

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, July 19, 1962.

The **SPEAKER** (Hon. T. C. Stott) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.

COUNCIL MOIETIES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I think my question should be directed to the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Railways, although I hasten to add that Government policy is involved. It relates to vacant land in the Edwardstown electorate (particularly in the Marion and Mitcham Corporation areas) that is held in the name of the Railways Commissioner. Adjacent to some of this railway property are many private allotments, and I understand that tenders have been called for the erection of houses on the eastern side of the South Road, in the Mitcham Corporation, adjacent to railway land originally intended for a spur line. Will the Minister take up with his colleague the question of what moieties the local government authorities can expect from the Railways Commissioner to compensate for the construction and widening of roads, the provision of concrete kerbing and the water tabling of footpaths abutting many of the numerous allotments owned by the department and held out of use?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will ask the Minister of Railways to look into the matter and furnish me with the information for the Leader. No doubt if the Minister requires any further detail the Leader will supply it.

BLACKWOOD POLICE STATION.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question, concerning the Blackwood Police Station, is directed to the Premier representing the Chief Secretary. The present premises occupied by the police at Blackwood, with the growth of the district and the increased work involved, have become quite inadequate for the sergeant and the three men under him. Can the Premier say whether it will be possible to have the present premises increased in size to cope with the additional work?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: A much larger amount is being provided on the Loan Estimates for this class of work this year. The department itself decides which work is the most urgent. I will get a report for the honourable member and let him have it next week.

ISLINGTON SEWAGE FARM.

Mr. JENNINGS: For some time I have had numerous inquiries from my constituents about the future of the Islington sewage farm after the new Bolivar treatment works are completed, and no doubt the Minister of Works and the Government have also had similar inquiries. Can the Minister give a general outline as to when the Bolivar treatment works may be completed and say whether the Government has any policy as to the future of the Islington sewage farm; also, whether the Minister will keep in mind the desirability of retaining a few open spaces there for recreational purposes, because it is a very populous area?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The honourable member is quite correct when he assumes that the Government has had a number of requests, mainly from people who are considering industrial expansion, to purchase land or obtain a title of some sort in this area. It is a large one and is, broadly, in two parts—one to the north of the Grand Junction Road and the other to the south, each of which is a substantial area in its own right. We have endeavoured to meet the wishes of some people to increase their industrial activity in that area, but for some strange reason or other they do not want to reside in the honourable member's district, although they want to establish an industry there. The difficulty is that it is an area which, in the main, is fairly low-lying, although it is excellent industrial land. It entails a great deal of drainage work to make it usable. In respect to this drainage work, the Enfield Corporation has had discussions with the department, which at the moment is owner of the land, regarding certain drainage easements which are required before the land can be occupied. Those discussions are continuing. The department did suggest to the corporation that should any delay eventuate in regard to the corporation easements, it might agree, when such became necessary, to provide access over its drains so that the land could be entered and occupied. That matter has not yet been resolved, but when it is I think we should be in a position to take some firm steps regarding that part of the area north of the Grand Junction Road. Tenders for the trunk sewer from the present terminal at the sewage farm to the new treatment works at Bolivar will be called within the next three months or possibly earlier. That means that, when the sewer is laid, which will take a year or two, the sewage farm will gradually become vacant. The matter is largely one of

policy as regards the larger area, and the Government has not yet come to any decision on how much of it should be made available, how much is required for future Government purposes—railways, etc.—how much of it should become available and how it should be disposed of. So far as the small area north of Grand Junction Road is concerned, that matter will be pursued with the Enfield Corporation.

CONTRACTS WITH MINORS.

Mr. HUTCHENS: It seems to me that in normal transactions it is not legal for a minor to enter into a contract, but it has been brought to my notice that many of the major football clubs have for some time been getting youths to sign a contract binding them, while they are teenagers, not to play for other teams if they are taken on, resulting in these boys only desiring to play football and giving no thought to their future lives. But, when they are called for purposes of employment to other areas, they have to return to play, which is most unsatisfactory, and some of them choose to play football and not serve the industry in which they are most suited. I believe that this situation is not only detrimental to the game but is not allowing industry the advantage of the best men obtainable otherwise. Will the Premier have this matter investigated to see if something can be done to improve the situation?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This matter is under consideration at present in relation to another problem. Frequently, we find that minors want to purchase houses or other property. Cabinet at present is considering whether legislation should be introduced or not in that respect. There are two phases, of course, in connection with this matter. It is not simple because whereas, on the one hand, it is no doubt often desirable that minors should be able to enter into certain phases of agreements, obviously in other instances it is necessary to protect minors against signing agreements which would not be in their best interests at all. I can assure the honourable member that it is already before Cabinet in respect of real property transactions. I hope to have something concrete in the fairly near future and, as soon as a decision is made, I will tell the honourable member.

SPRAYS.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Is the Minister of Agriculture aware that five cattle and sheep sprays—DDT, BHS, Dieldrin, Aldrin and

Toxaphene—have recently been banned by the New South Wales Department of Agriculture because it is stated that they contain carbons which accumulate in the fat of the animals? Does the Agriculture Department propose to take similar action in this State?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: This matter is under close consideration at the moment and I shall be in a position shortly to make a statement about it.

PORT PIRIE SCHOOLS.

