prepared to make the services of its senior public servants available to employer organizations in an effort to reduce wages here.

Mr. Hall: That statement is wrong, you know.

Mr. RYAN: It is not. The member for Gouger claims that he is a union member but I have never seen such a disunionist in my life. If he is a financial member he should look out because he may be up for contempt of court for his statements. I am not going to be called a grizzler about the economic position. If the present conditions had been produced by a Labor Government, then the press, radio, television and every other means available would be used by the Liberals to hammer for the resignation of the Government. Those media have been used to criticize the Government's action but not one medium has been used to demand the action that it would have demanded had a Labor Government implemented the proposals—the resignation of the Government. The Government attempted to hide the position and was supported by the press publicity. The member for Mitcham was on the band waggon, clapping the Prime Minister on the night of February 13 when he was trying to instil some confidence in his followers because they did not then have it. Now the Government is trying to blame the no-confidence attitude on the people and other sections of the community. I support the amendment.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): I am a little overwhelmed and my head has not yet settled down from the ululations of the member for Port Adelaide and his comments on the speech of the member for Gouger (Mr. Hall). I thought that the member for Gouger was a picador but after hearing the comments about him from members opposite I now think he is a veritable toreador. The Speech delivered by His Excellency the Governor, by comparison with others I have heard, was an excellent Speech because it was brief and to the point.

I express my appreciation of the manner in which His Excellency delivered that Speech. Sir Edrie Bastyan is obviously an energetic and active person and it is his intention, displayed by his movements around the State, to form his own opinion on matters and not to have it formed for him. When in Mount Gambier recently, His Excellency indicated that he intended to tour the South-East early in November. In his itinerary he has included Bordertown, which is a big town in the Upper South-East but which, because of a road constructed to Naracoorte via Padthaway, has been by-passed by people making V.I.P. tours to the South-East. I express my pleasure, and that of the people of Bordertown, at the fact that the Governor is to spend a day with them on his tour of the South-East.

I also express my regret at the passing of the late Leader of the Opposition in another place (the honourable Mr. Frank Condon) and I extend my sympathy to his wife and family. In my very short time in this place I found Mr. Condon to be a fine gentleman and a great advocate for his Party. I also congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply for the able and constructive speeches they made in this debate. I also commend the member for Light for his maiden speech because he made a commendable and constructive speech.

I listened with considerable interest to the member for West Torrens, whom I hold in high esteem as an advocate for his Party, but one would have thought, after listening to him, that the present recessional conditions applied only to industry. That is a view I wish to dispel. One only has to realize that nothing can be bought without money to know that unless we have some form of internal credit, which we do not have, we must earn money before spending it. These are only axiomatic first principles. Surely any recessional conditions we are experiencing have been brought about by lack of purchasing power, otherwise why did the Commonwealth Government act to correct the deficit in our overseas trade balances? All sorts of arguments have been advanced. The Government has been accused of doing all sorts of things concerning the credit squeeze but, obviously, it would have made no difference which Government was in power because someone had to act to correct the position.

Mr. Riches: Didn't they impose taxation to bring about reduced spending power?

Mr. NANKIVELL: They tried to reduce spending power, as the honourable member

has stated, but only to take money out of circulation.

Mr. Quirke: It was the only thing they were successful in.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The member for West Torrens (Mr. Fred Walsh) mentioned that after the Second World War we had a boom comparable with that after the First World War. This was brought about by the shortages of food and raw materials that inevitably follow such a war. But one has only to look at the figures showing our gross returns for exports over the past 10 years to realize that such a recession as we are experiencing could have occurred at any time during the past few years. As the member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) pointed out, there is no doubt that this position has been in a large degree masked by the advent of hire-purchase in this country. Our export earnings have remained virtually unchanged over 10 years. This is most alarming when we consider that rural production, which constitutes 80 per cent of our export earnings, has increased 55 per cent on the pre-war figures. This production has increased in spite of the gloomy forebodings of Mr. Pollard. I read his little book called *Labor's Agricultural Policy*, in which he set out to put forward the theory of Dr. Clunies Ross that, unless we settled some 30,000 or more settlers on the land in Australia by 1960, we would be importing foodstuffs. This is not so. However, as I said, despite these forebodings, through good management, good seasons, mechanization and myxomatosis, these gloomy prognostications have been confounded.

During 1961, the gross value of rural production is expected to show an increase of about £20,000,000. This has been largely because of an excellent disposal of grain and foodstuffs, brought about through our marketing organizations. Figures of production show that this increase of £20,000,000 has been largely the result of a rise of £87,000,000 from our agricultural products—our grains and other foodstuffs—whereas our income from livestock has fallen by some £67,600,000, which includes a fall of £45,000,000 in wool, and wool constitutes 40 per cent of our current agricultural income.

However, despite this increase in gross production of some £20,000,000, we find that rural income, the income of the producers who have made this fantastic increase in production of 50 per cent in the last 15 years, is expected to fall by some £20,000,000. This is largely because of, first of all, falling prices (over which we have virtually no control) and,

secondly, the phenomenal increase in the cost of commodities, services and essentials required in production.

Let me quote some of these figures from the October edition of the *Quarterly Review of Agricultural Economics*. These figures are for the five years 1955-60. The items listed under equipment and supplies increased by 6.7 per cent, wages by 14.7 per cent, services and overhead by 17.1 per cent, marketing expenses by 8.1 per cent, total production and marketing expenses by 10.3 per cent and living expenses by 9.9 per cent, making a total average increase of 10.1 per cent over those five years.

Today, we are becoming increasingly concerned about unemployment. Honourable members on this side and I are concerned about this. We should not be doing our duty as members of this House representing the community if we were not concerned about the problem. But who is concerned by the fact that the indebtedness of the rural industries has risen by £87,000,000 over the past five years? The figure now stands at some £468,000,000, a figure comparable with that of the hire-purchase debt, yet we never hear about it. This position is still worsening. The March figures released by the pastoral finance houses show a further increase in borrowing of some £15,600,000 in indebtedness to them alone over the period March 1960 to March 1961. We are told, and we know, that we had an excellent season. I defy anyone to prove it was so bountiful as we are led to believe by everyone, not only on this side of the House but elsewhere. Everybody says what a wonderful season we had, what a wonderful condition the primary industries are in, how affluent and financial they are! I bring these matters to the House because I believe this position is one of which we should all be conscious, as nothing could precipitate a depression in Australia more rapidly than the bankruptcy of our rural industries.

Mr. Hughes: And last year was the best!

Mr. NANKIVELL: And it is expected that this year will be even better.

Mr. Tapping: What is the answer to bankruptcy?

Mr. NANKIVELL: Let me continue.

Mr. Casey: We want your opinion on it.

Mr. NANKIVELL: You know as well as I! Listen to me and you will get it. During the 10-year period 1950-60, while our total exports increased by some 51 per cent, the actual increase in purchasing power resulted only in

our ability to purchase 10 per cent more imports and, as there was a 26 per cent increase in population during this period, it stands to reason that the actual purchasing power of each individual fell considerably.

The honourable member asked me what had precipitated this position in rural industries. I know his argument because he referred to it at the end of his speech, which was the only occasion on which he referred to agriculture. The major thing confronting us today, as honourable members know if they are farmers, is the cost sheet and the fact that we have no control over what we get for our products. Answer that one, if you can! Say that your costs are not rising out of all proportion to your return or investment and the effort you may want to put physically into farming!

Mr. Hughes: Don't look at me; I'm not a farmer!

Mr. NANKIVELL: As I have pointed out, there has been considerable loss in our purchasing power because of the fall in our income. Against this, Australian price levels have risen faster than prices in most countries buying from us. In face of these handicaps, we have been able to continue to export and to earn overseas funds. If we want to continue our rate of expansion the volume of our exports must increase. It is one thing to increase our over-all production, which we can do, but another to find a market for that increase. Until now the combined market of Great Britain and the European Economic Community has accounted for 42 per cent of our exports, hence it is no wonder that there should be concern about what will be the common agricultural policy to be introduced by the E.E.C. in 1967, and the effect it may have on our traditional United Kingdom market should the United Kingdom join the E.E.C., which seems a foregone conclusion. I can only hope that in the interests of the world the United Kingdom will be able to induce the other members of the E.E.C. to break down its present self-sufficient programme, thus enabling industrializing and primary producing countries to find a market for their produce.

Let me give some figures on the self-sufficiency of the E.E.C. in meeting its agricultural requirements. According to the April, 1961, issue of the *Quarterly Review of Agricultural Economics* (which incidently, contains an extremely good article on the agricultural policy of the E.E.C. that all members should read) in 1958-59 the E.E.C. was able to produce 94 per cent of its bread grains, 74 per cent of its secondary grains, 100 per

cent of its potatoes, 107 per cent of its sugar requirements, 92 per cent of its beef and veal, 95 per cent of all meats, 89 per cent of its eggs and 99 per cent of its butter and cheese. It is frightening when we realize that unless we can change the policy the position may not be as happy as we hope.

The problem of markets has been rather confounding, as it was thought that rapidly expanding industrialization and rising living costs would create a greater demand for foodstuffs. Instead, it has brought about a demand for an increase in less essential items of personal comfort. The countries with lower living standards are more concerned with the necessities of life and they require foodstuffs. In other words, demand is a monetary phenomenon expressed in purchasing power which does not necessarily reflect needs. Our problem is to open new markets with our less fortunate neighbours. The member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters), in discussing this issue, adopted a philanthropic attitude towards the disposal of world food surpluses. This, unfortunately, was unrealistic. The Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations has been particularly concerned with this problem, and it has produced several interesting papers on the topic. It would seem from its writings and findings that the answer is not charity in the form of gifts of foodstuffs, but a genuine effort to foster a really worthwhile Colombo plan that will assist these people to raise their standards of industrialization so that they can earn more and, consequently, buy more.

In last night's *News*, under the heading "India to Spend Millions" the Indian Government's proposals on this matter were stated. The Indian plan was outlined and the article stated:

The plan envisages a total expenditure of 116,000 million rupees (about £8,700 million), with an investment of 104,000 million rupees (about £7,800 million) over the next five years. It also envisages creating 14 million new jobs and providing 2,300 calories of food a day for each of India's approximately 438 million people.

The Government's policy, outlined in the Governor's Speech, is comprehensive and covers all sections of the community. I commend the Government's intention (as stated in paragraph 32 of the Speech) to guarantee a loan for the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Company of a further £500,000, thus enabling the rapid expansion of bulk handling throughout the State. Although the change-over to bulk handling involves considerable capital expenditure, it inevitably results in a

reduction in costs to the producer. I was also pleased to see reference to the 132,000 volt high tension line that the Electricity Trust will construct to the South-East.

Mr. Ralston: Hear, hear!

Mr. NANKIVELL: I welcome the interjection because, as I interjected when the member for Adelaide was speaking, this line is not being constructed initially for the benefit of the rural community through which it passes, but for the benefit of expanding industry in the South-East.

Mr. Hall: It is designed for decentralization.

Mr. NANKIVELL: It is in keeping with the Government's policy of decentralization. I do not intend to embark on a dissertation on decentralization, but like Labor's policy our policy is to take industry to the source of the materials or to the common market. The Government is taking power to the South-East to enable industry to develop where the raw material is produced. We have been assured that within five years it might be possible to inject power from this line into the domestic line that is being constructed from Tailem Bend to connect at Keith with the Tatiara electricity undertaking in June, 1962. Within five years it may be possible to put a substation at Keith to inject into this line and therefore ensure a permanent and continuous supply to the entire area. If we can develop industry at Bordertown it will provide power for that undertaking.

Mr. Hughes: That line will be of great benefit to primary producers.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes. At present they are being supplied by domestic lines. I do not know that they are cutting their costs. I am sorry that I have not with me the schedule concerning the Pinnaroo extension. If I did, I could show members the costs of some of the minor extensions.

This year, for the first time since I have been a member, no mention has been made of the proposed water supply to Keith. It is most reassuring to me, as member for the district, to know that this scheme has been referred to the Public Works Committee. I appreciate that Mr. Bywaters has also been interested in this proposal. In fact, he was largely instrumental in keeping it before the House before I became a member. Similarly, he has kept before the House the need to develop the Moorlands coalfield. If he referred to the *Mining Review* from which he took his

information he would see that the proven deposits mentioned are in the hundred of Sherlock, which is in the electorate of Albert. However, I do not begrudge his interest in the matter. I am also interested in this project. Undoubtedly, if necessary this coal could be used, but to burn it would require a special grate. Because of the high sulphur content, however, the exhaust gases would have to be treated otherwise the surrounding area would be denuded of its vegetation. The suggestion to establish electricity works at Taillem Bend to use this coal may not be very acceptable to the member for Stirling, because of the effect of the sulphur fumes on people established on the Jervois swamp. I am just as interested as Mr. Bywaters in the future development of the limited deposit of coal at Moorlands of about 32,000,000 tons. Undoubtedly, it could be mined by open cut and used as a limited source of supply for a small regional power supply, but by no means would it be adequate to supply the needs of the Lower South-East, as has been suggested.

There is a further matter in which Mr. Bywaters and I are jointly associated, and although he did not mention it I am sure that he, like myself, is grateful to the Government for the assistance it has given towards the construction of the Lower Murray District Hospital, which would serve a large area in my electorate. I am sure he will not mind if I mention it. He was most concerned about the Government's surplus for the last financial year. It was largely because of this surplus that assistance could be made available to us so readily to finance this scheme. I spoke on this debate because I had been waiting to hear someone else, other than the member for Barossa, talk on agricultural matters. I had hoped to hear something of Labor's rural policy, particularly from the member for Wallaroo. Last year he told me, by way of interjection, that I was not the only expert on agricultural matters in this House. I assumed from that that he was and, therefore, I hoped that he would tell members something about it.

Mr. Hughes: I could tell you plenty.

Mr. NANKIVELL: All I heard from the honourable member was an interesting speech on mining copper at Moonta, and the requirements of Wallaroo and other towns in his electorate. I am still waiting to hear him discuss the rehabilitation of farms in his district that had been laid waste by fire and denuded by wind.

Mr. Hughes: What happened when these people asked the Government for some assistance? You answer that.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I will not, because I am not the Government. I was very interested in Mr. Casey's remarks. His was a good electioneering speech. He mentioned what we are all concerned about—the drift of people from the country to the city—but he was more concerned about the drift in the northern agricultural areas. I have been a member of this House for only three years, but I was privileged in that time to be associated with the late member for Frome (Mr. O'Halloran). He was a conscientious advocate for his electors. Never did I hear him complain about people in his area being put off their blocks or being compelled to sell at skinflint prices.

If I might be so bold, I could refer to the paragraph in the Labor Party's land development policy which provides for the readjustment of areas in what is known as the fringe country to enable mixed farming to become a stable industry. Largely, that is what has happened. Although it was not my intention to cry "wolf," I suggest that the State cannot dissociate itself from the broader aspects of policy I have mentioned. I only hope that I am not a lone voice crying in the wilderness and that members will take some notice of the matters to which I have referred regarding the position of the agricultural industries, which are just as fundamentally important to the State and to members of the House as are workers in industry. It gives me great pleasure to support the motion as originally moved.

Mr. HARDING (Victoria): I rise to support the motion. I think that all honourable members are unanimous that the Governor's Speech was ably presented. We all have high hopes that his term in South Australia will be successful. It has been my pleasure to hear His Excellency not only deliver his opening address, but also speak at Mount Gambier and at the headquarters of the Returned Soldiers' League in Adelaide. I believe he has great ability to fill his office with great success.

I consider the address delivered by Mr. Nankivell as easily his best since he has been a member. In my opinion it was a very wonderful speech. I have previously mentioned the death of Mr. O'Halloran, so will not refer any more to it, but in all sincerity I refer to the sad passing of the Honourable F. J. Condon. His death was a body blow not

only to his Party, but to the State and to members of both Houses. I congratulate the member for Onkaparinga who, I believe, earned the recognition he gained for his services. Never in the history of this Parliament has the Public Works Standing Committee been so hard worked and well led. I heartily congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply on their excellent speeches. In this debate two matters have been flogged to death—the de-salination of water (fresh water will always be the life blood of this State) and the credit squeeze, which members opposite seem to think is the cause of our present problem. I do not accept that, and I shall give my reasons later.

I congratulate the Government on getting through last year without imposing water restrictions. I have travelled through all States and last year went to Tasmania. Anyone who travels in that State must covet its natural resources, particularly water. It has huge lakes with an elevation of 3,000ft. from which cheap power can be generated. However, despite the wastage of millions of gallons of water, last year Tasmanians were not able to wash their cars except with sponges. New South Wales and Victoria also have natural resources that we envy, yet those States have had water restrictions.

As soldier settlement is practically finished I do not intend to deal with it to a great extent. I congratulate Mr. Rowland Hill, the chief executive officer of the scheme. I have travelled over many thousands of acres in the South-East with Mr. Hill, Dr. Callaghan, and others, and I congratulate Mr. Hill on receiving some recognition, which I am sure he deserves, from the Roseworthy Old Scholars' Association. I am sorry that the depot at Penola is being closed. If and when a State settlement scheme is introduced, I believe private contractors will have enough heavy machinery that is almost idle now to do the work, and that it would be cheaper to have it done by private contractors.