Mr. McKEE: In reply to a question that I asked the Minister of Education, when this session commenced in April last, regarding the erection of a primary school and a technical school at Port Pirie, he told me that the Director of Education was preparing plans for the building programme. Can the Minister say if those plans have been completed and a decision reached regarding Port Pirie, also regarding the new proposed high school there?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I can only repeat the answer I have given to similar questions in the last day or two, that the Director of Education is at present preparing a comprehensive series of proposals for me. I hope to have them in the next week or so, and I will then be in a better position to answer the honourable member and other honourable members.

NARRUNG ELECTRICITY SUPPLY.

Mr. NANKIVELL: My question perhaps relates to the policy of the Electricity Trust. It was intimated that when power was connected to Meningie it would be further extended to incorporate the Narrung Peninsula and June, 1962, was mentioned as the possible date for the completion of that extension. The township of Meningie has been connected, but I do not know whether it is the trust's intention to continue with the project. Will the Minister of Works ascertain from the trust whether it is its intention to continue this extension to the Narrung Peninsula and, if so, when it is anticipated it will be completed?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will endeavour to get that information.

LEAVING HONOURS CLASSES.

Mr. CURREN: Can the Minister of Education inform me whether a Leaving Honours class will be established at one of the Upper Murray high schools in 1963?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I am not yet in a position to make any announcement. The whole matter resolves itself into a question of Government policy. Later in the year some announcement will be made.

Mr. McKEE: Can the Minister of Education inform me whether further consideration has been given to the establishment of Leaving Honours classes in country areas?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: This matter has been considered further. I have discussed it with the Director of Education, senior officers of the Education Department, and headmasters of independent colleges. A committee appointed by the University of Adelaide has been dealing with a somewhat similar problem and, I think, has almost reached a conclusion on its report and recommendations. That report will have to go before the University Council and no doubt will be further considered by Cabinet. I pointed out to the honourable member for Chaffey that this was a Cabinet decision last year, not a ministerial decision, as to whether Leaving Honours classes would be established this year. Before I reach a conclusion on the matter I shall refer it to Cabinet because it is a matter of Government policy. I cannot make any announcement at present.

HOT WATER SYSTEMS.

Mr. LANGLEY: I have reason to believe that times of operation of hot water systems have been altered. Will the Premier ascertain why these times have been changed?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I ask the honourable member to ask that question again next Tuesday, when I will have the information.

STOVES FOR SCHOOL RESIDENCES.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Last Tuesday I asked the Minister of Education a question about the installation of electric stoves in school residences. I understand that the Minister of Works has evolved a policy on this matter. Will he explain it to the House?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: This matter has arisen from time to time respecting various residences occupied by head teachers. Cabinet considered it and decided that electric stoves and electric bath heaters could be provided in such residences if requested by the occupants and that where the facilities were provided a small increase in rent would be applied. Following upon that decision, when the occupants of these houses have made such requests they have been dealt with in

accordance with that policy. So far as I know it is proposed to continue along that line.

WOODVILLE GARDENS SEWERAGE.

Mr. RYAN: Last February I wrote to the Minister of Works asking when a sewerage scheme would be recommended for installation in the Woodville Gardens, Athol Park, Mansfield Park and Ottoway areas. The Minister informed me that the report would definitely be available in March. In April I again communicated with the Minister's office and was told that the report would be ready for submission no later than May. On June 18 I wrote to the Minister seeking further information, but up to the present I have received no further advice from him or his office. Is he in a position to inform me when this project will be ready for submission?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I should like to refer to the letters that the honourable member has received from me to see whether I was as definite about it as he suggests. I have learned in my short experience that in the volume of work that departments have to cover one frequently finds it is not possible to meet deadlines of this sort, and therefore I have been cautious in correspondence and statements regarding them. I know that the honourable member is as concerned about the project as I am, and I shall endeavour to ascertain from the department what the present position is and let him know. There is no intentional delay on the part of anybody. The Engineer-in-Chief, as the House knows, has a prodigious volume of work to attend to and his officers apply themselves diligently, with loyalty, and with good intentions towards producing results. Any delay that may have occurred is certainly not because of a lack of zeal on the part of the department or myself.

WALLAROO MINES SCHOOL.

Mr. HUGHES: Can the Minister of Works tell me when the following long overdue work is likely to be carried out at the Wallaroo Mines School? First, I refer to the repairs to the ceiling in the main hall, a large portion of which fell in many months ago. Secondly, there are repairs to the staff room, which is unusable because the ceiling has completely collapsed. Also, lesser repairs are needed to the ceilings in the infant and assembly rooms, and repairs are needed to the guttering, the condition of which is damaging outside walls. Can the Minister say

when the heaters that have been at the school since the beginning of this year are to be installed? Will he take steps to have an investigation carried out with a view to altering part of the plumbing, namely, the box guttering, which I understand runs through the centre of the school, to prevent a repetition of dampness finding its way down a centre wall, which eventually could cause the wall to collapse, thereby endangering the lives of children?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The honourable member informed my secretary this morning that he proposed to ask the question and the Education Department inquired of the Public Buildings Department. It was learned that the relevant correspondence was with a building inspector of the department, who is at present making investigations in the Wallaroo district. As soon as he returns, a report will be obtained from him and I shall be pleased to inform the honourable member of the decision.

MURRAY BRIDGE CROSSING.

Mr. BYWATERS: On Tuesday last I asked a question relating to the dangerous crossing four miles south-east of Murray Bridge, where frequently accidents occur. One man was killed there last Saturday night. Has the Minister of Works a reply?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Railways, informs me that the level crossing at 64m. 42c., south line, is equipped with standard level crossing signs, flashing light signals, and gongs. Installation of additional signs is not contemplated by the Railways Department. It is possible that Ambulance Driver Wardle had in mind the provision of advance warning signs. Where provided, the latter are erected some distance from the actual crossing, and their installation is a matter for the Commissioner of Highways, who is giving it his immediate attention. I understand that the Highways Department will soon be calling tenders for the overway bridge.

FULHAM GARDENS SEWERAGE.

Mr. FRED WALSH: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked yesterday concerning the sewerage of Fulham Gardens and the area east of Henley Beach and Grange?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: In the docket this area is described as Grange, Henley Beach, Seaton and Kidman Park, and I presume that

is the area referred to. This morning I looked up the docket and the position is that the scheme, which commenced as a fairly small one, is now a large one, in so far as it is necessary to include in it, from an engineering point of view, a large area which at present possibly is not fully occupied, but which will be fully occupied in the foreseeable future. In order to provide the necessary mains and services, the whole area has been considered. The scheme has been mapped out and costed, and the approximate cost at this moment, as the department sees it, is about £900,000. Revenue estimates are being prepared and, as soon as they are completed, the Engineer-in-Chief will inform me, whereupon I can take the matter to Cabinet for consideration and, if Cabinet so decides, it will go to the Public Works Committee for investigation and report.

RIFLE RANGE.

Mr. LAUCKE: Has the Premier any information concerning the possible resumption of certain lands in the hundred of Para Wirra for the purpose of establishing an army training reserve or for re-siting the Dean rifle range? I ask this question because some of my constituents have interests in some land in the area.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: For a considerable time the Harbors Board has been anxious to obtain the land at Port Adelaide at present occupied by the Dean rifle range, which would ultimately severely handicap development in that particular area. The Board has been negotiating with the Commonwealth Government for shifting the range, and the area mentioned by the honourable member has been considered. I am not sure whether the Commonwealth Government has reached the stage of serving acquisition notices on landholders or whether it is negotiating with them, but I know that it is pursuing the matter and I think it likely that acquisition notices will be issued.

HAWKER WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. CASEY: Last session I made several suggestions to the Minister of Works and his department for improving the water supply at Hawker. I also arranged for a local boring contractor, Mr. Thomas, to submit a contract to the department with the object of improving the water supply by sinking a bore. As at the moment the reservoirs are empty and pumping from the old bore, which is unsatisfactory, has commenced, can the Minister report on my suggestions?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As the honourable member appreciates, the water supply to the town of Hawker has caused us much concern. The department has recommended—and I have approved the recommendation—that the contractor the honourable member named should be offered a contract to sink a bore and that, provided a satisfactory supply of reasonable quality water is produced (which he confidently predicts), the contractor should proceed. The terms of the contract we proposed as to both quantity and quality will, I think, be acceptable to the contractor, but the department is now consulting him and, if agreement is reached (as I think it will be), the contract will be proceeded with at once.

PEDESTRIAN RIGHTS.

Mr. TAPPING: Many motorists making left turns, for example, from Hindley Street into King William Street, and from North Terrace into King William Road force their way through to the exclusion and detriment of pedestrians. The 1959 amendment to the Road Traffic Act provides that the right of way shall be given almost entirely to pedestrians. Many motorists do not observe the pedestrians' rights, but are creating a hazard by their forceful tactics. Will the Premier inquire of the Police Department whether the Act is being applied properly?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I shall refer the honourable member's remarks to the Police Commissioner and ask him to take appropriate action.

ABATTOIRS MARKETING DAYS.

Mr. CASEY: Yesterday I asked the Minister of Agriculture whether he had received a report from the special committee set up by the Government to inquire into the alteration of market days at the Metropolitan Abattoirs and the Minister said he had a report. When is that report likely to be laid on the table of the House? Hundreds of people in the north are anxiously awaiting its publication as it affects the transportation of stock from the country areas that mostly concern me.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: At present this is a matter between the committee making the report, the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board, and me, and I cannot at present take the matter any further beyond my statement of yesterday that the report is now being examined. When I am able to add to that statement I shall do so.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on the motion for adoption, which Mr. Frank Walsh had moved to amend by inserting the following new paragraphs:

2a. We express regret at the failure of Your Excellency's advisers to make any reference to the need for a review of land tax.

2b. We desire to inform Your Excellency that in the opinion of this House a Royal Commission, consisting of five members of the House of Assembly, should be appointed to conduct such a review and to inquire fully into the incidence of the land tax legislation.

(Continued from July 18. Page 177.)

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): I rise to support the amended motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I take the opportunity to express my pleasure at the proposed visit to South Australia of Her Majesty the Queen. The people of this State have happy recollections of Her Majesty's visit in 1954; her modest charm and her kindness and consideration to all her subjects captured their lasting affection. I understand that there has been only one occasion during the 105 years of our Parliament's history on which a reigning Monarch has performed the opening ceremony, and that was on Tuesday, March 23, 1954, when Her Majesty opened the second session of the Thirty-fourth Parliament. It would indeed be a great honour for South Australia if arrangements could be made for this ceremony to be repeated when Her Majesty visits us next year. The people of this State are again anxious to demonstrate their affection, admiration and gratitude to Her Majesty and the Duke of Edinburgh.