I am proud to represent the district of Victoria. When I entered this House a person whose opinion I valued highly said that the district had the greatest potential of any district in any State. It enjoys natural privileges of a good rainfall and beautiful soil and, although it is not fully developed, it does carry 25 per cent of this State's sheep population of 15,000,000 and some of the finest beef and dairy cattle.

Mr. Shannon: Are you referring to its potential or its present capacity?

Mr. HARDING: Its present capacity.

Mr. Shannon: Have you any idea of its potential?

Mr. HARDING: I think it would be 100 per cent greater than its present capacity. I shall now deal with land settlement in the hundreds of Jeffries and Woolumbool. Land in the hundred of Jeffries was prepared for soldier settlement some years ago but was not accepted by the Commonwealth Government because it had only a 16in. rainfall and it was thought that the underground water might contain salt. I hope that I shall live to see the time when a power line is taken there and the area is served with Murray water. When applications were called last year for an area known as the Fairview Estate, which the Land Settlement Committee inspected several years ago, there were 10 applicants for every block as there were in the hundred of Jeffries, but finance was limited. Men have gone on to these blocks and have spent money they have accumulated as share farmers, shearers and so on. Some have spent £5,000 or £6,000 and they do not owe any money on hire-purchase agreements, but they are now at a standstill. I do not advocate that this Government should embark on a land settlement scheme, but I think it has a responsibility to see that these men, who are triers and have the necessary knowledge, have some assistance to enable them to remain on their blocks. It may be necessary only to guarantee a loan from a bank.

If we are honest with ourselves we shall realize that we have been spending more than we have been earning. People are in a great deal of trouble because of that. The following article appeared in last night's *News* regarding the wool clip:

South Australia's wool clip for 1960-61 was worth an estimated £34,284,000, according to figures just released in Adelaide by Deputy Commonwealth Statistician, Mr. D. L. J. Aitchison. The estimated value of the clip fell by more than £8,000,000 on the 1959-60 total. Estimated wool production in South Australia in the 12 months ended June 30 was 178,676,000 lb. This was 19,613,000 lb. below 1959-60 production. Mr. Aitchison said the value of the 1960-61 wool production was only 51.8 per cent of the value recorded in 1950-51. He said 1950-51 was a season of boom prices. "The average price of greasy wool at Adelaide sales for 1960-61 was 48.17d. a lb.," he said.

Comparable figures for other years were: 1959-60, 53.82d.; 1958-59, 45.62d.; 1950-51, 129.16d. Figures showed that the value of the 1960-61 wool clip was only just above the 1958-59 value, but slightly more than half 1950-51. There were 15,382,000 sheep and lambs

shorn in the 1960-61 season. This was less than the previous two years but nearly 5,000 more than in 1950-51.

The last Commonwealth wool clip was down £45,000,000, which means that there is £45,000,000 less to spend. Whether we like it or not, the only real money available for expenditure comes from the land. I want now to bring forward a new matter, and it is contained in the following article published in the Victorian *Stock and Land* under the heading "National Action on Fibroma Virus.":

Landowners may well rub their eyes as they read with astonishment that the fibroma virus, which is used to immunize rabbits against myxomatosis, has been imported into this country. It is believed that the virus can be transmitted by insect carriers and therefore the threat that it holds to the biological control of rabbits by myxoma is immediately apparent. In these circumstances news of the deliberate introduction of fibroma reads like a tale from "Alice in Wonderland" with the rabbit chuckling on the sidelines.

The introduction of viruses to any country is not undertaken lightly. Most of us remember the exhaustive trials made for years before myxoma was brought to Australia. It will be recalled too that the first trials were permitted only on Wardang Island off South Australia. Finally it was left to Victoria first to be convinced by scientists that no harm, but great potential good, could result from its use in mainland trials from which the first epidemic ultimately arose. All this was done with the full knowledge of the public.

The new situation poses several questions. Who prompted the import of fibroma? Why was this done in secret? Has the virus been tested against native fauna in the same way as myxoma? Answers to these questions should be sought in the Federal Parliament. The whole subject, indeed, should be investigated thoroughly.

As the fibroma virus is used in some countries to convey immunity against myxoma to rabbits bred for commercial purposes the assumption may well be that this is why it has been brought to this country. Interest in rabbit breeding seems to be vested at present in New South Wales. If fibroma virus is introduced to the licensed establishments, breeding rabbits in that State, then these projects also become virus breeders at the same time and with insects as carriers would represent a decided threat to the myxoma campaign. The myxoma experiment, which is by no means concluded, is the most important attempt at biological control of pests yet made in the world. It continues to destroy countless numbers of rabbits and together with the use of new poisons has revitalized huge areas of the countryside. It is hardly credible that action should be taken which promises to wreck this programme.

Victoria's immediate reaction to the introduction of fibroma was to ban the sale of this virus throughout the State. The Victorian Government acted promptly, but welcome

though its action is, it cannot prevent any spread of fibroma by insects if the fibroma virus is used in New South Wales. Action on a national basis, as recommended by the president of the Graziers' Association of Victoria (Mr. R. C. Webb), is urgently needed.

No-one can write down the great national importance of what happened to rabbits in South Australia through the use of myxomatosis. Wherever we go in the State, to the Far North or to the South-East, where £8,000,000 of Commonwealth money was spent on settling ex-servicemen, few rabbits can be seen because of the use of myxomatosis. This is a vital matter and should be carefully considered by the Government.

I intend to speak only about matters concerning my electorate. The sewerage work at Naracoorte is nearing completion, despite all sorts of unexpected troubles. I commend the engineer, the overseer and the men for their work under difficult conditions. The cost of the work has far exceeded expectations and it has become almost an embarrassment to Cabinet. The length of the sewers to be laid is 137,000 feet and the expenditure approved is £729,000. At June 30 last the length of sewers laid was 128,000 feet, length of sewers remaining to be laid 9,000 feet, expenditure £719,000, unexpended approved expenditure £10,000, house connections constructed 931, and houses connected to sewers 333. The treatment works were completed and placed in operation on March 28, 1961. At present the sewerage construction organization is operating at both Naracoorte and Nangwarry. I do not expect the conditions at Nangwarry to be so difficult as at Naracoorte, where the residents of the town and district have been patient, uncomplaining and co-operative. The members of the corporation, the engineer, the foreman and the staff had great difficulty in making the streets trafficable. I understand that the Engineering and Water Supply Department, or whichever department is responsible for providing funds for repairs to streets, has been most generous. The streets cannot be sealed or bituminized until the filling in the trenches has subsided and the roadway has consolidated.

I believe that the towns of Penola, Kalangadoo, and Lucindale will eventually be sewerred. I am sure that when the work is being done at Mount Gambier the people there will realize the difficulties and the inconveniences that are caused, and that a lot of whinges will go up.

Education has played a very important part in this State, and it is of a very high order in the South-East. We have very fine schools (some new) that are overflowing, and we have a new high school at Naracoorte which has been raised to a class II school and which I believe will be extended shortly. We have a new school on the drawing board for Penola. In 1959-60 it was promised that this school would be commenced in 1961 and ready for occupation in 1962. I regret to say that work has not yet been commenced, but I understand that secondary school courses will be started next year even if the school is not completed by the due date. We also have wonderful schools at Lucindale and other places. The distance travelled by school buses and the costs of this system have been enormous, due, of course, to the expansion of that part of the country. I congratulate the Minister, the Director, and all members of the Education Department for what they have done for education in the South-East.

The highways in the South-East and, in fact, throughout the State, are second to none. I have travelled in all States of Australia, and I can say that our highways compare more than favourably with those in other States. I suggest to the Government that it should erect notices where our highways cross the Victorian border. I believe that all tourists should know the rules of the road and the speeds at which they are permitted to travel. There is a variation of speed limits between South Australia and Victoria, and the Wimmera district has become a little gold mine as a result of fines imposed on South Australians who exceed the Victorian limit of 55 miles an hour. For that reason, I advocate the erection of notices showing the speed at which people are allowed to travel.

When the question of parking bays on highways was raised in this House some years ago it was pointed out that very little expense would be involved. All that was required were notices to the effect that there were parking bays a half-mile or a quarter of a mile ahead. The Highways Department has now erected such signs, and in my opinion this move will result in collisions being avoided in some instances. I commend the department for its action in that regard. On one occasion I suggested in this House that in order to avoid collisions with broken down transports these vehicles should be compelled to have winking or blinking lights both fore and aft across their full width. I have seen vehicles stationary in the Adelaide hills and in other

places. On some occasions there is only the one driver, and he is at his wits' end putting his signs out in order to avoid collisions. If all vehicles of that type were forced to have red blinking lights on their four corners when they have broken down, it would, I believe, save lives.

I asked a question in the House the other day and was amazed at the amount of publicity given to it. I refer to the suggestion of a parking area over the railway lines between Morphett Street bridge and the railway building. Now that the matter has been publicized through the press, and supported by the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn), I hope that some thought will be given to it. I believe that if anything is done with the Morphett Street bridge there could be entry to it from the east, the west, and the south.

I suggest that there should be more "stop" signs, "danger" signs, and flashing lights near all main railway crossings, particularly in the South-East. Far too many accidents occur at railway crossings. Buildings or stockyards often obstruct the view so that people cannot see 100yds. ahead with the result that serious accidents occur.

I also suggest to the Government that it should consider establishing administrative offices at Naracoorte. At present that town has the Department of Agriculture in one office, the Highways Department in another, and the Lands Department in yet another office, and probably later on it will have the Engineering and Water Supply Department in a separate office. Those employed in these departments at Naracoorte are conscientious and well-trained men, and they are doing a wonderful job. I pay a compliment to the work done there by the Department of Agriculture in keeping noxious weeds down in such a valuable district. What they are doing generally is of immense importance to the State. The Lands Department has only one officer, who has to do his own typing and correspondence. I maintain that it is a sheer waste of money to have that person doing a typist's work in an office when he is trained and qualified for other work. I hope the Government will consider that matter.

The Housing Trust has built 166 purchase houses in the area, and all have been occupied. Many more houses are being built. I ask the trust to consider building a quota of rental homes at Naracoorte. It is a great hardship for people who have to go there on a wage or salary and then find board and lodging or pay rent of £5 or £6 a week for a privately-owned

house; they cannot afford it. If the trust could build a small percentage of rental houses, I am sure the people of Naracoorte would be very pleased. The Penola position is different because that town has all rental houses that are occupied. The trust has purchased land at Kalangadoo and will shortly commence building there.

I and other members in the various south-eastern districts were pleased to have a visit from Parliamentarians last month. Such parties are always welcome and the more often they visit that area the more pleased we shall be because the South-East has something worth seeing and studying. In his speech the Governor said that the present annual forestry planting of 4,000 acres is to be stepped up to 6,000 acres. More land was recently purchased and still more has been offered to the Forestry Department for investigation and purchase if required.

The community may be surprised to know that there are 10 to 12 sawmills in the Victoria electorate only one of which is a Government mill. Some of the mills are large but some are small. Several of them are connected to the Mount Gambier power system and the people interested in the others are anxiously waiting for the time when their installations will be connected to the power line. Members generally do not know that there are more forests in the Victoria electorate, which possesses great potential, than in any other electorate in the State. Over half of the State's planted area is in that district. The Woods and Forests Department has an unplanted area of 188,000 acres and a planted area of 92,682 acres, and 48,257 of the planted acres are in my electorate. The area planted by private companies is 40,852 acres and the total forest area, planted and unplanted, is 229,000 acres with more land being offered to the Government for purchase.

I am impelled to make a report on behalf of the apiarists. Unfortunately I am still chairman of the Honey Board, which is in a difficult position even if that position be no worse than that in other States. The position should be better. Recently the annual conference of the South Australian apiarists was held at the Waite Agricultural Research Institute, which has been most helpful to apiarists, who are thankful for the help given. The conference was opened by the Premier and in all my years' association with this industry, both in South Australia and in other States, I have never attended a conference that was so ably addressed and at which so much knowledge was imparted by the speaker.

I wish to quote a few extracts from the Honey Board's report to that conference on July 31, 1961. The extracts are as follows:

I would like to think that the local net price could be held at 10d. but as long as beekeepers are prepared to sell honey to Victorian buyers for cash for the local market at prices below which the board charges agents, beekeepers are providing Victorian packers with a margin which they can use to cut our local price. And further, beekeepers in this State who purchased honey in Victoria, and sold it at prices below the board's agents' wholesale price, were a major reason for the reduction in the local price. Their action can only result in continuous pressure on the local market price. The board has decided to continue until further notice to grant rebates on local sales, making the net return 10d. a lb. The loss to the board and hence to you, the beekeepers, could be as much as £20,000 a year.

Later on the report reads:

Apart from the local market being so uncertain, the world honey market is vastly different from when the board was started in times of post-war shortages and currency regulations. It is now much more competitive and this competition has spilled over on to the local market. These figures for 1959 will give an idea of the position:

Exports.

	Percentage of world trade in honey.
Mexico supplied	27
Argentina supplied	21
Australia supplied	10
U.S.A. supplied	9

The four countries named supplied over two-thirds of the total, and nine other countries supplied nearly nine-tenths of the total. All other countries supplied 11 per cent.

This is the selling side—now let us look at the buying side.

Imports.

Germany bought 58 per cent of the world exports.

United Kingdom bought 12 per cent.

Twelve other European countries bought 22 per cent.

Rest of the world bought 8 per cent.

You will see that Australia is a major supplier—third in the world—in a world with only two major markets:—Germany and United Kingdom; and if the United Kingdom joins the Common Market, only one market. If Australia is to sell, it must take the ruling price. If it doesn't sell, that sale is lost to another competitor. We cannot alter trends in the world price by withdrawing supplies.

The price of New Zealand honey is frequently contrasted with Australian honey. The average New Zealand price is about 50 per cent higher. You may have noticed that New Zealand was not named as a major exporter—New Zealand exports approximately 1 per cent only of the world's total. In 1959-60 New Zealand exported 378 tons or, in our language, 14,000 tins—during the same year, 1959-60, South Australian board agents exported 41,000 tins;

nearly three times as much, and Australia 237,000 tins, 17 times as much. It is doubtful if the extra price on New Zealand exports could be maintained if its exports were increased 17 times.

The present outlook for Australian beekeepers is not good, and the need for co-operation between all beekeepers in all States is great. The suggested Mitchell plan is a Commonwealth step in the right direction—it will provide

funds to lift local sales and help cut unnecessary competition between Australian exporters. I have the South Australian Honey Board's statistics and figures for the year ended June 30, 1961, and I ask permission to have those statistics incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

28th July, 1961.

THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HONEY BOARD
STATISTICS FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30TH JUNE, 1961

Quantity of Blending Honey Received

Quarter Ending	1954-55	1955-56	1956-57	1957-58	1958-59	1959-60	1960-61
30th September	5,630	3,014	3,638	9,812	5,988	13,107	6,182
31st December	14,484	25,706	28,241	14,631	12,026	35,563	26,880
31st March	15,738	21,123	36,319	10,282	15,286	13,402	16,743
30th June	9,798	16,514	20,097	4,273	29,483	1,238	14,280
60 lb. tins	45,650	66,357	88,295	38,998	62,783	63,310	64,085

Grades of Blending Honey Received

Grades	1954-55	1955-56	1956-57	1957-58	1958-59	1959-60	1960-61
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
96 to 100 points	42.90	63.51	61.89	37.38	78.68	69.25	81.29
91 to 95 points	25.67	20.98	25.29	36.06	14.48	20.10	15.45
86 to 90 points	13.15	8.66	9.42	19.80	6.15	8.60	2.92
Under 85 points	15.51	6.85	3.40	6.76	0.69	2.05	0.34

Average Grade Points of Blending Honey Held

1960				1961			
July	95.3	October	97.0	January	98.2	April	98.3
August	95.9	November	97.9	February	98.3	May	98.1
September	97.3	December	98.2	March	98.7	June	98.0

Overseas Sales

Destinations	1954-55	1955-56	1956-57	1957-58	1958-59	1959-60	1960-61
United Kingdom	33,678	16,633	17,963	22,173	12,532	22,295	40,725
Other European Countries..	30,152	20,406	4,572	35,815	6,590	17,671	12,506
India and Malaya	438	388	386	66	nil	77	70
Other Countries	52	52	31	378	308	1,076	1,298
60 lb. tins	64,320	37,479	22,952	58,432	19,430	41,119	54,599

Grades	1954-55	1955-56	1956-57	1957-58	1958-59	1959-60	1960-61
Pale amber	—	—	—	—	—	—	7,117
Light amber	37,759	27,585	18,661	50,193	6,025	31,360	36,473
Medium amber	25,648	5,225	nil	7,127	9,650	8,093	2,583
Manufacturing	913	4,669	4,291	1,112	3,755	1,666	8,426
60 lb. tins	64,320	37,479	22,952	58,432	19,430	41,119	54,599

Local Sales by Exempted Producers

	1954-55	1955-56	1956-57	1957-58	1958-59	1959-60	1960-61
60 lb. tins	3,744	3,030	5,047	3,211	4,284	4,613	1,799

Sales by Agents and Local Sales by Exempted Producers

	1956-57	1957-58	1958-59	*1959-60	*1960-61
Overseas	22,952	58,432	19,430	39,453	46,173
Interstate	5,727	624	829	2,599	1,493
Local	28,621	26,800	28,984	29,231	24,574
60 lb. tins	57,300	85,856	49,243	71,283	72,240

* Manufacturing honey excluded in these years.