I congratulate the mover and the seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I do not think there is any need for me to enlarge upon the seconder, because he has been so well-known in this House over the years for his ability, but I should like to take the opportunity of congratulating the mover of the motion, the member for Light, on the fine and dignified manner in which he made his speech. Paragraph 4 of His Excellency's Speech, dealing with primary production states:

Despite excellent opening rains, seasonal conditions during the past year were not good and yields were in general below average, although better than at first anticipated. My Government continues its policy of extending and increasing research and scientific services in all fields of primary production and is doing its utmost to ensure that the best use is made of all available resources in the light of scientific and technical advances.

Yesterday the member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke) referred to the progress that had been made with the bulk handling of grain in South Australia, but I thought one of his statements was exaggerated. I interjected at the time, but apparently *Hansard* did not catch my interjection because it was not recorded. The honourable member said how pleased he was that a cargo of oats had been loaded in one day. I interjected and said that perhaps it could have been a light cargo, and he replied that it was about 9,000 to 10,000 tons. I do not think the honourable member, when he guessed that figure, realized that that would have meant loading at about 1,200 tons an hour, and there is no bulk installation in Australia that could handle that amount of grain in one hour. I think that perhaps it would be best for the honourable member not to make such guesses.

Mr. Laucke: I referred to 24 hours.

Mr. HUGHES: In these days a working day is recognized as consisting of eight hours.

Mr. Quirke: It could still be done at the rate of 400 tons an hour.

Mr. HUGHES: If the honourable member had been referring to three shifts in 24 hours, we could have readily understood him, but he did not mean that: he said, "in one day." The honourable member, together with every other member in this House, knows that when a person refers to one working day he refers to eight hours, despite the long hours that Parliamentarians work.

Mr. Quirke: What about the cookies?

Mr. HUGHES: As I represent one of the best grain-growing districts in the State, I know that, had a similar year been experienced 15 to 20 years ago as was experienced last year, the total production of wheat and barley would have been considerably less. However, in the light of scientific research, farmers have adapted themselves according to the personal knowledge gained. The results have been better financial returns and increased benefits to the State in general.

I believe the majority of primary producers appreciate the great assistance given through the Agriculture Department. I have found that the officers of the department are very courteous, and the assistance given by them over the years has had the effect not only of increasing the primary producers' efficiency but of enabling them to increase greatly their carrying capacity. Recently, I was called upon to respond on behalf of the visitors at the luncheon given in conjunction with the

harvester field day trial at Paskeville. I suggested to those present, who of course were mainly representatives of various agricultural bureaux, that they should encourage more primary producers to pursue the sound progressive policy enunciated by departmental officers.

Much has been accomplished in this direction, but I think we all realize only too well that much more remains to be done. I further suggested on that occasion that despite the enormous difficulties sometimes associated with methods recommended by the department, the primary producer himself must be determined to follow them through, and that the experience gained should be of inestimable value. Whatever success was achieved in this direction would naturally be towards lower cost of production. However, there always seems to be lurking around the corner some bogey that brings about inflationary forces which press heavily on the economics of the primary producer. I refer to an article which appeared in the *Advertiser* of June 27 last, dealing with the increase of freight rates. This must of necessity increase the cost of production to the primary producer. The article, headed "Freight Rates to U.K., Europe, Up 5 p.c.", states:

Freight rates to Britain and the Continent will be increased by 5 per cent on all goods carried under Australian Overseas Transport Association freight-rate agreements. Announcing the increase tonight, the Chairman of the Federal Exporters' Overseas Transport Committee (Mr. D. A. S. Campbell) said that the new rates would apply to the 1962-63 and 1963-64 export seasons. The agreements covered wool, meat, general cargo, dairy products and fresh fruit. The decision followed, and was governed by, the agreements negotiated earlier this year between the Federal Exporters' Overseas Transport Committee and representatives of British and Continental shipping companies, Mr. Campbell said.

The investigations of the joint accountants into the relevant figures of the shipping companies indicated that, under the new formula, a rise of 6.4 per cent in freight rates would be justified. But the "stand-still" agreement provided that the maximum rate of increase was to be 5 per cent and that the consequent level of freight rates would be maintained for two years. Mr. Campbell said that nearly all costs, with the exception of fuel costs, in Australia and elsewhere, had moved against Australian producers and exporters during the period under review. In addition, the fall in imports in 1961 resulted in many vessels coming to Australia comparatively empty, although these were needed for the homeward trade.

The "vacant space" so involved brought a fall in earnings of the ships. In the homeward trade, the overall use of space was "fractionally better" than in the previous year.

The trend of costs generally was disturbing, and proportionately was more serious overseas than in Australia, as the standards of living continued to rise in Britain and the European Community, Mr. Campbell added.

To keep shipping service costs as low as possible it was essential in Australia that utmost efficiency be achieved in the handling of outward and inward cargoes. It was also imperative that industrial disputes, particularly on the waterfront, should be eliminated as far as possible. Failure to watch and control these factors could only result in increased costs, which ultimately would be reflected in freight rates, Mr. Campbell said.

As intimated in the report, a thorough investigation had been carried out by the joint accountants into the records of the shipping companies, and under a certain formula, it was stated, a rise of 6.4 per cent would be justified. In other words, the shipping companies are bound to introduce another steep rise immediately the agreements are terminated. It would be very interesting to peruse their report and to know just how this 6.4 per cent would be used in the period stated. I do not suggest that I understand the problems associated with the shipping companies as well as some honourable members.

In the *Advertiser* report it will be noticed that sympathy was expressed to the Australian producers and exporters because of the rise in costs. Nothing was said about the respective Governments. The wharf labourers were told that the responsibility would be placed upon them unless they were prepared to eliminate disputes. Apparently they must suffer inconvenience and say nothing. One thing that intrigues me is that every time there is a price rise or an increase in the freight rate, the poor old worker must first have a lecture. It is made to appear right from the outset that he is at fault. Anyone knowing anything about shipping is aware of the arduous conditions under which a big percentage of the men are called upon to work. I think that in such a move as the shipping companies are making it would have been better for all concerned to stay off the men's back. It is not only the primary producers who will be affected by this freight increase, but the whole of South Australia. The increased rate will bring about a loss of markets for some of our commodities, as was mentioned in your statement to the press on June 28 last, Mr. Speaker. Under the heading of "Fears on Freight Increases" there appeared in the *Advertiser* on that date the following:

Increased freight charges to Britain and the Continent could result in the loss of markets for some of the commodities affected, Mr. Stott, M.P., said yesterday.

Mr. Stott, who is the General Secretary of the Australian Wheatgrowers' Federation, said the increases had come at a very bad time in view of the uncertainty of Australian markets in European areas.

Freight rates to Britain and the Continent are to be increased by 5 per cent on all goods carried under Australian Overseas Transport Association freight rate agreements during the 1962-63 and 1963-64 export seasons.

The agreements cover wool, meat, general cargo, dairy products and fresh fruit.

Mr. Stott said the increased rates were very disturbing and would add to the cost of production for primary producers.

I was also interested to read a statement by Mr. Shanahan regarding the effect of the increased freight rate on the future of wool, and this is what he had to say:

The President of the S.A. Wheat and Woolgrowers' Association (Mr. T. Shanahan) said the increased freights would affect wool less seriously than they would meat, fruit and dairy products.

"The world must buy our wool", he said. "But there is keen competition for markets for meat, fruit, and dairy products, and if costs rise too high Australia will price herself out of the market."

Wheat exports would not be affected by this freight increase because they were covered by a separate charter arrangement.

It will be noticed that both Mr. Stott and Mr. Shanahan consider that the rise in shipping freight rates could price Australia out of the market, and how very true that is. Thank goodness, wheat comes under a different charter arrangement, otherwise those producers who principally grow wheat, as many do in my district, would be very seriously affected. It appears that the States will need to pay much more attention to the turn-round of ships. Unless adequate facilities are made available by the States, with a minimum loss of time, these freight rates will continue to increase and this in turn will be reflected in production costs.

Mr. Quirke: How do you do that?

Mr. HUGHES: I would ask the honourable member to wait a few moments and then I will tell him some of the things that this Government could do to reduce primary producers' costs. At present the position is not good at some of our outports. The trend is for larger and deeper draught vessels throughout the world, and this has become very evident, especially at ports that have been handling export freights to the United Kingdom and the Continent for many years. As you would know, Mr. Speaker, Wallaroo handles most of the grain grown in the northern Yorke Peninsula area and also the lower northern agricultural areas. Grain can be loaded either in bulk *ex* silo, or bags *ex* rail trucks. This

port has a very good reputation for its efficiency and its low cost of loading over the years.

Mr. Hall: How many tons a day do they load at Wallaroo?

Mr. HUGHES: I am surprised at that question coming from a primary producer of the calibre of the honourable member. He knows as well as I do that the belt system at Wallaroo handles approximately 400 tons of grain an hour. Let him contradict that!

For many years Wallaroo has been the only natural deepwater port between Port Augusta and Port Adelaide. However, because of the trend towards larger ships, the depth at the wharf and in the channel is not enough to meet present-day shipping requirements, and it is necessary for a number of ships to call at Wallaroo, take on a part cargo and then proceed to Port Adelaide to complete their loading. If in the chartering of a grain ship it is found necessary to nominate a second port because of the draught problem, naturally this increases the cost of that shipment. The Wallaroo port has served South Australia well for almost a century and, in conjunction with the railways, has been, and still is, a consistent revenue-producer for the State. It is felt that a programme of public works spread over a period of years and designed to improve harbour facilities and reclaim areas for port and industrial purposes, together with a serious drive to attract shippers and importers to use the port, is well warranted. Other States are doing this with ports much smaller and with less cargo potential than Wallaroo.

It should be the policy of this or any Government to provide public facilities to keep the cost of production down to enable a just and fair return to the producer. One important avenue—and now I come to the interjection of the honourable member for Burra (Mr. Quirke)—is to provide our main export shipping ports with suitable berths to accommodate ships being used in our export trade. Shipping must be as cheap economically as possible: that is, the service rendered must not absorb a greater quantity of labour and capital than is necessary. Otherwise, as honourable members know, waste occurs and the community suffers in just the same way as in the case of the unnecessary engine—and by that I mean that, if one engine will do a job, it is not necessary to build two. Moreover, the price charged for the services must be as small as possible consistent with the maintenance of the service itself. The mechanism of a transport system, as we all

know, is expensive. Economic waste takes place if that mechanism is not used to its fullest capacity.

The application of improved methods to agriculture raises the standard of living but this improved standard of living is liable to be lost if we ignore the changes both in production and, more particularly, in the distribution of our commodities. The capabilities and the actual use of the Wallaroo bulk shipping plant running from the silos to the ship's side, I will admit, have contributed to a quicker turn-round of ships in that area but, unless ships can take on a full cargo, their effectiveness is lost in keeping production costs at a reasonable level.