Relative Distribution

	1956-57	1957-58	1958-59	1959-60	1960-61
	%	%	%	%	%
Overseas	40	68	39	55	64
Interstate	10	1	2	4	2
Local	50	31	59	41	34

Approximate Return to Board (Pence per Lb.)

	1956-57	1957-58	1958-59	1959-60	1960-61
Overseas	13.5	8.12	7.87	5.75	6.25
Interstate	14.5	11.50	11.00	8.00	7.50
Local	15.5	13.87	13.50	13.50	13.07

Manufacturing Honey (60 lb. Tins)

	1958-59	1959-60	1960-61
Received	2,191	8,598	230
Sales	4,705	2,576	8,979
Stock at 30th June	2,843	8,865	116

Beeswax

	Received			Sold		
	1958-59	1959-60	1960-61	1958-59	1959-60	1960-61
	lb.	lb.	lb.	lb.	lb.	lb.
First grade	33,383	26,816	6,746	12,177	45,539	10,860
Second grade	4,519	16,713	8,375	5,016	12,341	12,328
Third grade	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
lb.	37,902	43,529	15,121	17,193	57,880	23,188

Sales Destinations

	1958-59	1959-60	1960-61
	lb.	lb.	lb.
Local market	4,941	7,408	2,813
Interstate	3,152	4,471	—
Overseas	9,100	46,001	20,375
lb.	17,193	57,880	23,188

Charges, Sales Promotion and Administration

	1959-60	1960-61
	£	£
Storage @ 1d. per tin per month	2,968	1,599
Interest	4,078	1,351
Handling @ 3.2d. per tin	958	858

	1955-56	1956-57	1957-58	1958-59	1959-60	1960-61
	d.	d.	d.	d.	d.	d.
Sales promotion, per tin	6	4	6	12	24	6
Administration, per tin	11	9	18	12	24	24

Statistics subject to review.

Mr. HARDING: I wish now to briefly refer to the new power line of 132,000 volts which is going through the South-East. That line is needed and everyone is looking forward to it. I refer now to a letter that I received from the Premier's office recently which reads as follows:

The Premier referred your letter to the Chairman of the Electricity Trust of South Australia, who has now furnished him with the following report:

"The answers to the questions asked by Mr. Harding, M.P., in his letter of May 30, 1961, are as follows:

The 132,000-volt transmission line to the South-East will supplement and not supersede the 33,000-volt line to Keith. Sub-stations will be provided at Keith, Snuggery and Mount Gambier, these sites being the most convenient for tapping the high voltage line. Low voltage distribution in the South-East will be made from these stations in addition to the Mount Gambier power station. Owing to the high cost of major transmission lines, it is necessary to keep the length of line to a minimum. No advantage accrues to any town in the South-East from the high voltage line passing through it; the advantages will accrue from supply by lower voltage distribution in due course.

The Electricity Trust has clearly established that it is uneconomical to make concrete and/or steel poles at localities other than in the special plant established for the purpose in Adelaide.

The 132,000-volt transmission line will be built by contractors who specialize in this field, and it is most likely that a tower construction will provide the most economical line."

I understand that a contract has been let for the South-East extension of power—a single wire earth return around Millicent, Tantanoola, Glencoe and Snuggery. Surveys are also being made well into the Victoria electorate, Tarpeena, Kalangadoo and other places approaching Callendale. This does not necessarily mean that these extensions will be proceeded with during the current year.

Many honourable members are not aware that I represent in this House a large and valuable portion of the district council of Mount Gambier, a large area noted for its fertility, dairying, afforestation, stock and the people themselves. On behalf of the residents of this area and myself, I wish to dissociate ourselves completely from the belly-aching and exaggerated statements made by the member for Mount Gambier regarding unemployment in Mount Gambier.

Mr. Ralston: Who gave you that—Jim Forbes?

Mr. HARDING: No country city in this State has been so well and generously treated

as the picturesque and beautiful city of Mount Gambier. I think that for its member (or, for that matter, any member of this House) to talk tripe and exaggeration . . .

Mr. Ryan: The tripe is on your side!

Mr. HARDING: It belittles a wonderful part of South Australia. I dissociate myself entirely from it.

Mr. Ralston: Who wrote that?

Mr. HARDING: Who said it? I have pleasure in supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr. RALSTON (Mount Gambier): I rise to support the motion for the Address in Reply, as amended. In so doing, I compliment the mover, the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe), and the seconder, the member for Chaffey (Mr. King), on their splendid contributions to this debate. While not in agreement with their comments on some issues raised, nevertheless I enjoyed hearing their views. We mourn the passing of our friend and Parliamentary colleague, the late Mr. Frank Condon. He was a great and gifted man who used his talents for the good of the people and the advancement of the State. To his relatives our sympathy is extended in all sincerity.

Members on this side of the House—and, I presume, members on the other side as well—must have had real pleasure in hearing the maiden speech of the member for Frome (Mr. Casey) who made a splendid approach to all the problems he dealt with. Despite the belly-aching of members on the other side and the way in which they are forecasting that there will be a change in Frome, I want to remind them that prophets have little honour in their own country and are generally forsaken before long. I am sure that the people of Frome will be judge of that, and I have no hesitation in taking their judgment either in the last election or in any future election.

Mr. Lawn: They are well represented now.

Mr. RALSTON: We bid the warmest of welcomes to His Excellency Sir Edric Bastyan and Lady Bastyan and trust that their association with the people of South Australia will prove to be long and happy. His Excellency has already visited the South-East to perform the opening ceremony of the new hospital. This ceremony, which should have attracted several thousand people, attracted only a few hundred. As member for the district, I sincerely regret that the first visit by His Excellency to the South-East was not in happier circumstances. For some reason best known to itself . . .

Mr. Jennings: Himself.

Mr. RALSTON: It could have been "himself", but the Government saw fit to ignore the people who should have been recognized on this occasion.

Mr. Bockelberg: You were there!

Mr. RALSTON: I was there but a few were not there. It was not so remiss regarding others. For instance, it was noticeable (and I want the member for Eyre to remember this) that prominent members of a certain political Party were invited to attend. They were not overlooked, but members of the Women's Hospital Auxiliary, who had for many years worked hard in the interests of the hospital, did not receive an invitation. Their president resigned. I use this comparison to illustrate the general pattern of what happened at the official opening.

His Worship the Mayor was not invited to join the official party or to be present on the dais during the opening ceremony. Naturally, His Worship did not hesitate to express his opinion on this lack of courtesy to the position he occupied. Without question, the mayor of any municipality is first citizen in that area and at all public functions his position must be recognized when they take place in his area. There are no exceptions to that. Although 200 invitations were issued by the Government, the mayoress was completely overlooked. Her name was not on the official list and, of course, she did not attend. Quite naturally the people of Mount Gambier were not impressed by the lack of courtesy shown to its mayor and mayoress and they were not backward in saying so. This type of thing has happened on two previous occasions during the present mayor's term of office, and it is time the Government either changed its policy or made sure that the names of those entitled to be present on such occasions were included on the official list. In 1955 the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) took the Government to task for similar discourtesies at Port Pirie. He said that on that occasion a grievous wrong had been done to representatives of local government. I assure him that the Government still continues its policy of inflicting grievous wrongs on representatives of local government.

Mr. Ryan: And on members of Parliament.

Mr. RALSTON: Some people never learn, and I suppose they do not want to.

Mr. Clark: Have you discovered the reason for this?

Mr. Jennings: It is ignorance.

Mr. RALSTON: I will leave it to the Government to explain why it happened. The most noticeable feature of this debate is the way members opposite have studiously avoided, let alone debated, the Leader of the Opposition's amendment, the purpose of which is to bring before Parliament the Government's actions in the recent basic wage case. There is no need for me to outline what happened. This has been done by previous speakers from the Opposition. The Government can be in no doubt of our opinion of its action. Why did the Government make such an unjust and unwarranted appearance before the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission? Was it because the Government believed that whatever the Sydney basic wage was in future, Adelaide should eventually receive only 90 per cent of it? Is this State so poverty-stricken that it can afford to pay only nine-tenths of the wage payable in Sydney? That is what the Government advocated: or was it window dressing for political reasons? I am beginning to think there was a little of both. The member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) is an authority on these matters. No-one opposite contests his wide knowledge of industrial matters. If any member opposite cares to dispute that, let him say so. I accept the case he presented last Thursday as being a fair and just summary of the Playford Government's position in that case. There is no need for me to reiterate the points he made with all the logic and ability of a practised advocate.

Mr. Coumbe: You'll get on!

Mr. RALSTON: He clearly exposed the Government's iniquity in its close association with the various employer groups to progressively reduce the State's basic wage in the future. There was no doubt initially about the Government's intention to support a country wage differential of 12s. a week less than the metropolitan rate. Subsequently the Opposition told the Government in no uncertain terms what it thought of its action. This resulted in a complete reversal of form: the Government withdrew its support of the country differential wage case and left the employer groups lamenting.

Mr. Ryan: Because of the Opposition's pressure.

Mr. RALSTON: Of course. When under pressure the Government had no hesitation in ratting on its friends. Had the Government's action been successful, any workers of quality in South Australia would have crossed the border to the eastern States without hesitation.

There would have been more crossing the border in the next two or three years than there were border hoppers during the war years. No worker could afford the genteel poverty that the Playford Government would have imposed on South Australian workers. Our industrial centres would have been as quickly denuded of their work forces as it was possible for the eastern States to absorb them. Fortunately for the people the commission rejected both claims by the Employers' Federation and the South Australian Government and their associates.

I rarely do not see eye to eye with the Public Works Committee, which does an excellent job in the interests of this State. I am sure all members of that committee would be as keen as I am, or any other member, to advance the State's interests in every way. It is for this reason alone that I draw the committee's attention to the need to specify suitable local materials when recommending projects, particularly if those materials are available on the site. Recently the committee recommended the erection of a technical high school at Mount Gambier to be built in two stages. So that there will be no misunderstanding, I quote the following from the committee's report:

It is proposed to erect this school in two stages. The first stage consists of a timber school, a type 1a standard domestic arts centre and a type 6 standard workshop. A permanent school of solid construction, forming the second stage, will provide the balance of required accommodation. Stage 1 will be erected to meet the immediate urgency, the timber school of this stage providing the accommodation required by February, 1961.

I am not blaming the committee because the school is not completed, and there is great doubt whether it will be by February, 1962. The students have been enrolled and the teachers appointed. The school is something like a travelling menagerie. First, it was at the North Mount Gambier primary school and now it is at the Mount Gambier East primary school. It seems to be a lost cause. We hope that by February, 1962, it will eventually get to its home. The estimated cost of the first stage is £146,500. I wish to draw attention to the specifications, which were prepared by Messrs. Cameron and Middleton, chartered quantity surveyors, of North Terrace, St. Peters. These are the specifications: Timber: (a) Oregon for all carpentry; (b) Baltic pine for all joinery and second fixings not otherwise specified; (c) Jarrah for all underfloor timbers; (d) Hoop pine for plywood requirements; (e) Hardwood for floors (I understand that this

could be either jarrah or Tasmanian oak); joinery timbers otherwise specified are meranti and parana pine. These would be the whole of the timber requirements of the school.

The outside walls of these standard type units in Stage I are to be precast concrete and steel. The only place that radiata pine is specified is for the backs and sides of drawers in the woodwork benches. Here we have a school to be built of prestressed concrete and imported timbers in the heart of the coralline limestone district and within a mile of the largest radiata pine mill in Australia. I trust that the Minister of Forests is taking notice of this. Every yard of stone and every foot of timber required for this school are available on the spot. Every pound spent on that building would have created employment in South Australia, and because of its action the Government is losing thousands of pounds of good money.

(Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.)

Mr. RALSTON: There is no valid reason why building materials available in South Australia cannot be specified for our Government buildings. In fact, there is no reason why leaders of Government instrumentalities who make these decisions should not use South Australian radiata pine wherever possible. The Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization rates it as equal to imported timbers for building purposes (in most tests this has proved to be so) and as superior to imported timbers in some tests. It complies with the requirements of the Standards Association of Australia. It is available in any size; it can be obtained pressure-impregnated (which makes it immune to pest or fungus attack) and it can be used either under or above ground because the impregnation lasts for practically a lifetime. The Radiata Pine Association of Australia claims that it lasts a lifetime. The fullest use of radiata pine from South-Eastern forests should be Government policy on all occasions, and I hope a directive to this effect will be issued to every Government department, including the Electricity Trust and Housing Trust.

The Leader of the Opposition said that at least 50 per cent of radiata pine should be used in all Government projects or things of a similar nature; I advocate a much greater use of this first-class building material. The Minister of Forests is charged with the control of our forests and the progress of these State

enterprises, and we look to him to foster the use of products of these forests. I think he could be more diligent in advocating the use of this product at Government level.

Paragraph 37 of His Excellency's Speech refers to a special grant of £1,000,000 to the Electricity Trust to extend a transmission line to the South-East. The extension of electricity to this area, of course, had to come about irrespective of who comprised the Government because it is essential to have ample supplies of electricity to establish a major wood pulp industry, and the cost of electricity used in producing wood pulp is about 30 per cent of the total cost. In previous Address in Reply debates I have strongly advocated the establishment of such an industry, and two years ago I quoted from statistics prepared by the United Nations research organization, that clearly showed that as the standards of living rose in various countries the consumption of paper products rose accordingly. America leads the world today in this regard with a consumption of 440 lb. of paper products a head each year. These products range from cardboard packages to newspapers, magazines and other paper products. Australia, with a consumption of about 170 lb. a head per annum, occupies sixth position in the world, whereas some Asiatic countries and parts of Africa, which have a lower standard of living than ours and in which educational facilities are limited or practically non-existent, have a consumption as low as one-third of a pound per annum. Members will see that Australia is far behind America and other countries in the use of wood pulp products. The future development of this industry is unlimited so members of this Parliament, who are the custodians of our pine forests, will be pleased to know that pine processed into wood pulp is at least three times as valuable as that used for building timber.

Members no doubt noticed in the 1959-60 Auditor-General's report that the recovery of dressed, undressed, and case timber was only 32.8 per cent of timber milled in log form. This State cannot afford to lose 67.2 per cent of its pine forests in the process of milling. True, most of the waste is used as fuel to generate electricity, but it is far too valuable for that purpose and should be put to a far more economic use. Using it as a fuel has not enabled electricity to be supplied as cheaply as we were led to believe it would because of the use of this relatively cheap fuel, but I shall deal with that aspect later. I am more concerned now about the proper use of our pine

forests. It takes 40 years to raise a pine tree to maturity and recovering only 32.8 per cent of that tree for marketing purposes is no way to use the resources of our forests. I am not reflecting on the Woods and Forests Department or its projects. This percentage of recovery is better than in most other countries at milling level, but when we have such a valuable asset it is not good enough to lose the market value of 67.2 per cent of the forest growth.

All overseas milling projects have an associated pulp industry. The pulp pays all the operational costs of the mill: the timber represents the profit. Some people may not agree with this, but the authorities I have read are happy about it. That is why we must have a pulp industry of major proportions associated with our State forests. The annual growth of the forests, which represent an industry valued at £75,000,000, is estimated at 140 tons of wood every hour of every day of the year. Every ton of wood represents 400 super feet of timber in log form. This forest growth represents 1,344,000 super feet of natural increment every day. Members can visualize from these figures what a tremendous amount of timber growth occurs in our forests every day. As future plantings will be increased from 4,000 acres to 6,000 acres a year this growth will continue to increase each year.

At present, unfortunately, we depend almost entirely on the sale of milled timber in its various forms to obtain a stumpage return. Apeel and Cellulose assist in this matter, but their consumption is only a relatively small percentage of the total forest output. Most of our forest growth is in the form of milled timber. The industry has been expanding every year. The radiata pine milled from the mature trees was being used for building purposes extensively in the eastern States as well as in South Australia, but what happened when the Commonwealth Government lifted the import restrictions last November? This permitted the importation of huge quantities of overseas soft woods, mainly at dumped prices. The timber yards in the capital cities of Australia are stocked to the utmost limit with imported soft woods.

Mr. Lawn: Is there full employment in the timber industry?

Mr. RALSTON: Mr. Harding read a letter from an unknown correspondent about my belly-aching about unemployment. I will deal with that later. These imported timbers are being used for house construction and we are not using Australian grown timber as much as

we should. We are spending our overseas funds on importing timber whilst our own timbers are being stockpiled at the mills. Timber production in the South-East is being progressively reduced and workers are being sacked. These dismissals are occurring although thousands of super feet of first class radiata pine wood suitable for building purposes are being stockpiled, waiting for someone to buy it. The people who should be buying it are importing timber from overseas. Unfortunately, this is what is happening in South Australia today.

I have enlightening figures regarding importations. I have taken them from Commonwealth forestry and timber bureau statistics. They deal mostly with importations of timber from North America. I have the figures for the six months ended December, 1959 (before the restrictions) and for the six months ended December, 1960 (after the restrictions had been lifted). The returns to June 30, 1961, are not yet available but I understand that they show substantial imports to replace the stocks sold from the yards of merchants. The imports from North America were mostly Douglas fir, hemlock, redwood and cedar timbers.