Mr. Quirke: Can that channel be dredged?

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, I understand it can.

Mr. Quirke: That is the only way you can do it.

Mr. HUGHES: That is true. Last year the member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) took me to task for not speaking on agricultural matters. In fact, he appeared at that time to be disappointed because in the course of his remarks he stated that he spoke in the debate only because no other member, apart from the honourable member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke), had spoken on this matter. This afternoon I want to assure the honourable member that never at any time have I set myself up as an expert on agricultural problems.

Mr. Fred Walsh: You are not suggesting that the others are experts?

Mr. HUGHES: Not by any means, but before and since coming into this House I have made a genuine attempt to understand the problems associated with primary production and the rising costs attached to the industry.

Mr. Clark: You have had personal experience?

Mr. HUGHES: I have had a little. In fact, I am vitally concerned, so much so that unknown to the honourable member and long before his speech in this House last year I had been working on a big problem affecting the primary producer, not only in my own district but in the districts represented by several Government members.

Mr. Nankivell: Tell us all about it.

Mr. HUGHES: I think I shall be able to open the eyes of the honourable member. A case was presented to the Minister of Marine (it may be anything from 15 to 17 months ago) by way of a deputation requesting that an investigation be carried out by the Harbors

Board into a proposal to deepen the shipping berths and the channel at Wallaroo. The deputation I introduced on that occasion was led by the Mayor of Wallaroo (Mr. R. E. Allan) and it comprised members of the council, the Secretary of the Wallaroo branch of the Waterside Workers Federation, the Manager of the Wallaroo-Mount Lyell Fertilizer Co., and the Chairman of the Overseas Shipowners' Representatives Association (Mr. M. M. Robinson). We also had with us the Chairman of the Australian Steamship Owners Federation (Mr. K. V. Gordon) and Wheat and Barley Board representatives.

It can be seen from the names that I have mentioned this afternoon that a strong representation from shipping companies is vitally interested in the future potential of shipping at Wallaroo. Because it is absolutely essential that some provision be made to allow ships of a deeper draught to fully load at Wallaroo and in view of the expenditure involved and its relationship to cost of production, I want to place before the House this afternoon the request of that deputation. Before I am finished, I think I shall have taken any doubts out of honourable members' minds that this request is warranted at Wallaroo in an endeavour to keep down the rising costs of the primary producer. The deputation was prompted not by the current huge volume of shipping using the port but by the world-wide trend to the larger and deeper draught vessels that are now appearing in the world grain export trades. The appearance of these vessels means that the depth of water at the wharf at Wallaroo is not sufficient.

Mr. Jenkins: What about the outside channel? Is there any silting?

Mr. HUGHES: I do not think there would be any trouble. The depth of water at the Wallaroo wharf is 28ft. at the two seaward berths and 27ft. at the two central berths. One is served by the bulk loading elevator. Outside the jetty the factor limiting the movement of vessels is a 26ft. area that has to be crossed before a vessel can reach the open sea and, unfortunately, the average high tide is only 4 to 5ft., which is the lowest of all South Australian ports. For more convenient working, the bottom berth on the south side could be eliminated and the top two berths could be shifted down. This would facilitate shunting and loading arrangements.

Wallaroo has always played a major part in South Australia's rural commerce. Grain exports have exceeded 400,000 tons a year on many occasions since 1920. Indeed, the average

tonnage exported each year since then has been about 300,000 tons. The information I am quoting was collected early in 1961 and the grain exports as at March, 1961, had already exceeded 200,000 tons. The total tonnage of cargo handled at Wallaroo has exceeded 500,000 tons a year at least twice. At present, apart from the grain exports, the port's principal imports and exports comprise about 45,000 tons of phosphate rock and 3,000 tons of jute products imported annually and about 1,000 tons of superphosphate exported annually. Wallaroo has always served the State well. It has achieved a good reputation in shipping circles for rate and costs of loading, both of which have always compared favourably with larger ports. It is the export outlet for much grain. Its importance to the State was clearly recognized when the present Government chose it as the site for the first State-owned bulk grain loading elevator. The wisdom of building South Australia's largest silo and the grain elevator here has been fully vindicated during the last three or four seasons.

Farmers from near and far have used these facilities to their financial benefit. Export tonnages are again increasing to the benefit of the Railways Department and Harbors Board revenues. Over the past five years—and particularly since the bulk elevator has been used—many problems associated with shipping have become noticeable. World ship building is at a record level and the trend is to larger, faster and specialized ships. In the grain trade this has meant the gradual disappearance of the wartime-built tonnage ship that predominated until recently. It has been replaced by a new class of freighter of 11,000 to 14,000 tonnage. This trend will continue and as tramp shipping is a most competitive business we can expect that within the next 10 years all bulk cargoes will be carried in vessels in this newer and larger class. This trend has become most noticeable at Wallaroo. Numerous vessels have had to go to Port Adelaide from Wallaroo to complete barley cargoes. Vessels fitted out in South Australian ports to load bulk wheat cargoes have had to go to Geelong to load their cargoes, but if sufficient water were available at Wallaroo some of these boats could have loaded there. Larger vessels, when loading part cargoes at Wallaroo, have had to alter their intended stowage because such stowage would have caused the vessel to touch bottom at either the stern or the bow when loading near draughts of 28ft: these vessels have had on occasion to cease work and lie idle whilst

waiting for that extra water to enable their cargoes to be completed. Modern vessels bringing cargoes of phosphate rock have had to be deliberately under-loaded to be able to berth safely at the Wallaroo port, which is not good, and something should be done about it. Many vessels with grain cargoes partly loaded at Port Pirie have had to by-pass Wallaroo and make the longer trip to Port Adelaide to complete their cargoes as Wallaroo could not accommodate them fully loaded.