For the period ended December, 1959, importations totalled 72,666,000 super feet, and for the period ended December 1960, the figure was 123,964,000 super feet. The New South Wales figure for the first period was 41,368,000 super feet and for the second period 67,982,000 super feet. The figures respectively for Victoria were 12,070,000 super feet and 23,129,000 super feet. South Australia produces most of the radiata grown in Australia and she should have been doing something about the use of soft woods. Her respective figures were 17,808,000 super feet and 29,248,000 super feet. We had a much better importation rate than Victoria, and with only half the population. We did a good job in importing timber whilst stockpiling our timber at every mill in the South-East and putting people out of work! Honourable members will realize what effect this has had on the radiata timber sales from State and private mills in the South-East. The private millers are extremely concerned, for this has brought no happiness to them or to their shareholders. At their request, I have met them in conference on several occasions. They have had little success at Commonwealth level, and they wish to know what the State will do about it. They have applied to the Tariff Board for protection against this

unfair competition of imported timbers at dumping prices. They have done everything in their power to obtain a fair share of the Australian market. In their representations at Commonwealth level they have had no support from the South Australian Government.

Mr. Ryan: And they are both of the same Party.

Mr. RALSTON: That is so. I have yet to hear of any action by the South Australian Government to create a greater use of radiata pine in this State, or of any approach to the Commonwealth Government either in its own right as a timber producer or in conjunction with its fellow members of the Radiata Pine Association of Australia. If the Government has taken any action I shall be pleased to hear about it; I feel it should have done so and I trust that it has, but I have not heard of it yet and neither have the private millers. If the Government has taken some action we should know about it, and if it has not we should know about that, too. This matter is far too important for the State Government to be allowed to stand idle or for anyone to accept what has happened as being the inevitable. Everything is inevitable if one is not prepared to fight against it.

Mr. Stott: You said we were importing timber and at the same time stock-piling our own timber in the South-East. What is the imported timber being used for, and where is it going?

Mr. RALSTON: Imported timber is being used almost exclusively in housing. I mentioned this afternoon that in a Government contract to build a school the specifications called for almost 99½ per cent imported timbers. Incidentally, that school was built within a mile of the State mill—the biggest mill in the southern hemisphere—where thousands of feet of radiata pine had been standing, milled and ready, waiting to be used.

Mr. Stott: It doesn't sound very wise.

Mr. RALSTON: The people of the South-East do not think so. Having expressed my views on the timber position, I should now like to discuss the extension of electricity to the South-East. Firstly, may I say that this extension meets with my wholehearted support and approval, for I think it is a splendid thing and that it should have happened long ago. Perhaps now we shall get power and lighting at a rate comparable with that of the metropolitan area. I am pleased to know that members opposite have come around to our way of thinking on this matter. Speaker after speaker on the other side of the House

deserted his Party's cause and said that we were right. It is a slow process, to be sure, but I am pleased to know that we are converting them.

Mr. Lawn: They had better wake up; there is an election next year.

Mr. Ryan: If a vote were taken it might be different.

Mr. RALSTON: We might find that too. The member for Torrens, in moving the motion, said that the Electricity Trust provided the cheapest power on the average of any State in Australia except Tasmania, which had hydro-electric schemes. I do not know on what figures he based his claim, but the report of the Atomic Energy Commission, tabled in the Commonwealth Parliament, tends to prove that South Australia has the highest electricity generation cost of any State in Australia. When I interjected during his speech and asked him whether he knew the production costs per kilowatt hour at Port Augusta, he said he did not have the figures with him. Of course he did not have them with him; they are unknown even to the trust. He also said that he thought I would have been more interested in Mount Gambier. Well, how right he was! I shall now proceed to enlighten him about my interest in electricity costs in the region served by the Mount Gambier power station and how much they concern me and my constituents. After allowing for administration and distribution costs—which admittedly are lower in areas where the population density is greatest and this must be borne in mind—a comparison of costs or charges at a consumer's level in the three areas concerned makes interesting reading. There are three areas in South Australia where the generation of electricity on a major scale takes place under the control of the trust. We are unable to obtain generation costs for the Osborne or Port Augusta power stations.

On September 6 last year (page 941 of *Hansard*) the Premier replied to my question on notice about the generation of electricity by the trust. He stated, firstly, that the kilowatt hours generated at Osborne A station for the year ended June 30, 1960, were 57,885,480; at Osborne B, 917,456,200; at the Thomas Playford (Port Augusta) station, 716,033,700; at Mount Gambier, 40,269,880; and at Port Lincoln, 15,003,490. The reply to the second question was:

The power station at Port Augusta and the Osborne power stations feed into the trust's interconnected system. Overall costs of generation are not kept separately for these stations.

That is an unusual thing. There is a tremendous station at Port Augusta and two stations at Osborne, and the trust does not even know the generating costs at each station. I cannot imagine a major industry of this type not having an efficient costing system to ascertain the basic costs of generating electricity. That seemed a most unusual reply.

Mr. Ryan: Isn't the Government unusual in many ways?

Mr. RALSTON: There are some unusual members even if it is not an unusual Government. The *Hansard* report continues:

The combined cost per kilowatt hour supplied to the system from the Port Augusta and Osborne stations was 1.15d. a kilowatt hour. The corresponding figure at Mount Gambier was 1.95d. and at Port Lincoln 2.47d. The answer went further and stated that waste wood fuel was used at Mount Gambier and that Port Lincoln used furnace oil. Members can only accept the overall costs in the metropolitan area as shown in the statement made by the Treasurer but we can obtain a comparison of generating costs as between Mount Gambier and Port Lincoln.

The wood waste fuel used at Mount Gambier is obtained principally from the central mill and, I understand, the cost is 5s. a ton but to this we must add transportation costs because the fuel is taken a short distance from the central mill to the power station by a conveyor belt. I do not know the cost but it would be reasonably small and, to be fair, I suggest a cost of 5s. a ton, which would make the total cost of the waste 10s. a ton. In that year 93,579 tons was used and, costing 10s. a ton, the total cost would be £47,000. That fuel generated 40,269,880 kilowatt hours of electricity. Port Lincoln used 5,578 tons of furnace oil, the market price of which is now £13 7s. a ton. The Government buys its furnace oil under contract and, although the prices are treated as confidential, I suppose the Government would pay much less for it than the ruling market price. I suggest that the oil companies would be happy to supply it to the Government at £10 a ton, which is a substantial reduction, but the price may be lower or higher than that. However we must adopt some figure when everything has been done so secretly.

The cost of fuel at Port Lincoln was £55,780 to generate 15,003,490 kilowatt hours. The Mount Gambier regional power station produces nearly 300 per cent more power than Port Lincoln and at a substantially cheaper fuel cost and this should reflect itself in consumption prices and in consumer tariffs

because, obviously, if the fuel costs less and there is a much greater generation of power, administrative and distribution costs should be smaller. Therefore, the price of electricity at Mount Gambier should be substantially less than that charged at Port Lincoln, apart altogether from the metropolitan area price. That statement shows that electricity is cheaper, but only on some tariffs, when it reaches the consumer level.

The people in Mount Gambier and Millicent obtain domestic tariff on a quarterly reading at a slightly cheaper rate than others using the same amount of electricity, and on some tariffs the variation is substantial. My first comparison takes as its standard a normal all-electric house with a man, his wife and two children, and to make sure that my figures are fair I checked several homes and averaged their figures only to find that the resultant figure is close to the normal consumption figure. For domestic light and power on tariff M the average home would consume about 600 kilowatt hours each quarter and it would consume about 1,000 kilowatt hours on the night hot water service J tariff. On that basis the consumer in the metropolitan area would pay £10 7s. 10d. each quarter, at Mount Gambier he would pay £14 15s., at Port Lincoln £17 2s. 2d., at Millicent £18 15s., and at Tumby Bay £20 1s. 3d.

I brought Millicent and Tumby Bay into my calculations because they are each about 30 miles from the power stations at Mount Gambier and Port Lincoln respectively. Let us now examine the charge for industrial lighting and power—tariff P—which is given in two of these areas on a minimum consumption basis. To obtain the benefit of this tariff the consumer must use 30,000 kilowatt hours a year which, reduced to a quarterly figure, is 7,500 kilowatt hours—not a large consumption for industry. However, that is the minimum requirement and it is a fair basis to adopt for my purpose. In Adelaide the cost of that amount of electricity would be £111 5s. It would cost £115 12s. 6d. at Mount Gambier and £118 2s. 6d. at Port Lincoln. This is where we have anomalies because at Millicent the consumer would pay £146 17s. 6d. whereas at Tumby Bay the cost would be £128 12s. 6d. for the same consumption.

Why is it that, where there is a domestic consumption, the figures progressively rise at those towns? We know that the generating costs at Mount Gambier must be substantially cheaper. The figures I have already quoted show 1.95d. per kilowatt hour for Mount

Gambier as against 2.47d. for Port Lincoln, and yet, when it comes to industry, power can be generated at Port Lincoln only at a much greater cost, only 30 miles from Tumby Bay, than the power generated at Mount Gambier and Millicent. The person at Millicent pays a 27 per cent higher charge over the generating point at Mount Gambier whereas at Tumby Bay the increase is only 8½ per cent. I cannot follow those figures; I find them difficult to deal with. If the honourable member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) would cease making irresponsible interjections and listen instead, he would be a much better informed member on matters concerning this House than he is at present.

Mr. Hall: Why don't you give facts for a change? Base your statements on figures given properly and not on something supposed.

Mr. RALSTON: The honourable member can quote any figures he likes; I am quoting my figures.

Mr. Hall: They are airy-fairy!

Mr. RALSTON: Tariff P is a compulsory rate in Millicent and Mount Gambier, but it is available to the metropolitan area if the consumption is 30,000 kilowatt hours a year. I reiterate that, so that the member for Gouger will understand it. We have another anomaly when dealing with another rate, tariff R, a special rate granted at the time of the Light by-election.

Mr. Ryan: For political purposes.

Mr. RALSTON: That is when it was started and we heard some remarkable things about it. It is based on a quarterly 2,500 kilowatt hours consumption. I have kept it low because the higher the consumption goes so does the variation in price become more to the disadvantage of Millicent. Based on that quarterly consumption that I have mentioned in the metropolitan area, with this tariff R (for I suppose there are a few farms in the area) and on that consumption the cost to the primary producer would be £35 15s. over three months. At Mount Gambier, where there are a few farms, it would cost £40 4s. 2d. At Port Lincoln, where the generating costs are much higher, it can be got for £38 18s. 4d.; at Millicent it is £48 12s. 6d., and at Tumby Bay it is £41 10s. Why is the primary producer at Millicent expected to pay a rate of £48 12s. 6d. for that consumption in a three-monthly period when the farmer at Tumby Bay can get the same amount of electricity, produced at a much greater cost and distributed over the same distance of 30 miles, for £41 10s.? What will the farmers at Millicent think

of these things when they are brought to their attention? What will they feel about the activities of the trust? Will they feel that they have had a fair and just go? There is an election approaching and they are entitled to know these things. I am putting this forward so that they will be aware of the generous way in which the Playford Government has looked after their interests, especially on tariff R!

To decentralize industry, production costs must be comparable with those applying in other areas. It is impossible to get major industry to any country area unless there is a special reason such as some form of primary product there that can be processed on the site. But, if there is to be any form of decentralization without these inducements, production costs must be Government-controlled at comparable prices. The member for Gouger and many other members on that side of the House have stood up in this debate and made it clear that they support that policy in its entirety. They believe that the country person is justified in getting these benefits at the same rate as that applying in the metropolitan area. They are willing to advocate a policy of subsidizing the country consumer. We on this side have always advocated that and intend to go on advocating it.

Before completing my remarks, I shall refer to the letter read this afternoon by the member for Victoria (Mr. Harding). He read to this House extracts from a letter saying that the honourable member for Mount Gambier was "belly-aching" about unemployment. It was said to have come from the Mount Gambier district council area. I have enough confidence in the honourable member for Victoria to believe that it did come from that area. I shall not suggest that he wrote the thing himself or that it was passed over to him to see if he could embarrass me because I have been concerned about unemployment, but I should have appreciated it more had he been prepared to read out the name of the person who signed it.

Mr. Lawn: It was not the member for Barker, was it?

Mr. RALSTON: I did notice a prominent Liberal from another Parliament sitting in the Speaker's Gallery. I know that the honourable member is particularly perturbed about the unemployment and wants to convince us that it is very small indeed. Indeed, he is willing to quote figures at least six weeks old and only partly correct. They might have been correct about those who were receiving

unemployment relief but he did not bother to tell us about those who had not applied for unemployment relief. Nor did he mention anything about those who were registered as unemployed but were not receiving relief. No—they had to be kept secret, so he produced small figures of some 30 men and 20 women. What a marvellous performance on his part! There was no mention of the juveniles out of work—those details had to be kept quiet too. Those are the figures we are supposed to accept for the South-East. I ask you! Why, I have had more letters than that from unemployed people in the South-East and pitiful are the tales they tell me about the effect of this credit squeeze of the Menzies Government on their lives.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: You are being humorous!

Mr. RALSTON: If the Minister thinks it is a laughing matter, I don't. The honourable member for Victoria seems to be concerned about it. I can tell him that I have been in Naracoorte and heard the people along the street belly-aching about the effect of the credit squeeze on them. I have been in Penola and heard the people's views of the Menzies Government. A fortnight ago 11 men were sacked from the Penola mill.

Mr. Harding: There were 14.

Mr. RALSTON: Then the position is worse than I thought. There are 36 men in the South-East on provisional notice to finish at the end of this week. The member for Victoria claims that there is no unemployment. From my own research I know that there are nearer 300 than 30 unemployed. Unemployment is the concern of every person in South Australia. It is as much the concern of a Labor member in this House as it is the concern of a Liberal member in Canberra. Labor members live among their constituents, and I do not want anyone from Naracoorte telling me what is happening at Mount Gambier; nor do I want anyone from Coromandel Valley telling me what is happening. My constituents live near me and are on my doorstep. I know what is happening. The unemployment position was created by the decision of the Menzies Government last November.

Mr. Ryan: Supported by the Playford Government.

Mr. RALSTON: The Commonwealth Government started it, but apparently it has no idea of how to stop it. Perhaps the people will make the decision for it. It was a decision of the Menzies Government that created our

present unemployment position which is affecting at least 112,000 persons. It has brought untold misery to the wives and dependants of those workers. People have lost goods in which they have purchased a big equity. They have had to use their life savings in paying rent and in trying to maintain house payments. I know these things, because the people come and tell me. They may not go to the Liberals, but we Labor members know what is going on. The unemployment has created much suffering, poverty and want. The Treasurer knows what it is costing his Government in public relief payments. Of course, the only way public relief can be obtained is for a person to be destitute and receiving Commonwealth unemployment relief. He can then go to our Treasury to get a further hand-out to enable him to live.

Mr. Clark: Not live, exist.

Mr. RALSTON: We are concerned about these things. I have appealed to the people of Mount Gambier to let me know what is happening. I cannot get the true picture from Commonwealth figures, because some are released for political purposes and some are suppressed. Every member knows that is true, and no member opposite is denying it. Members opposite said I was belly-aching. I am telling them the truth now. What are they afraid of? Do they think it is wrong for a member to go to his constituents for the truth when it is not available elsewhere? That is the proper thing to do, and it is a pity that Government members do not do it. I support the motion as amended by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. STOTT (Ridley): Some of the speeches I have listened to have been most interesting, but tonight I propose to touch on one of the most topical questions concerning Australia today, and which everybody should understand: the question of the United Kingdom entering the European Common Market. In expressing a view on the effect of the U.K. entering into the Common Market—or, to use its proper title, European Economic Community—it is first essential that we should ascertain what the Common Market is all about.

The facts are that France, Italy, West Germany, Belgium, Netherlands and Luxembourg agreed, in a conference in Rome (which later became known as the Treaty of Rome) on four major objectives: (1) Steadily to eliminate tariffs among themselves and to move towards a common external tariff against non-members; (2) To adopt a common agricultural policy; (3) To "harmonize" a great range of economic policies covering, for example, employment, migration of workers, investment

and transport; and (4) To associate overseas territories (past and present colonies of members) as members but with certain special privileges.

Analyzing these four points, the first means that they will reduce tariffs amongst themselves and eventually move towards a complete free trade movement between the members of the Common Market. This can be likened to what happened in Australia at the turn of the century. In 1900, all the States joined together in the Commonwealth of Australia and agreed under the Constitution (with particular reference to section 92) that trade between the States should be absolutely free. The latter part of the first objective, "external tariff against non-members", means that the members of the Common Market are not going to be free trade countries in the world trade sense, but will put barriers against goods entering the countries of the members of the Common Market.

The fourth objective is the next one with which we can be concerned. It includes the words "to associate overseas territories . . . as members but with certain special privileges." It is not clear what these special privileges imply. The next query is, "Why should the U.K. be anxious to enter the Common Market?" The answer, not completely but mainly, is because some time ago Great Britain attempted, on a European-wide basis, to set up a free trade area. This move failed. The idea was for a tariff association, the members of which would gradually give each other free trade privileges but retain their own international tariff barriers against non-members. However, the proposals of this multilateral agreement did not include agriculture and this was the main reason why the agreement failed. However, Britain still has a minor agreement with Scandinavia, Austria, Switzerland and Portugal. This agreement offers a two-way bargain but it does not go very far towards economic integration.

As these previous moves failed, then the present countries in Europe, known as the "six", entered into their own treaty and formed the European Common Market. It has been implied by some leaders in Australia that Britain has no alternative but to enter the Common Market, mainly on political grounds alone. This thinking is as follows: Britain's application for entry into the Common Market is influenced by political motives, but it is also true to state that the main motive is one of trade. This is proved by subsequent statements from British Cabinet Ministers to the

extent that there is a market of 360,000,000 people in Europe, which cannot be ignored by the United Kingdom.

I now turn to the following statement made by the Minister for Immigration, Mr. A. Downer:

The Murray irrigation settlements would be "shaken to their foundations" by Britain joining the European Common Market. If Britain were to join unconditionally, £170,000,000 of Australian exports would be at stake, and a tariff wall would be erected against Australia which would shelter most of the democratic European nations. It would be without question one of the most decisive acts since the days of Queen Elizabeth I. The impact of Britain's entry on South Australia would be very severe. The economic and social life of our Murray irrigation settlements would be shaken to its foundations. The Barossa Valley and South Australian wheatgrowers would be similarly, but not so severely, affected. The statement made by the Premier which appeared in the *Advertiser* of Tuesday last included: "Pessimism in the rural industries over Britain's proposal to join the European Common Market was unwarranted". I will now quote statements made by the Prime Minister of Australia and more particularly by the Minister for Trade who, without question, have been very seriously concerned at the possible effects on the agricultural industries if the United Kingdom entered the Common Market. Who are we to believe, the Premier, who states there is nothing to worry about, or the Minister for Trade, who has been in all these negotiations down through the years and is fully conversant with all the implications involved to world-wide trade, and who has had his officers prepare voluminous reports on General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs and attended meetings on this question?

I pay a high tribute to the Minister for Trade, who has been most forceful in his utterances, which are full of authority, logic and common sense, and I entirely disagree with the Premier in his statement, which is dangerous. It could easily lull our rural industries into complacency so that they would consequently do nothing until the earthquake hit them, when it would be too late. Is the Premier prepared to accept that responsibility? He has made this statement in contradiction to the Prime Minister and the Minister for Trade. I can assure the House that the top-ranking officers in the Department of Trade and of Primary Industry in Canberra are seriously worried and extremely pessimistic on the effect on Australian primary industries if the U.K. enters the Common Market. It is true to state that the final terms of Britain's

entry are not yet known. Therefore, some people are not prepared to even think about the effects of it yet, but want to "wait and see" what the terms and conditions are. I do not agree with this thinking either.

We should analyse what could be Britain's conditions of entering the Common Market. Let us have a look at the possible conditions. I pose this question: Is it possible for the U.K. to enter into the Common Market with the other six member countries under special privileges and conditions that are not enjoyed by the six member countries themselves? To my thinking this is absolutely impossible, but I do not doubt for one moment that the U.K. will try. Let us have a look at the other members' viewpoints on this question. For instance, what would Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg say if Britain's entry into the Common Market included the entry of Australian and New Zealand butter into the U.K. market and retained the present preferential duty—in other words Britain would still retain a tariff barrier against her other partners in this agreement by butter entering the U.K. market. This, of course, is false thinking and quite impossible.

The words "Common Market" mean what they say—a common market between all members, and to my mind it is impossible to even contemplate that the U.K. should enter this Common Market with special privileges and conditions to the members of the Commonwealth to the exclusion of the members of the new agreement in the Common Market. The Prime Minister has emphasized that he has no doubt that there would be some conditions on Great Britain's entry. This may be true to a point, but they certainly would not be conditions that would be favourable to a continuation of Australian and New Zealand agricultural produce entering the U.K. market under the existing preferential duties. I believe this thinking is logical and it is strongly supported by those in the best position to know; therefore, it is logical and feasible to accept the position that if the U.K. enters the Common Market it will have serious repercussions on the Australian agricultural industry.

Mr. Jenkins: It would automatically lose the 20s. per cwt. for butter.

Mr. STOTT: Exactly. I am supported in my view by the Prime Minister, the Minister for Trade, and the Minister for Immigration, who have a full knowledge of all the implications involved, following talks with the British Minister for Commonwealth Relations (Mr. Duncan Sandys). At present

we enjoy a 10 per cent preferential duty on flour entering the U.K. market. I believe that this preferential duty will have to go. We have an honourable understanding with U.K. that it will undertake to purchase 28,000,000 bushels per year. This is not a bi-lateral agreement in the sense of an ordinary agreement; this is only an understanding. In effect it means that if Britain cannot purchase the wheat, she will not endeavour to do so. This is the only type of agreement that it has been possible to secure with the U.K. right down through the ages—in other words, it wants three parts of the stick all the time. This was clearly proved in Britain's negotiations in the International Wheat Agreement conferences. It was not prepared to enter the agreement on terms and conditions unless it could contract out of the agreement by some other safeguarding clause. It attempted to smash the I.W.A. on two occasions by remaining outside. This was done ostensibly for the purpose of allowing it a free hand to purchase wheat outside the I.W.A. quota and being able to secure it at lower prices than the floor price ruling under the I.W.A. However, subsequent events proved that the four main exporting countries refused to sell wheat outside the quotas in the I.W.A. below the floor price and the U.K. was forced to pay the same price for her wheat as every other importer throughout the world. Subsequently, this brought the U.K. back into the agreement—in other words because she could not get her own way she had no alternative but to join.

A similar position, I believe, will apply to Britain's application to enter the Common Market. As I said previously, it will try to get special privileges and conditions, or to have a clause whereby it can contract itself out, but I cannot see the present six members of the Common Market, nor the other outside seven, who are indicating that they are anxious to join as well, allowing the U.K. special privileges not yet enjoyed by the other partners to the agreement.

The Prime Minister has made these statements: "That whether it is a good thing or a bad thing depends on a choice which it is not for us to make." This is one of the points to which I object. He also said: "Australia has played a magnificent part in the Commonwealth of Nations and has given every possible assistance to the U.K." As it is possible that Britain's entry into the Common Market would have serious reper-

cussions on our agricultural industry, I believe that representatives of Australia should be present at the conference when Britain decides to enter the agreement.

Mr. Menzies said Britain would consult the Commonwealth before deciding to join the Common Market, either on terms or unconditionally, but consulting is not enough with the issues involved. We should be in the round table conference alongside our sister Dominions (New Zealand and Canada) in these negotiations. When the British Commonwealth, which every member must support, had economic and political problems to face, the Prime Ministers of the Dominions were called into conference. The results of these conferences down through the years have been outstanding.

I believe that the British Commonwealth is now facing its greatest crisis since the days of Queen Elizabeth I, and I therefore believe that we should have our representatives, and not the U.K. alone, at the round table conference negotiating this entry into the Common Market. The reasons for this are that a great diversity of interests is involved. We have had strong ties of common political procedures, traditions and aspirations as well as strong economic links in trade, and right down through all the various problems associated with these traditions we have had frank and friendly exchanges of views. Such a forum as this promotes understanding and often leads to appreciating the other fellow's points of view, and on many occasions agreement on important world issues has been reached by the members of the British Commonwealth; and yet, right down through the history of the British Commonwealth, all members have followed their own national interests.

This poses the question: should Britain join in her own international interests? If she does, then it certainly will challenge the interests of Commonwealth members, it may even strain relations, and it must inevitably throw Australia's economic and trade interests closer to our nearby Asian markets. This means that we will grow away from the British Commonwealth and establish closer ties and trade relations with the near East, China and Japan, and on the defence question it will throw Australia, as the food bastion in the South Pacific zone, closer to the U.S.A. In this opinion I have the support of the Minister of Trade, the Honourable J. McEwen, who stated:

No solution would seem possible unless Britain does in effect realize that whatever political gain there might be in Britain joining with Europe to make a politically stronger Western Europe, the trade consequences of that achievement could easily cause the whole economic structure of the free world to totter. This could happen unless the United States becomes positive and active in working with the European countries, including Britain, to introduce fundamental changes to existing policies affecting trade in primary products and raw materials—indeed, if there is one lesson from Cuba that is important, it is this.

Cracks in the political and economic structure of the free world could just as easily and indeed perhaps more rapidly develop in countries of the free world which are more affluent, more privileged or more mature, than in many of the underdeveloped countries, in their industrialization. These countries must be prompted and encouraged to grow and to raise their standards of living within a framework of genuine international co-operation. We do not want greater economic or political cohesion in Europe to be achieved at the price of weakening cohesion among the friends of the West outside Europe.

These are mighty words from a man who should know, and we should heed them.

Mr. Riches: Do you subscribe to them?

Mr. STOTT: I do. I think we must be realistic in our approach to the whole question. I believe that to be realistic Britain, as a great manufacturing country and trader, has to join the Common Market to ensure her economic survival. Having accepted this fact, I agree that we should not be complacent, do nothing, and adopt a wait and see attitude. Australia, through the Commonwealth Government, has indicated that we are not urging Great Britain to join unless she can guarantee continuation of British preferences of Australian exports to the U.K., and failing this, if Britain is forced to enter, to enter on conditions that will do least harm to the Commonwealth. To be realistic on this point we have got to realize that Britain does not hold all the cards. The four aces are held by the six partners in the present agreement and they are therefore the main bargaining power.

It seems extremely unlikely that Britain will be able to join and at the same time preserve tariff preferences for Commonwealth countries on the U.K. market. What does this mean for Australia? Britain may have to accept the common agricultural policy as laid down in the objectives. Although this is not finally settled, broadly it means that the partners in the Rome Treaty will aim at agricultural self-sufficiency. In pursuing this aim they will heavily subsi-

dize agriculture, which is a continuation of their present policy followed since the last war. Common prices for agricultural commodities will be established and, where imports from outside the Common Market are lower than, or equal to, this price, "lock out" levies will be imposed to keep out imports competing with the Common Market agriculture.

This will lead to a tremendous expansion of agricultural production in Europe. Australian farmers will find that, far from having a preference in exporting to the U.K., former competitors—French wheat or Dutch butter—will enjoy duty-free access and Australian products will be virtually locked out by heavy tariffs. To alter this, Britain will have to persuade all the other partners to the agreement to change their common agricultural policy which has been an integral part of these six countries ever since the end of the last world war. This, to my mind, seems highly improbable. However, if they were successful, what would this mean? It would mean under that system that Common Market agricultural producers would market their products at ordinary market rates and, if these rates were below a certain guaranteed or subsidized price, the Government would make up the difference to the producer.

From Australia's point of view this would at least be somewhat better than a system of "lock out" levies. Fortunately for Australia our greatest export (wool) will not be prejudiced by whatever Britain does, since the Common Market countries have agreed to admit wool duty-free. The same applies to important metal exports. My great concern is the real possibility that at least a major share of the Great Britain market for foodstuffs will be lost to Australia. Agricultural products that may be shut out, or at least partially excluded, are meat, dairy products, apples, pears, canned and dried fruits, eggs, wine, wheat, flour, sugar, rabbits, processed vegetables, jams and sauces.

I do not agree with the Chairman of the Australian Wheat Board (Sir John Teasdale) in his statement on this question. He stated, *inter alia*, "Public men are exaggerating". This is perfectly true. They are, and they need to be to alert Australian agricultural producers to the dangers ahead. He stated:

Western European countries can hardly increase output. If more wheat, then less barley, oats, etc.

This contention ignores modern mechanization and better yields in Europe. Recent history

has proved that they have increased and will increase their production, with the Common Market or not.

He also stated, "Britain buys from us what it needs and will continue to need it, irrespective of the Common Market." This is wishful thinking. If we could prove that, all would be happy, but this statement is completely contrary to all those expressions by the authorities in Canberra who ought to know; but I point out that Britain's entry means losing all our preferences. They will be handed over to European countries, which means increased European production.

Britain will continue to buy wheat, but in what quantities and at what prices? Obviously, if we lose our 10 per cent preferential duty on flour and in order to safeguard their own agricultural producers they must impose a 10 or 15 per cent tariff duty against the entry of Australian wheat, this must mean that the price of Australian wheat will fall in the Common Market countries, including the U.K., to the extent of the tariff duty. He also stated, "The Common Market will not cause an immediate set-back. People must eat and won't alter their eating habits."

I point out that it takes a year to make a change, and that the Common Market will make big changes in a few years. People will continue to eat, but they don't have to buy Australian wheat to do so. They don't have to eat our food if they can get supplies from within their own Common Market areas. It does not need any change of eating habits of Europeans to consume soft wheat. After all, Europe now uses 2,000,000,000 bushels of European soft wheat each year. More European wheat, which is of the soft variety, could easily replace Australian soft wheat. They must import, and continue to import, hard wheat. Most of this is supplied from Canada and the United States. Past history has shown us that wars, depressions, revolutions, and prosperity have caused Europe to change its eating and other habits every 10 years of the last century, and Europe did without our wheat for 10 years from 1939.

The chairman of the Wheat Board also states that "a tariff would affect all exporters alike. Europe would still need imports and Europe itself would pay the higher duties." This is perfectly true, but the E.C.M. countries do not only go in for tariffs. They indulge in quotas, special duties, lock outs, and other types of bars, to make sure that all local

types of production have a market. All exporters would be in the same boat, because Europe intends to have its market to itself. The aim is surely self-sufficiency, otherwise why have a Common Market? There would also be a surplus to export from Europe. I point out that France, Italy, Spain and Sweden are in the International Wheat Agreement as exporters, and Germany is a very strong competitor on our flour markets, so they will build up their own market with a self-sufficiency policy.

Instead of paying import duties, the idea of the Common Market countries is to pay high local prices to encourage production, and to supply all the Common Market needs. Sir John Teasdale also stated, "Taxing the foreigner behind high tariffs does not work". That is true enough too, but I point out that the U.S.A. built up the world's biggest free trade area inside the U.S.A. and behind high tariffs on imports. The countries in Europe are out to do the same thing. They have the advantage of a huge population on a rich continent, and the tariffs among themselves that they abolish will give them free trade within Europe itself, including the U.K. I now quote a translation of a statement issued by the E.E.C. countries on July 18 at Bonn, Germany:

The Heads of State and Chiefs of Government of Western Germany, Belgium, France, Italy and Luxembourg and the Premier and Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands; inspired by their desire to consolidate and strengthen the spiritual values and political traditions which form their common heritage; united in their awareness of the great tasks which are facing Europe within the community of the free nations for the safeguarding of freedom and peace in the world; endeavouring to strengthen the political, economic, social and cultural ties which link together the nations, in particular within the framework of the European communities, and to continue on the road towards European unification; convinced that only a united Europe, in alliance with the United States of America and other free nations, is able to resist the dangers threatening the existence of Europe and the entire free world, and that it is imperative to join together the energies, capabilities and resources of all those for whom freedom constitutes an inalienable possession; firmly resolved to develop further their political co-operation in order to achieve the unification of Europe and simultaneously to pursue the effort initiated in the European communities; desiring that other European States which are prepared to shoulder the same responsibility and obligations in all fields, may be in a position to join the European communities; have resolved:

1. To give form and stature to their aim, the achievement of political unification, which

aim is already embodied in the treaties establishing the European communities; furthermore, in pursuance of this goal, to organize their co-operation which will create, to an increasing extent, the conditions for a common policy and which eventually will make it possible to complete the work begun by the Institutions.

2. To have meetings at agreed intervals in order to compare the views, to harmonize their policies and to achieve a common line of thinking so as to further the political unification of Europe and thereby strengthening the Atlantic Alliance. The necessary steps will be taken to prepare these meetings.

On the other hand continued active co-operation of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs will contribute to the continuity of this joint effort. The co-operation of the six should not be limited to the strictly political field only but should be extended to education, culture and research.

This co-operation should be supported and maintained by periodical meetings of the Ministers concerned.

3. To instruct their committees to submit proposals for ways and means to give the union of their peoples a statutory character within the shortest possible time.

The heads of State and chiefs of Government are convinced that by choosing such a form of co-operation they will contribute to the further implementation of the treaties of Rome and Paris.

Furthermore, they are of the opinion that their co-operation will smooth the way for reforms which may be able to improve the effectiveness of the communities.

To achieve this they have decided:

1. To have study made of several points mentioned in the resolution of the European Parliament of June 29, 1961, concerning the political co-operation of the member countries of the European communities.

2. To give the public opinion a more important role in this work by requesting the European Parliament to widen the scope of their deliberations accordingly, in co-operation with the Governments.

I repeat what I said previously, namely, that we cannot afford to be complacent about this problem and therefore we must be energetic and alert to continue to build up our trade with our Near East neighbours and other countries. Recently Italy has reduced her price supports and Australia has sold 15,000,000 bushels of wheat to Italy. We recently had some magnificent sales of wheat to China. A total of 41,000,000 bushels of wheat has already been shipped to China, and we are already committed for a further 80,000,000 bushels.

Japan has purchased 15,000,000 bushels and Hong Kong 2,000,000 bushels. India purchased 400,000,000 bushels from the U.S.A. under Public Law 480. In addition to this, Australia has entered into an agreement to supply India with 333,000 tons of wheat. As recently as last week Spain, Norway, the Congo,

Lebanon and Egypt have also purchased Australian wheat. Another factor helping Australian trade in wheat is the record drought in Canada. Estimates from Canada this week show that due to drought their crop will be down to one-half of last year's production—an estimated 240,000,000 bushels. The U.S.A. is indulging in a more vigorous reduction in acreage of wheat, and their crop will not be as large as usual.