Mr. Heaslip: Nothing else counts!

Mr. HUGHES: What does the honourable member mean?

Mr. Heaslip: Only Wallaroo counts!

Mr. HUGHES: The primary producers know of statements the honourable member made in this House last year, and they have not looked favourably upon them.

Mr. Heaslip: Haven't they?

Mr. HUGHES: No. I have had primary producers from the honourable member's district coming to me about those statements and something is going to be done in the near future about the honourable member. Let me revert to what I was saying about ships having to by-pass Wallaroo and the extra

costs involved. These extra costs would not be incurred if they came to Wallaroo because the safety regulations do not apply to Port Pirie to Wallaroo movements. This could represent a huge saving to primary producers and I am surprised that primary producers opposite try to make fun out of a sound proposal that is being put before them this afternoon. I should imagine that from his travels around the State the Chairman of the Public Works Standing Committee would know full well what I am discussing this afternoon and he would appreciate what a huge saving this could represent to the primary producers if it were carried out. I raise the next matter for the benefit of members opposite. I am not now a primary producer. It will be to the advantage of members opposite and to many of their constituents if they learn something from what I say today, and use their influence in the right direction to have my suggestions adopted. The best example I can give concerns barley shipments, and soon we shall be having bulk handling of barley in this State. From 1959 to March, 1961, eight ships out of 15 that arrived at Wallaroo to load full cargoes were unable to complete loading at the port, and I give the following details for the information of members:

Name of vessel.	Dead weight capacity in tons.	Length of vessel.	Summer draught.
		Ft.	Ft. in.
<i>Pleiades</i> (fitted out at Wallaroo and then had to proceed to Geelong to load) ..	14,200	488	30 6
<i>Procyon</i> (loading delayed because of stowage, to Melbourne to complete) . . .	16,200	518	31 5
<i>Rothenstein</i> (loading delayed awaiting tide)	10,857	546	28 11
<i>La Falda</i> (loading delayed because of the tide)	12,660	477	30 2
<i>Eurydamas</i> (restricted to 28ft. by charter clause)	13,240	491	29 0
<i>Milora</i> (deliberately shortloaded 1,000 tons twice (phosphates) because she could not berth)	12,750	485	29 11
<i>Marionga Maris</i> (came to Adelaide to complete cargo)	11,664	483	29 0

The following vessels all had to be brought to Port Adelaide to complete cargoes.

Name of vessel.	Dead weight capacity in tons.	Length of vessel.	Summer Draught.
		Ft.	Ft. In.
<i>Miss Chandris</i>	14,550	509	30 4
<i>Myrtidiotissa</i>	13,336	504	29 6
<i>Goldstone</i>	12,500	477	29 6
<i>Loradore</i>	11,000	456	28 0
<i>Clare Hugo Stinnes</i>	10,770	491	29 0
<i>Poli</i>	12,000	492	28 7

These are the classes of vessels that are now being chartered to load export grain from this State. When compared with the war-time vessels, which were only recently the backbone of tramp shipping, it can be seen that the trend is to have larger and deeper draught vessels. In war-time we had the *Liberty* type vessel of 10,750 tons dead weight capacity, 423 feet in length and a summer draught of 27 feet 9 inches. Also there was the *Park* type of 10,100 tons dead weight capacity, a length of 445 feet and a summer draught of 27 feet 4 inches. It should be understood that the larger vessels now being chartered for the export of grain from this State are by no means the largest that can be engaged for our ports. In Geelong and Fremantle exporting boards have been able to use vessels of up to 20,000 tons dead weight capacity, with a consequent additional saving in overseas freights. Despite our problems, our grain exporting boards have been able up to March of last year to clear all the export grain from Wallaroo, but it has been done only with great difficulty.

Ships have now to be virtually hand-picked to suit all South Australian outports. The charters under which vessels are engaged invariably include a clause allowing for a second port to be nominated to complete the loading if the draught of the ship requires it. It is a basic principle in the chartering of vessels that minimum freight rates can be gained only where fast and efficient one-port loading can be offered. The larger specialized bulk carriers have brought greater competition in world ship chartering. These ships have been able to operate at lower rates than the 7,000 to 10,000 tons tramp vessels. Our exporting boards have not been able to use these freight-saving vessels to any extent in this State because of the lack of sufficient water at loading ports. Some "smaller" vessels of the modern class have been chartered but their loadings have been restricted by such factors as having to allow for a second loading port, and in some cases a restrictive loading draught of 28ft.