Some people have expressed the view that China will not pay for the credit sales of wheat made by Australia. This is only a fear and is not based on factual evidence. The Australian Wheat Board, with the support of the Commonwealth Government, has stated that it is confident that China will meet its commitments in full. The terms of the agreement are that they will pay 10 per cent deposit, 40 per cent in six months, and the balance of 50 per cent in 12 months. Bankers in London, too, have indicated that they are confident that China will meet its commitments in full. Australia last year had 310,000,000 bushels to sell—an all-time record harvest. It has already sold 234,000,000 bushels, and 173,000,000 bushels have been shipped. To achieve this shipping programme all ports throughout Australia have been working to full capacity, and only normal stocks will be held on December 1. China wanted a further 250,000 tons of Australian wheat but we were unable to supply them; we have to wait until September-October and then estimate the coming crop, at which time this sale could go forward. I conclude on the note that these are the dangers that I see facing Australia. The U.K. will, of course, continue to buy some Australian wheat, but I point out that certain terms and conditions which will be imposed on our wheat, according to the tariff raised against it, must inevitably reduce the price. I can see no other alternative.

I commend the member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke) for his comments about the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Company. I also commend the Government for guaranteeing 50 per cent of the additional £1,000,000 loan sought by the company. This proves that the company was built on a sound financial basis. Its progress has been fantastic and has confounded all the critics. Tenders have been invited for silos of 300,000 bushel capacity at Minnipa, Waddikee and Darke Peak on the West Coast. All those will be ready to receive wheat from this coming

season's crop. The 750,000 bushel terminal silo at Thevenard is progressing rapidly, and other silos in that division will shortly be considered. Additional storage of 750,000 bushels is to be built at Port Lincoln if finance permits.

A bulk wheat depot at Port Adelaide is being investigated. At present the company has built only enough silos to cater for the productive capacity of surrounding areas. Naturally, during the delivery period those silos become overloaded, and the company is unable to use rail movement from those silos because there is no shipping or no export from Port Adelaide. In order to overcome that problem and to meet the requirements of the local trade (which takes most of the Port Adelaide zone wheat), the company is considering the possibility of erecting a bulk wheat depot at Port Adelaide to enable local millers to pull up in their bulk trucks and take the wheat to their own mills. When that is done it will enable a rail movement from the silos in the Port Adelaide zone during the peak harvest delivery period, and this will possibly stop queues and stop the bulk wheat remaining out in the paddocks until the silos have emptied a little and are able to take it in.

Construction is under way at Andrews, Cowell, Ungarra, Roseworthy, Meribah, Appamurra, Cambrai, Frances, Darke Peak, Yeelanna, and Farrell Flat. These places comprise a 3,000,000 bushel capacity. The next five to be built will be at Waddikee, Wirrulla, Minnipa, Cummins, and Warramboe. They will not be ready for the 1961 crop, but they will be ready for the 1962 harvest. Tenders will be called next month for the Port Pirie 1,000,000 bushel silo in time for the 1962 harvest. That silo will be completed by then, but we are not certain at present what the Harbors Board has to do in completing the belt and other installations at Port Pirie.

Mr. Nankivell: Have you given up the idea of a storage at Keith?

Mr. STOTT: No. I am talking of the immediate future, and Keith comes in the next round-up. There are many other places such as Loxton or Pata, and probably Wanbi and Alawoona, and in the area between Meribah and Taldra in the Murray Mallee. We have considered Keith in that particular round-up. I have only listed those to be undertaken in the immediate future, and Keith has not been dropped by any means.

Mr. Jenkins: Has Streaky Bay been considered?

Mr. STOTT: When we get this 750,000 bushel terminal silo at Thevenard, other silos to feed that silo will be considered, probably within the next three or four months.

Mr. Nankivell: A 300,000 bushel capacity is not adequate for Tatiara.

Mr. STOTT: We may need one at Wolseley or towards Coonalpyn or Tintinara. The problem the honourable member raises is becoming urgent. The Bordertown silo is not meant to cater for wheat coming from Wolseley or the Frances area; it is only from the Bordertown area, and consequently before long other silos will have to be built in that district.

Mr. Nankivell: You will admit there is a tremendous production there?

Mr. STOTT: Yes, it is a very big production area. However, it is the same old story: the company is trying to spread silos over all parts of the State in order to give the growers bulk handling facilities as quickly as possible. The same applies to Gulnare, Gladstone and Owen. Once a silo is established everybody for miles round wants to use it: that jams up the silo.

Mr. Nankivell: Are the facilities at Port Adelaide to be available to us?

Mr. STOTT: That depends entirely on the proposal of the Australian Barley Board in relation to shipping bulk barley from Port Adelaide. The Barley Board has considered the question of eventually building an in-transit siding at Port Adelaide for shipping bulk barley. When the board completes the in-transit barley silos at Port Lincoln and Wallaroo the next step will be to consider Port Adelaide and when that stage is reached a conference will be held with the Barley Board to consider using the belt for barley and oats. That poses the question whether we should build a bulk wheat depot and I believe that that will have to be adjacent if we wish to ship a parcel of wheat over the belt at Port Adelaide and that would be handy in good seasons.

I come now to local matters affecting my own district. The Highways and Local Government Department should build a bridge across the river at Berri. I referred to this matter some time ago, but I have not urged it so much recently because the Government approved the Blanchetown bridge and we cannot expect two bridges in one set of Estimates.

However, I hope that in the Loan Estimates, shortly to be introduced, provision will be made for the Blanchetown bridge to be completed in slightly over two years. It is not necessary for us to wait until the passing of two Estimates and the completion of that bridge before we consider the urgency of a bridge at Berri. Two punts should immediately operate at Berri similar to the two now operating at Blanchetown. During weekends, particularly when there is a football match at Berri or Loxton, queues of motor vehicles form for great distances on either side of the river. Often the Loxton people will leave their vehicles on the Loxton side and travel on the punt as pedestrians, returning to get into their cars and go home, but many old people cannot walk that distance, and utilities and trucks used for business purposes must use the punt on market days. They are required to carry the stock purchased. This problem is reaching big proportions at Berri and two punts should operate pending the building of a bridge there.

Mr. Quirke: What about the low country on the Loxton side of the river?

Mr. STOTT: I do not agree with some of the contentions advanced by engineers who have always rejected a proposal to build a bridge at Berri because the low country is inundated in flood time. The engineers tell us that the banks cannot be built up because that would throw the water level back, thus flooding more country. I have never been able to accept the logic of the engineers that big pipes cannot be put through the banks to keep the water flowing. I have seen big pipes in embankments in other countries and the water flows through all the time and does not adversely affect the position. The main con-

tention of our engineers is that a bank will cause the water to flow back, flooding out the country and causing damage.

I come now to a question that is causing much concern to some sections of the primary producers, even greater concern than I realized. I get fresh evidence almost every week of the effect of the new land tax assessments on some producers. Obviously the land tax question must cause us all great concern and that is brought about chiefly because of the activities of subdividers operating near the metropolitan area. Subdivisional activity has been carried out extensively, with the result that some colossal assessments have been made by the Land Tax Department. That, however, is inevitable under the present Act, which defines the unimproved value as "what land can be expected to sell for". Consequently, if an assessor comes to value land and finds that a speculator has purchased 5,000 acres nearby at a high price he cannot be blamed if he assesses an adjacent agricultural property growing barley or grazing sheep at £1,000 an acre, because it is reasonable to assume that that land could be sold for that price. Therefore, the assessor is doing his duty under the Act in assessing the property at the price he believes the owner could sell for. An appeal can be lodged against the assessment, but how could an appeal under those circumstances be successful if the assessor were able to show that the adjacent land sold at that high figure? Under the terms of the definition the appeal could not possibly succeed.

I shall read one or two statements in my possession to indicate what has happened in certain areas close to Adelaide because of the incidence of subdivision. I shall not give the names of the people involved, but will give the acreages. The first information in tabular form is as follows:

Area.	Previous tax.		Tax on new assessment.		Increased tax.	
	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.
500 acres	154	8 10	3,475	17 0	3,321	8 2
308 acres	46	0 0	286	0 0	240	0 0
353 acres	77	7 0	1,494	15 10	1,417	8 10
237 acres	121	14 0	1,261	12 6	1,139	18 6
160 acres	23	15 0	232	14 2	208	19 2
10 acres (Morphett Vale)	9	12 6	344	0 0	324	7 6

The owner in the last-mentioned case understood that his tax would not be increased to the amount stated and, being an old man and acting on the information given to him by the officers, he leased his property at £205 a year. But he has to pay £324 7s. 6d. in land

tax. I have not read all the figures I have, but they are so interesting that I ask leave to have them incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

Land Tax Act, 1936-1952.

Address.	Acres.	Previous tax.		Tax based on new assessment.		Increase in tax.		
		£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	
Reynella	500	154	8 10	3,475	17 0	3,321	8 2	
Morphett Vale	308	46	0 0	286	0 0	240	0 0	
Morphett Vale	353	77	7 0	1,494	15 10	1,417	8 10	
Morphett Vale	237	121	14 0	1,261	12 6	1,139	18 6	
Reynella	160	23	15 0	232	14 2	208	19 2	The above land is leased until 1967 at £530 per year.
Morphett Vale	153	12	4 0	466	1 10	453	17 10	An increase of 3,800 per cent.
Morphett Vale	107	10	14 9	233	0 0	222	5 2	
Reynella	205-2-16	19	18 6	146	10 10	126	12 4	
Morphett Vale	9-2-15	2	11 5	26	13 0	24	11 5	
Hackham	658	97	10 0	2,377	2 9	2,259	12 9	
Morphett Vale	136-0-30	11	6 6	194	15 0	183	9 4	
Reynella	224-0-18	32	5 6	267	11 0	235	6 4	
O'Halloran Hill	918-3-5	185	17 4	1,225	2 2	1,039	4 10	
O'Halloran Hill	952-0-24	96	0 0	705	8 0	609	8 0	
O'Halloran Hill	722-2-11	82	14 2	912	15 0	830	0 10	
Morphett Vale	320	39	11 6	1,644	18 4	1,605	6 10	
Noarlunga	438	47	12 6	1,093	6 8	1,055	14 2	
Morphett Vale	—	9	12 6	344	0 0	324	7 6	Leased for £205 per year, being less than the rate.

Mr. Laucke: In all the situations you have referred to, no tax has been levied as yet, and the minimum proposed would cover the situation?

Mr. STOTT: No, it would not. That is what I am concerned about. Many of those tax assessments have been made a few months ago. They were all made at the time of the high incidence of land sales just prior to the effect of the credit squeeze. Because of the credit squeeze, many sales have not materialized. Consequently, these people are left with that assessment for five years. I do not know what is in the proposed Government amendments to the Land Tax Act; we shall have to wait and see. All I can go on at the moment is the Treasurer's statement in the press. He has said, in effect, that they can appeal and get their land assessed as agricultural land. That does not answer the problem if that is all that is intended—and I do not know if it is.

However, if that is so, this is what will happen. People will appeal because they are affected by subdivisional activities. They will still be holding agricultural land, supporting sheep, barley, wheat, etc., so they will be assessed on agricultural land—but on what figure? We do not know. Unless the definition of "unimproved value" in the Act is altered, they will still be mulcted because all that will happen is that some person will come along and buy some agricultural land for speculative

purposes at a high figure. They will be assessed on that high figure (by definition under the Act) at which it can be sold, and they are landed again, so it is not satisfactory. I pose these questions deliberately to the House as they are dangers I can see, but I do not know what the Government's intentions are in respect of the Act.

I put it to the House that there are anomalies. Every member must admit that there are anomalies in the present Land Tax Act. The Government is convinced there are; otherwise it would not be bringing down amendments. I suggest that the Government appoint a committee of inquiry to go into the whole question of the Land Tax Act and how to make assessments on an equitable basis. It should be set up with the following terms of reference:

To call for and receive evidence to enable the committee—

- (1) to consider and report on the present methods and bases of the valuation of land for land tax, local government, succession duty, and other State revenue purposes, and the extent to which they give rise to anomalies and injustices;
- (2) to devise and recommend an equitable basis of valuation for such revenue purposes of land in areas where land is used in fact substantially for primary production and is intended to be so used in the future alongside or near land which has been sold or cut up or is intended to be used for subdivisional or building purposes;

- (3) to consider the practicability of basing the values for such revenue purposes on land used for primary production on its productivity for that purpose;
- (4) to consider and report generally on the valuation of rural, as compared with urban, land;
- (5) whether any anomalies, variations or injustices are apparent between the State authorities and the Commonwealth authorities made on assessment on land for gift, estate, and/or succession duties, and to make recommendations as to the course to be adopted to ensure the uniform application of any methods recommended to the assessment of gift and estate duty and to other Commonwealth revenue purposes.

The committee should be of three, comprising a chairman (say, Sir Edgar Bean or Sir William Bishop), one representative of the Government and a representative of the owners of land used in primary production. Some members may ask: why worry about the gift and estate duties as between the Commonwealth and the State? The point there is that, where an older partner wants to retire or leave his land to his sons to avoid paying terrific probate duties and his health may not be good enough to enable him to qualify for an insurance policy on probate, his only alternative is to form a company with his sons. He does that and we find then that he has to pay a gift tax of three per cent when handing the land over to such company. The local State authorities assess the land on the same interpretation of the unimproved value of that land under the Land Tax Act, namely, on what it can be expected to sell for. They base it on local sales of land, collecting the data from the local stock agents, and that is reliable information. They assess it accordingly and it is accepted by the State authorities. But, subsequently, the Commonwealth Government comes to the party in respect of gift and estate duty, and the Commonwealth authorities may assess the same land at £23 an acre higher than the State authorities have assessed it. There is a grievous anomaly, a definite injustice, because how can the Commonwealth authorities assess land for gift duty at £23 an acre higher than the State authorities whose assessments are on actual sales that have occurred adjacent to the land divided up by the company?

I do not put myself forward as a know-all with all the answers to these problems. I admit I have not the answers, but I am posing these questions and I am convinced that we should get the fullest possible information. So, let us appoint such a committee to get all

the evidence and reports available for us, and then the Government in its wisdom can bring down the necessary amendments based on the report of that committee. We should also consider the practicability of basing assessments on land used for primary production on its productivity. When we make an assessment of income for income tax purposes, we furnish particulars of the gross return and productivity of that land, less any allowance made, and then we get the net return on which tax is payable, which, in effect, means that the producer pays income tax on the productivity of his land. If that is good enough for income tax purposes I am satisfied it is sound enough to adopt for land tax purposes as well. Some people raise all sorts of queries. The income tax method could not be applied in every case, but an average of the district could be taken. That could easily be obtained by the authorities from the average productivity of the land. Taking an average assessment of that, they could arrive at the assessment for land tax purposes accordingly. I have an open mind on this. I do not know that I have all the answers, but I believe that a capable committee should be appointed to inquire into the whole question and report to Parliament. I would be willing to prepare evidence for submission to that committee.

One or two members have referred to the need for water conservation in South Australia and to the process of desalination of water which, I believe, is a coming event in South Australia. If the present rate of population increase is maintained we shall be confronted with serious problems. We must obtain more water. The building of a dam north of Paringa, in my electorate, will be a huge undertaking that will be of inestimable value to our irrigation areas and to metropolitan industries. The sooner the Governments involved can reach agreement the better, because this project will take years to complete. Another main, from Murray Bridge, is necessary to augment Adelaide's water supply, but I suggest that within five years it will be inadequate to meet the demand. I have read articles about desalination processes in India and the United States. This question is so important that we should gather all possible evidence on the economic removal of salt from water so that that water can be used for industrial purposes. I have previously referred to the fact that by 1970 there will be insufficient employment for the children leaving school.

Mr. Riches: 1970! What about 1961?

Mr. STOTT: Provided there is no further panic in Canberra that imposes another credit squeeze, there is some hope of relieving the present position, but by 1970, even if money is available, industry will not be able to provide sufficient employment for the available labour. Experts should be examining this prospect to find a solution. I had intended to refer to the credit position, but members have had the pleasure, or horror (depending on their viewpoint) of listening to me on anomalies arising from the Commonwealth's credit policy. I can see no good in a policy that restricts credit in times of plenty or that withdraws money to create unemployment. That is a policy of tragedy, and I do not agree for one moment with the Prime Minister's statement that calamity howlers are causing trouble and a lack of confidence. It is not the calamity howlers, but his stupid financial policy that has created the problem. That policy caused unemployment and the Prime Minister frightened the people almost to death: now he blames them for a problem of his own creation. I am completely opposed to the Prime Minister's views on this subject. I support the motion.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart): I do not propose, at this late hour, to keep the House for a long time, for two good reasons: firstly, because I have no illusions that the House would want to listen to me for any time, particularly at 9.35 p.m. and, secondly, because I have been assured that if I am brief the Premier will be brief, and I know that the House will appreciate that. Most of the items affecting my own district can be discussed during the debate on the Loan Estimates and I propose to avail myself of that opportunity for discussing purely district items, with the exception of one or two.

I join with other members who congratulated His Excellency on the manner in which he delivered the Speech with which he opened this session. I associate myself with their expressions of goodwill and their hopes that he and his Lady will have a happy stay in South Australia. I am convinced that the people are happy with them. His Excellency and Lady Bastyan have already graced Port Augusta with a visit, and we were amazed at their knowledge of South Australia and the living conditions of people. They were able to converse easily with the ordinary people about their ordinary fields of work and they displayed great understanding and friendliness. When Sir Edric and Lady Bastyan returned to Adelaide they wrote expressing appreciation

of the warmth they felt at Port Augusta and said that when they returned next May they believed they would be coming among friends: that will be so. His Excellency came to us representing the Queen and we asked him to represent the people to the Queen. We told him (and I mention this because of the speech we have just heard) that the loyalty of the people of South Australia to the person of Her Majesty the Queen and to the Throne of England and to the British Commonwealth of Nations reached a far higher level than any mere consideration of trade and commerce.

I deplore statements, not only from the member who has just resumed his seat but from members in the Commonwealth sphere, that hold Australians up as people who, because they may have to re-adjust their thinking in terms of trade and commerce, are prepared to strain or sever their links with the British Commonwealth. I do not believe such statements. I believe that this question of Britain entering the Common Market is of grave concern, but I do not think it will have the effects prophesied by the member for Ridley. On the contrary, I believe that for some of our industries it could be a means of channelling some of our products into that market more advantageously than at present. We do not know the full repercussions, but Australia has never had cause to believe that England would let her down. I believe there is just as grave concern for the well-being of the Commonwealth by the Old Country as there ever was. I speak in this way because there are young people in my district who have, by dint of saving and determination, been placed in a position to travel. Before going overseas they ask me for a letter of introduction, perhaps to the Agent-General of South Australia in London or to the Embassy of some of the other countries. It has been my privilege as mayor of Port Augusta to provide those letters and of their own volition every one, with one exception, in the last five years, has chosen to go to England. The other one went to America. Invariably I have received letters from them expressing appreciation of the courtesy extended to them in England. Some of the letters have arrived after they have left the Old Country and gone to the Continent. Last week I received one from Luxembourg and instead of this person telling me of the experiences he must have enjoyed and the scenes he had seen in that country, his outstanding impression was witnessing the Trooping of the Colours and being near to the Royal Family in some part

of England. There is something deeper in the average Australian outlook tying us to the British Commonwealth than mere considerations of trade and commerce.

Mr. Jennings: It would be a pretty poor show if it were not so.

Mr. RICHES: I agree. I wish to suggest something for the consideration of Mr. Stott. I think that the entry of the U.K. into the Common Market will mean that we shall have to pay greater attention to the marketing of our products than hitherto, and we may have to trade with people whom we do not like in some respects. I do not know that those who trade with us necessarily accept all our thinking and our way of life; but we must live in this world with other people and it is reasonable to expect that we should trade with them. If Australia can persuade the Chinese to become eaters of wheat, what a great market could be opened in Asia and what goodwill could be built up amongst the people with whom we come in contact. Let us start at home and educate our people to buy Australian produce. I saw in the *Port Pirie Recorder*, which is published in my electorate, a letter written by a Port Pirie housewife who placed an order for groceries. She did not state what brands of produce she required, but merely put in an order for frozen peas, frozen strawberries, marmalade jam, tomato pulp, wafer biscuits and fish cutlets. This is the extraordinary thing she discovered when she opened her order—the frozen peas came from Georgia in the United States of America, the frozen strawberries from Kansas, U.S.A., the marmalade jam from England, the tomato pulp from Italy, the wafer biscuits from Sweden and the fish cutlets from Norway. In the Port Pirie district large quantities of green peas and tomatoes are grown which are exported to Melbourne and which form an important part of the local economy, and oranges are grown at Beetaloo, which is also in the district. Surely South Australia can produce wafer biscuits. Let us look to our own market as well and let Mr. Stott try to educate Australian manufacturers and distributors and let him approach the Commonwealth Government regarding import restrictions on goods that can be manufactured competitively here.

I commend Mr. Quirke for what I thought was one of the most eloquent contributions to the debate. As to his announcement on economic reform, the House knows that I go a long way with the honourable member in that regard, but I cannot understand his

continually getting off the rails and why he cannot recognize his friends. Further, why does he take every opportunity to point out the weaknesses of the only organization in Australia that will ever have the opportunity to give effect to the reforms he has advocated over the years? He knows, as the people of Australia must know, that there are two political forces in this country, one of which stands for the retention of the *status quo* for the preservation of everything we know by way of privilege. The reforms he advocates are not likely to be given effect to because they cut across privilege and interfere with private interests, and the pickings which people live on in terms of unearned increment would be reduced if ever those reforms were given effect to. These reforms would be against the interests of those people who stand for the preservation of the *status quo*. The only opportunity for people to have a voice in achieving reform is through the other movement that he said was once so great. It is as great as it ever was, and in its future lies the control of the destiny of this country.

I hope that the existing unemployment situation is one that I shall never see again. I have a vivid recollection of what was said by the Honourable Sir Shirley Jeffries at the time he was a Minister in the South Australian Liberal Government and was charged with the unpalatable duty of handing out the dole during the last depression. I can remember his saying what relief he felt when it was no longer necessary, owing to the outbreak of war, to continue this practice. He said that never again would he lend himself to engagement in any act in which he would be handing out the dole, because there was nothing more soul-destroying or devastating as far as family life and humanity were concerned. As His Excellency the Governor said to a management conference in Adelaide this week—unless the world blows itself to pieces in the meantime we have great opportunities for expansion in enterprise if we are only imaginative enough. He described some people who were always looking backward as "ghouls of gloom". He was addressing his remarks to leaders when he said:

You who are the leaders today must not be held back by this psychology if you are going to play fair to the young people who will be leaders tomorrow.

Everything associated with this depression has been brought about by the deliberate act of the controllers of the Australian economic structure.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Are you quoting?

Mr. RICHES: Yes, I shall quote first of all the Commonwealth Attorney-General (Sir Garfield Barwick) who admitted in Queensland that unemployment because of the credit squeeze (that is what he attributed it to) was greater than the Commonwealth Government could have wished or could truly have foreseen. He also admitted:

We did not put the squeeze on and hope for the best; it was done after investigation and as a deliberate act of Government policy.

The Commonwealth member for Barker (Dr. Forbes), speaking at Bordertown last week, admitted that the measures adopted by the Commonwealth Government last November had had some effects that had not been intended, but the squeeze was intended and the policy was deliberate. He said there was no intention to depress home building, and went on to say:

Steps have been taken to remedy the effects where they have gone wrong and as measures achieved their objectives they were relaxed. Business confidence was returning, unemployment had reached its peak, and the situation would improve without going back to the over-employment of last year.

Here is a gem! It was reported in the last issue of a Mount Gambier paper that Mr. Forbes said:

To have no person unemployed at any time would involve a degree of control of individual freedom which I am sure the people will regard as objectionable.

To have no person unemployed at any time I thought would be the ideal, but it is the deliberate objective and desire of some members (I do not believe all the members of the Commonwealth Government would subscribe to this; surely not!) that there should be some unemployment. Experience has shown that this kind of thing cannot be turned on and off like a tap. It cannot be controlled, and at least 100,000 people in Australia would hold that it had already got out of hand.

When in Adelaide in June, the Prime Minister admitted that there was unemployment, but said that it was not on the scale other people thought. He said that the Commonwealth Government was going to watch it and that steps would be taken to control it. He is a long time exercising that control! And all this is at a time when the Governor could tell us when he summoned us to this Session of Parliament that the past season proved to be one of the best experienced in the State, the harvest yielding an all-time record of 100,000,000 bushels; mineral production for the past year

both in quantity and value constituted a record, the nominal production value exceeding that of the previous year by more than £1,000,000; State forests continued to flourish and log production was expected to exceed 190,000,000 super feet; and so on.

His Speech contained no reference to unemployment, of course; it drew attention to the wealth of the State, the bountiful seasons and the record mineral production—a situation in which there should be a jumping-off place for the greatest era of development this State has ever known, in which there should be no need for unemployment in any part of the State. However, it is in these good times that these depressions occur! Those of us who remember the last depression will recall that our barns and warehouses were full, and we were short of nothing but the money to exchange for the goods produced. In tonight's television news service a warning was given by the Australian Coal Board that New South Wales miners had produced more coal than it could market. I hope the member for Rocky River heard that; the miners produced it in a 40-hour working week. There is now a danger, of course, that society will say that we have no place for them, that they have done their job, and that they can be out.

Mr. Heaslip: Who said that?

Mr. RICHES: I did not say anybody said that, but society will say it. It is time that the economists of this country got together and learned the fundamentals: that there is no need for depression, unemployment and sealing up works when everything produced is here in plenty. It is as silly as a donkey standing in a paddock with food up to its belly yet going hungry. I support the amendment.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): I do not wish to take up the time of the House very much tonight in answering previous speakers in the debate. Many suggestions made by members will be followed up to see if mutual benefit can be derived from them, and I shall examine one or two matters raised. During the debate two matters were mentioned prominently, and I think they featured in almost every member's speech. These matters are of great importance to us. One is the unemployment which we unfortunately have in our State at present and which, unless we take an active interest in it, can easily resolve itself into a hard core of unemployment, because we are gradually getting to a position in which, when people become unemployed through the credit squeeze, the

tradesmen are picked out and the unskilled workers are left in the unemployment office. This means that, although the numbers may not appear to be rising steeply, the problem is more difficult for the people unemployed than it was previously. One or two members seemed to resent the fact that the Government had taken action to support a statement made by Mr. Heffron regarding an interstate conference. One or two interjections were made about this, one by the Leader of the Opposition who implied that the State Government had not become interested in this problem until the last few days.

I have the official docket dealing with the matter. Let me accurately set out the facts about what happened in this State regarding the unemployment position. At the Loan Council meeting there was made the strongest case for more money to relieve unemployment, and as a result of the South Australian case additional money was made available. When we talk about taking action to relieve unemployment, the only way the State Government can do it is by spending money. There is no other way for the State Government, because it cannot give tax remissions in order to induce employment, and it has no economic control over import licences, etc. The only way in which the State Government can help relieve unemployment is by spending of hard cash. Because we were able to get additional money from the Loan Council, and because we were able to finish with a surplus in last year's revenue accounts, we could to some extent take immediate action to relieve the unemployment position.

In South Australia we have the motor industry, which was the industry hardest hit by the economic measures. Although South Australia depends on that industry to a greater extent than any other State, official Commonwealth figures show that the percentage of unemployment in this State was the lowest in the Commonwealth. That was achieved because the Government by the good husbandry of money in other ways was able to make additional money available to provide employment. Mr. Lawn was keen to compare unemployment figures and he asked me a question about the number of people directly employed in the Government service. I think he was pleasantly surprised to learn that this Government, unlike other Governments, had not laid off any men. The Government has continued to employ men, and it even took on a large number of unskilled men.

Mr. Lawn: How many?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I think about 1,000 extra men were employed in the Engineering and Water Supply Department. I could get the exact figure for the honourable member. They were difficult men to place. I make no apology for the direct action taken by the Government. There was the inference that the South Australian Government did not care and did not make any representations to the Commonwealth on the matter. In an interjection the Leader of the Opposition said that we would not waste a fivepenny stamp on it.

Mr. Frank Walsh: You said that to a deputation.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I did not.

Mr. Frank Walsh: Yes, you did.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Let me quote from the docket, which contains the proof. If necessary, my secretary will give a certificate saying that it contains all the papers relevant to this matter. The docket is available if members want to look at it. The first communication I got in this matter came from Chrysler Aust. Limited and contained a copy of a letter from that company to the Commonwealth Treasurer. It was dated November 24, 1960. The company pointed out what would be the economic effect of the measures proposed by the Commonwealth Government. My letter to the Commonwealth Treasurer was written on November 28, 1960. I will read it so that members may get its tone. It states:

Mr. D. H. Brown, managing director of Chrysler Aust. Ltd. of Keswick, S.A., made representations to me stating that the new Commonwealth proposals for sales tax will hit Chryslers very heavily and they will have to reduce employment. In fact, on Thursday November 24, they announced severe retrenchments. I personally am very concerned. South Australia depends almost entirely industrially on the motor car industry and the new tax will undoubtedly detrimentally affect this State very much heavier than any other State. I understand that the proposals are of a temporary nature only. Could I have some information on which to advise Mr. Brown?

In my letter to Mr. Brown I enclosed a copy of my letter to Mr. Holt, the Commonwealth Treasurer. I received a letter from Mr. Holt in which he informed me that he would reply direct to Mr. Brown. I took up the matter immediately with Mr. Brown. Mr. Holt's letter was posted on December 16, and probably I received it on December 18. On December 20 I sent a letter to Mr. Brown, saying:

Referring to your letter of November 24 in which you enclose a copy of your letter to the Federal Treasurer, I made representations to Mr. Holt and he has now informed me that he has replied direct to you. Is there any further way in which I can assist you? I understand that the reply was not very satisfactory.

The next paper in the docket is a telegram which came to me from Mr. Birrell of the Vehicle Builders Union of South Australia. It was sent from Canberra and arose out of a deputation from various unions that had waited on the Commonwealth Treasurer. The telegram stated:

General Motors-Holdens to retrench 1,550 employees in South Australia. Respectfully request that you make urgent representations to Prime Minister in effort to rectify decision. I immediately made representations to the Prime Minister and informed Mr. Birrell that I had done so. If honourable members wish to hear the contents of the letter I sent to the Commonwealth Treasurer, I shall be happy to read that letter to the House. It reads:

At the Loan Council meeting last week you were asking the States to give some indication of how the present economic controls were affecting the level of employment in the respective States. You will remember that before South Australia, Western Australia and Tasmania had expressed any views, other matters intervened and you suggested that anything that seemed to require attention should be forwarded to you by letter. I am most deeply concerned at the position that the motor industry is rapidly being forced into. Already there have been very severe retrenchments and I am informed further heavy retrenchments are inevitable. The restriction of credit is probably having a bigger effect upon the industry than the increased sales tax, but there is not the slightest doubt that the additional 10 per cent in the primary cost of the car is seriously hampering sales. I feel that this must be closely watched or it will very quickly snowball and cause major repercussions. I have already received representations from the Vehicle Builders Union in South Australia concerning the retrenchment of 1,550 employees in this State from General Motors-Holdens, but I feel that this, as serious as it is, is not the end of the matter, and I have a feeling that Chrysler's also are very seriously involved. Any assistance that you can give in connection with this matter will be greatly appreciated.

The next paper in the docket is a reply from the Commonwealth Treasurer, who said:

I have noted and made known to my colleagues the concern you feel about the position of the motor industry and your views on the factors which have contributed to retrenchments being made. The situation in the motor industry formed part of the general examination Cabinet has been making over the last two days of various aspects of the Australian economy. You may have learned from the press that I am receiving a deputation led by the Australian

Council of Trade Unions on Monday to discuss employment aspects in particular, and yesterday I placed before Cabinet the contents of a communication received from the President of the Federal Chamber of Automotive Industries. I can assure you that we are maintaining close contact with the developments.

The next letter in the docket, dated February 17, was received by me on February 20. It is from Mr. Brown of Chrysler's, who stated:

Dear Sir Thomas, Your letter of the 20th has just come to my attention. I have been absent overseas from December 17 until the first week in February, and during this time your letter was referred to Mr. Ferguson. I did receive a reply from Mr. Holt and your understanding is correct in that this reply in no way offered any hope that Government action would be taken to improve the sales position of the automotive industry. As you are well aware, the employment and sales position of the automotive manufacturers is continuing to deteriorate. The situation is proceeding to the point that it would appear that recovery will be slow and painful. Thank you for your efforts on our behalf.

The next communication in the docket is a press cutting that was placed in the docket by one of my officers; it was not there as a result of any communication forwarded to us. It states:

The Leader of the State Opposition (Mr. Walsh) yesterday called on the Premier (Sir Thomas Playford) for a top level conference to review the "national economic emergency". In a letter to the Premier, Mr. Walsh said, "I request that you as Premier call a conference within the State of representatives of industry, commerce and trade unions to work out a plan to counteract the effect of the economic restrictions now being applied by the Commonwealth Government. These restrictions are retarding the industrial development of this State. Large numbers of workers are being dismissed, and if this is permitted to continue a position similar to the depression years may be created." Mr. Walsh recalled that the Prime Minister (Mr. Menzies) had refused his request for a conference of Premiers and Opposition Leaders to review the position, and asked that his request be considered as urgent. A meeting of the South Australian Trades and Labor Council last night expressed "grave concern" over the retrenchments.

That cutting is dated February 11, 1961. I have never received the Leader's letter. When the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) said that Mr. Walsh had sent me a letter I immediately interjected and asked him, "Are you sure?" and he said that he was sure. I am equally sure that that letter has never been delivered to me, for none of my officers have seen it and I certainly have not. Mr. Walsh did make personal representations to me, and on February 21 I replied to those representations as follows:

Dear Mr. Walsh, In respect of your communication regarding retrenchments in the motor vehicle industry I can assure you that everything we can possibly do from this end is being done to relieve the position of those who have lost their jobs. A survey has been made of Government departments' requirements, and where possible employment has been provided. Unfortunately, a large number of the retrenched persons are not skilled tradesmen but are process workers, and, as our shortages have been mostly in the skilled categories, we have not been able to give as much assistance as we desired. In addition, I have been in communication with the motor industry itself and with the Federal Treasurer to see if there is any useful action that the Government can take to assist the position.

I could quote the remaining papers in this docket but I think that I have quoted at least enough to convince any fair-minded person that right from the very start, before even the trade union movement had taken steps on this matter, the management of the motor firms having expressed concern to me, I had made the utmost representations in my power to convince the Commonwealth Government that the action taken had been unwise and that it should be corrected as quickly as possible.

I take very great offence indeed at the suggestions of honourable members opposite that the Government had not been interested in the unemployment situation and that it had only taken some interest in it at this late stage. If I were to go on quoting from the docket I could tell honourable members something rather more significant still: that, although Mr. Heffron stated publicly that he was communicating with all the Premiers to ask for a Premiers' Conference, he did not in fact communicate with South Australia. The only communication I have had from Mr. Heffron on this matter was a telegram he sent me after I had written him a letter. I regret that I have neither the letter nor the telegram here but will table them tomorrow for honourable members if they desire them. I wrote to Mr. Heffron and told him that I considered a conference should be called and that I understood he had made some representations to another State previously but had not been successful because of the Victorian elections. However, I still considered that a conference should be held to put the matter in the strongest possible terms to the Commonwealth Government. He replied by telegram asking what sort of things we desired to raise if a conference were called. I sent an immediate answer setting out my views but I have received no further communication from him.

Mr. Lawn: If the Premier is sincere in what he is saying he will not ask the people to

return the present Commonwealth Government at the next elections.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will not answer the honourable member's question couched in those terms. He said, "If I were sincere". I never use terms like that to honourable members and if the member wants an answer he should couch his questions properly in this House. If there is one State that has done its utmost to relieve the unemployment position it is South Australia. That statement may not be to the liking of honourable members but I believe it is true and I hope I will get honourable members' support on the matter.

While on this topic I wish to say something else about unemployment which is not so controversial but which is a matter of policy. The Government frequently receives suggestions from people—often unfortunately in responsible positions and in one or two instances from Federal Ministers—that the States should now take off the brake and spend their money forthwith to relieve unemployment. I have examined that position and find that the Minister of Works' Department is over-spending its Loan money. That is causing me great concern because in round figures the total sum which this State has will be about £80,000,000 on the Budget and about £50,000,000 on the Loan Estimates. It may be a little more than that in each instance, but the total is about £130,000,000, which means that we have a limited sum for each month and that, if we spend more than our appropriation in the first month, we will have to sack someone in the last month. It is as simple as that. We are governed by the amount of cash we have. We cannot make cash: we have not the control over the credit resources of the Commonwealth and the amount of money the Treasurer of this State can spend is the cash available to him. If by any chance we spend more than the appropriate sum in the first month we must spend less than the appropriate sum in the last month and that merely means that we have to retrench people.

I have always taken the view (I believe it is the correct view) that we do not want ups and downs in our economy: a stable economy gives assurance and confidence to people and enables them to plan. Without a stable economy every man in the Government service is looking over his shoulder day in and day out, wondering when the axe will fall. Over the last 23 years we have had a proud record regarding retrenchments. I think honourable members who have been here—many of them

nearly all that time—will remember that there was a time in Parliamentary history when scarcely a week went by without a debate on the Government's having to retrench so many men at Islington or somewhere else.

By managing our finances and maintaining an even expenditure we have been able to establish a stable Government economy and that has benefited not only Government employees but the whole economy. If honourable members will consider that, they will agree with me that, at the moment while seasonal unemployment is particularly bad, the Minister of Works is spending rather more than his allocation: all works departments are spending more. Last month the Minister of Works' Department spent £1,200,000 whereas the sum it should have spent from capital funds was about £860,000, so we are spending rather more than we should spend. It would be disastrous if we took that advice literally and made a big splash for three months and then had wholesale unemployment in the Government service. Under no circumstances would I be a party to that procedure.

Another topic recurred throughout the debate but I shall not deal with it to any great extent because it is a Party political issue. The fact remains, however, that after 15 or 16 years since the last war the whole of the free world is still plagued by constant threats and aggressive acts of the Communists towards us. In those circumstances I presume that it is impossible to keep Communism out of our reckoning. Indeed, at present, a strong move is being made by the returned soldier element for another referendum to outlaw Communism in our country. Honourable members opposite have taken offence at one or two remarks made by members concerning Communism, particularly with regard to unity tickets and the suppression of the group movement, which sprang up in the unions and had as its purpose the supplanting of Communist leaders through the unions.

I suggest that if honourable members opposite feel at all hurt about this matter, they should examine their own organizations for the answer because there is no doubt that in those organizations in some States—indeed, even in this State—there has been a tolerance extended towards Communists holding executive positions in big unions.

Mr. Lawn: What unions?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I do not want to engage in personalities, under privilege of the House, but if the honourable

member wants an instance there was a unity ticket in the meat industry.

Mr. Lawn: You said "unions".

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Honourable members know—at least, I thought that the honourable member for Adelaide would know—that the unions are directly affiliated with the Australian Labor Party.

Mr. Ryan: Not all.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This particular one was, so that does not help the honourable member. I know there are one or two unions that have refused to be associated with the A.C.T.U. on this very issue—and one is the biggest union in Australia. It has said, "Until the A.C.T.U. takes some effective steps to control Communism as far as the leadership of the unions is concerned, we shall not affiliate with them."

Mr. Lawn: That is not the reason, though.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I did not take any particular interest in this matter. It obviously does not directly concern me, but a complaint was made about a unity ticket. In due course we saw in the press that the matter had been considered. I did not see any report about what had happened in this matter.

Mr. Lawn: It was published in the press.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Maybe I missed it. Anyway, I made an inquiry, and it was stated that of the three men concerned two were exonerated and continue to hold official positions.

Mr. Ryan: That is not true.

Mr. Lawn: You challenged me about asking whether you were sincere just now and this is a lie.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This is the information I received. The third one was expelled from the A.L.P.

Mr. Ryan: That is still not true, because four men were involved.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Were they all expelled?

Mr. Ryan: No.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member answers the question himself.

Mr. Ryan: I do not answer it; I am stating the facts, but you are not.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: As I stated, I had inquired . . .

Mr. Lawn: From whom?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This document was officially supplied to me. It was made after a careful inquiry. I shall be happy if the honourable member will get up and tell me I am wrong—

Mr. Ryan: I told you you were wrong.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: —because that would answer what I am putting.

Mr. Ryan: You only challenge me to get up because you know you have no right to do so.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: One or two other things were said today in the course of the debate that I should like to mention. One is not of any great public concern, but purely and simply affects the comfort of honourable members themselves. It was first raised by the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) and supported strongly by the member for Port Adelaide (Mr. Ryan). It was in connection with the parking of motor cars. As a result of what the member for Adelaide said—but not as a result of the comments made today because I should not have had time to act upon them—I made some inquiries and I find that there is a good deal of ground for complaint at present, for many unofficial cars are parking regularly in front of Parliament House. Honourable members will remember that several years ago an amendment was inserted in one of the Acts of Parliament to provide that the parking space in front of Parliament House be reserved for members. In accordance with that, the Government set up what it hoped would be an effective system of control and asked honourable members to notify the office of their cars. It placed a courteous and good police officer in front of Parliament House to help honourable members in policing the cars.

Mr. Ryan: We agree with that.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am sure this police officer does his utmost to help honourable members. So far, we seem to be agreed. But I want to take the honourable member severely to task when he says that the Legislative Council are the offenders in this matter.

Mr. Lawn: Who said that?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: You did. You said that an honourable member in the Legislative Council had several cars.

Mr. Lawn: I said "four cars".

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Four cars, yes. Let me tell the honourable member that one member of his Party has six cars registered.

Mr. Lawn: That is equally wrong. I should like to know who has six cars.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have looked into this carefully.

Mr. Lawn: We do not believe it. I should like to know who has six cars.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I find that on both sides of this House and of the Legislative Council a good deal of carelessness has been displayed by honourable members with their cars. When they have changed the ownership of a car, they have not had the number struck off the list but that does not alter the fact that a number of members have put on the list cars that never belonged to them.

Mr. Ryan: Start off from scratch now!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I shall make some suggestions to honourable members because I think this is a case where we can get some advantage from a revision of the present procedure. First, we should get the roll completely reviewed. In that, I hope I have the concurrence of honourable members. Secondly, I suggest that every honourable member personally sign for the number that he puts in the book. The present procedure is far too loose. I do not think there would be any objection to an honourable member putting one, two or three cars under his name if he wanted to, but they should be grouped together and the police officer should be informed that only one car may be parked by each member at any particular time. Strict observance of the rules can be overdone because honourable members will find that on occasion a constituent will want to come and see them at Parliament House to introduce a deputation for something and he will need to park his car. Thirdly, I suggest that we review the rules and cut out as far as possible those who have no regular business in the House.

Mr. Frank Walsh: Can you go further and request that lines be drawn so that we can get reasonable parking space?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes, I agree with that. Frequently, at present, two cars are parked so closely together that an honourable member cannot get into his car. I raise this matter so that we may be able to draw up a new set of rules for honourable members, and I hope that they will comply with them. I come back to the statement made

by the member for Adelaide and point out that these 205 cars in the black book are not all Legislative Council cars.

Mr. Lawn: I did not say that all the cars belonged to Legislative Council members. I mentioned Commonwealth members too.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I believe that discussion of the Common Market will intrude itself into future debates far more than it has in the past. In discussing this, may I correct what the member for Ridley said about my remarks at Tanunda this week? My comments were to the effect that we did not at this stage know what the ultimate result of the Common Market would be and that many people were blowing off a lot of hot air on a subject they did not understand or know much about. I was intrigued tonight when the honourable member in the early part of his speech praised the Prime Minister as a statesman. He agreed entirely with the Prime Minister about the Common Market and I thought that we were converting him to Liberalism. However, a little later I discovered that the Prime Minister had slipped in his estimation and that the Prime Minister did not know anything about economic matters, and that the credit squeeze and the financial policy were all wrong. All extravagant statements at this stage are probably incorrect, because the effects of the Common Market are not yet known. All we know at present is that the Common Market has been immensely successful for the six member countries. I have verified that with people from those countries. The second point is that the Common Market has already had an influence upon something that was detrimental to the Australian primary production—the heavy uneconomic subsidy on the production of grain where grain should not be grown. In some instances the subsidies paid upon such grain represented twice the value of that grain on the world market. Those subsidies have already been seriously diminished.

The honourable member gave an example of the type of deal he thought would emerge from the Common Market discussions. I could give him just as supposititious and ill-founded, and probably just as incorrect, a deal that might emerge from discussions. One must remember that the present balance of trade between Great Britain and Australia is most often in Great Britain's favour. In other words, Great Britain is selling us, under the preferences we are giving her, goods of greater value than the goods we are selling her under the preferences.

Mr. Loveday: That has been the case for years.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: That is the general position. In other words, the balance of trade that we have with Great Britain today is, in the main, showing an unfavourable trend and it does not take into account three other important factors: first, that tourist activities are heavily weighted in Great Britain's favour; secondly, insurance is heavily weighted in her favour; and, thirdly, shipping services are heavily weighted in her favour. From the Common Market countries' viewpoint it would obviously be a good deal if they said to Great Britain, "We will take you in on condition that we share with you the benefits that you give to your colonies if you will share with us the benefits that you get from your colonies."

Mr. McKee: That would be something!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: That would obviously be a good deal for the Common Market countries, and it would not hurt Australia one scrap: in fact it would benefit Australia. If the balance of trade between Australia and Great Britain were overwhelmingly in Australia's favour, I would admit that there would not be much room for bargaining, but at present that is not the position and it has not been for a long time. I believe that with the emergence of the Asian countries and their impact on our economy, and particularly on our rural production, that will never be the position again. Under those circumstances anyone who ventures to say that the Common Market is going to be tragic for Australia is crying calamity at a time when the issues are not known and when they cannot be known. Great Britain has only started to talk about it. Members should not forget, whether they like it or not, that the Common Market is an established fact, and that whereas at present seven countries with western ideals are not in the Common Market, irrespective of whether or not Britain enters it there will be 12 countries in before we turn around.

Members of the Industries Development Committee already know that the fact that the Common Market is being discussed has led to what could be an interesting development for South Australian industry. It had a brief experience of that this morning. A firm has come to South Australia, and one of the reasons for its being here is that it believes that if the Common Market is enlarged it will be able to supply its products better than it has previously. Although it is a world-wide organization, it has never before troubled to become associated with Australian industry.

I thank honourable members for their consideration of this motion. The Leader of the Opposition has moved an amendment that is in accordance with a vote of no-confidence that he moved last year when a by-election was pending in the Frome district. This Government's views on industrial matters are quite clear and I shall state them briefly and without ambiguity. We believe that wages should be based upon two factors: first, the ability to pay and, secondly, upon the cost of living. Those factors must be considered when wages or salaries are fixed. There are no other matters nearly as important, although there may be some minor ones. When the Commonwealth Arbitration Court, as it then was, suspended quarterly adjustments it did so without any prompting or assistance from any case that had been submitted from South Australia.

If you accept those two things, you logically accept the fact that if there is a difference between one State's cost of living and that of another State that must be considered. In fact, the industrial unions supported that view, and had always supported it until recently in the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission. They were parties to submissions that led to South Australia's having a basic wage slightly different from the basic wages in the other States. The basic wage here was higher than that in some States, and lower than that in others. The cost of living in Queensland has always been significantly lower, because it has many timber houses, the cost of which, under the C series index, was appreciably lower than in other States. All the evidence that Mr. Seaman gave (and which he was authorized to give) was given in trying to set out fairly and squarely what was the cost of living in this State. We did not ask, as some honourable members have said we asked, for a reduction in wages if the cost of living were higher. What we said was that if it was found that there was a disparity, the wage of the industrial worker should not be reduced, but that the margin should work itself out in time.

I know that honourable members opposite and some unions would be happy to contend that South Australia was opposed to reasonable working conditions. I had an example of that only last week. About two months ago a deputation of railway unions waited upon me concerning an industry allowance, saying that other industries were enjoying such an allowance and that they wanted one. They further stated that other States, notably New South Wales and Victoria, had awarded an industry

allowance and asked me to examine the position. I did so and found that the Victorian Government had altered long service leave privileges, and I think superannuation privileges were also involved. A railway man there could, if he took out the necessary units, get some benefit under the new conditions. I found that the Victorian Government did not regard it as a concession, because it was found that most of the men were not willing to pay anything additional toward superannuation, although they were going to get out of it at a lower total cost than previously. I could not see that there was any benefit to anyone under the Victorian scheme. If everyone went into it and made the utmost payment towards superannuation, they could get more over a period of years. The tendency was for the employees not to go in for it and, consequently, the Victorian Government was more likely to win than to lose on it.

The New South Wales Government offered to the railway unions a margin for skilled operatives amounting to about 15s. a week. After consulting with the Railways Commissioner here, I wrote to the unions concerned and said that the Government was prepared to allow 15s. a week available in the same way as had been proposed in New South Wales. However, that offer was turned down, as was also the offer in New South Wales turned down by the unions there. Another deputation waited upon me and said that in New South Wales they were renegotiating to spread the benefit more widely. They objected to an award that covered only skilled tradesmen and semi-skilled tradesmen. I am not sure of the actual category. An agreement was worked out between the New South Wales Government and the unions and was submitted to the arbitration commissioner as an industry award. As I understand the position, the commissioner refused to accept it as an industry award and made an award setting out clearly that it was an over-award payment.

I sent a copy of the report to the union here and informed the secretary that the Railways Commissioner had stated that the Government agreed that it could not accept an over-award payment. Without further reference to me, the union secretary immediately stated in the press that the Government had withdrawn its 15s. offer. The secretary of the union rang my secretary and said, "I presume that the offer has been withdrawn. Will the Premier meet another deputation?" My

secretary said I would. Although the offer has not been accepted, it has not been withdrawn. I think only this morning in a small paragraph in the press it was stated that the offer was not withdrawn. The union secretary was responsible for that statement.

Mr. Lawn: He was not responsible for the small print in the *Advertiser*.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The union secretary should have seen that the statement received the same publicity as did his previous statement. Honourable members opposite would be happy to create the impression that this State Government is a low wage Government, but they cannot do that. By every economic factor on which the position can be judged it will be seen that the conditions of South Australian workers are equal to those of workers in other States. This Government employs much labour and is responsible in an arbitration court hearing to submit, as it sees fit, its views at the time. I regret very much that a highly competent officer of the Treasury, one who has done nothing but good for this State and has only carried out his duties faithfully, should be criticized here.

Mr. Lawn: He was not criticized; it was the action of the Government that was criticized.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Members opposite—not one but several—did not hesitate to do so. Mr. Seaman is one of the best Under Treasurers this State has had and the advice and assistance he has given to the

Government has meant very much indeed to many people today who have had the good fortune to have jobs they could not have had if the finances of the State had been less expertly managed and the Government had not received the good advice it received. I oppose the amendment and support the motion.

The House divided on the amendment:

Ayes (12).—Messrs. Casey, Clark, Hughes, Jennings, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Balston, Riches, Ryan, Tapping and Frank Walsh (teller).

Noes (17).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Jenkins, King, Millhouse, Nankivell, Nicholson and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke and Shannon, Mrs. Steele and Mr. Stott.

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Hutchens, Bywaters, Fred Walsh and Corcoran. Noes—Sir Cecil Hincks, Messrs. Pattinson, Laeuke and Dunnage.

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus negatived; motion carried.

The SPEAKER: I wish to announce that His Excellency the Governor will be pleased to receive members for the presentation of the Address in Reply at 2.10 p.m. on Wednesday, August 16.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 11.6 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 10, at 2 p.m.