Grain is essentially a low cost commodity and the marketing boards of this State have to make every effort to save money in the form of sea freight in order that the maximum return may be received by the producers, and by the country as a whole. We would suggest to the responsible authorities that to bring Wallaroo up to present-day requirements dredging to the extent of 4ft. extra at the outermost four berths is needed. There should be lesser

dredging from the wharf to the open sea to provide a wide channel with at least 27ft. of water. Because the shipping of barley *ex silo* is to commence in South Australia soon it would be rather ironical if this money saving loading could not be employed to achieve the maximum savings for our primary producers. The added freight cost for the first dozen ships forced to proceed to Adelaide to complete cargoes under the slit-bag method would go a long way towards covering the capital cost of the deepening necessary at Wallaroo. The importance of providing at least 30ft. of water at bulk loading berths must be fully realized by the South Australian Harbors Board as, when the Port Lincoln berth was constructed in 1959, it was dredged to 31ft. The 27ft. prevailing at Wallaroo does not compare favourably with the Port Lincoln berth or with any other major berths in Australia, the depths of which are—Albany, 33ft.; Fremantle, 34ft.; Newcastle (where in the near future about £2,000,000 will be spent on deepening berths), 27ft. 6in.; Bunbury, 30ft.; Brisbane, 30ft.; Geraldton, 29ft.; Sydney, 33ft.; and Geelong, 32ft. When it is realized that bulk loading facilities are currently being built at Thevenard (I am talking of the time when this case was being presented) and are being considered for Port Pirie, both of which are considerably shallower ports than Wallaroo, the problems that will confront the grain exporting boards in South Australia will become obvious, and equally obvious will become the need to have at least one further port where all ships can load full cargoes or can complete cargoes part-loaded at those shallower ports, either in bags or *ex silo*.

Despite what some people say, we believe that the quantity of wheat available for export through Wallaroo will increase for some years yet, even though Adelaide's rapid growth is increasing her consumption of wheat products each year. We are led to this belief because the average yield of wheat to the acre is still increasing as farm lands respond to still better farming methods, fertilizers, etc. The Department of Agriculture can be justifiably proud that in 1960-61 a near record wheat harvest was produced with only nearly 50 per cent of the acreage that produced the record crop of about 20 years ago. We believe that the quantity of wheat available will increase, and Wallaroo is proud of the part that it has played and is still playing in producing State revenues. Harbour and railway receipts have always been buoyant and are greatly dependent on each other. We consider that the

investment of public moneys in port improvements will directly benefit the revenues of both these departments. To deepen the port of Wallaroo would automatically increase its popularity with overseas shipping, bringing added demands for cargoes. Thus, grain could be moved greater distances and in greater volume. Wallaroo is ideally situated for such an increase in tonnage and the loading capacity of its grain elevator is proving to be such that the port is capable of becoming the State's major grain exporting port.

Mr. Hall: What extra area would use Wallaroo now?

Mr. HUGHES: I suggest that the honourable member inquire at the Wheat Board office, where he will be told that grain has been taken for many miles to Wallaroo—from practically all centres of the State. When a boat comes to Wallaroo but no cargo is there, it has to find the wheat somewhere else, and it seems to find it.

Mr. Heaslip: What will happen when they go to Port Pirie?

Mr. HUGHES: Let the honourable member talk about Port Pirie when he follows me. Paragraph 22 of the Governor's Speech is as follows:

There has been a very rapid growth in population in some areas, and this has meant that consideration should be given to a redistribution of electoral boundaries. My Government is prepared to explore this question with Her Majesty's Opposition to see whether agreement can be reached upon it.

Since I have been a member of Parliament I have heard many references to democracy and to the will of the people. I have heard it said that the people are free to change their minds if they are not satisfied with the Government, and I entirely agree with that. Of course, the people can change their minds! I have never objected to people changing their minds in selecting a Government, but I do object to a system that prevents people from securing effective results from changing their minds, which is exactly what happened in this State after the last elections. Thousands of people who had previously supported this Government changed their minds, so much so that South Australia is now being governed by the largest minority Party. I turn now to a book ably presented by Mr. Combe, the highly respected Clerk of this House. I am sure that this book has been read by every member of this House, and I have not heard one word of dissent about its contents. Before the elections in March this book, as far as I know, was accepted without

question. On page 10, when referring to the Government of South Australia, the author states:

This follows the British system of responsible Cabinet Government. As applied to South Australia, this system requires that the Government should act on the advice of a Cabinet of Ministers, headed by the Premier; that the Ministers should individually be in charge of the various executive departments of State, and that the Ministers should be members of Parliament having the support of the majority Party (or coalition) in the lower House. These provisions are not set out in a Statute but are governed by convention.

The Government occupying the Treasury benches today is not a coalition Government; it is a minority Government as, when the member for Burra indicated his stand after the March elections, as reported in the *Advertiser* of March 10, he said:

I reserve, as I have always done, my right to vote on any Bill as I feel it to be in the best interests of the people of the electorate of Burra and the State of South Australia. This I will continue to do from my position as a member on the floor of the House.

The member for Ridley, who likewise is an Independent member, in a statement that appeared in the *Advertiser* on March 28, said:

I do not propose to alter my status as an Independent and therefore will reserve the right to vote on all legislation on its merits. As an Independent I will closely watch all legislation and vote for or against it on the merits of the Bill or issue before the House. As an Independent I will not capriciously withhold my vote on any legislation that I consider has for its purpose the development, stability and social welfare of the State. I sincerely trust that my stand on this very important issue will not do any harm to the South Australian Wheat and Woolgrowers' Association, nor the Australian Wheatgrowers' Federation.

In view of the public statements made by you, Mr. Speaker, as the member for Ridley, and your colleague, the member for Burra, the Government in South Australia today should not be holding office. This is no coalition Government and yet that is what the public is led to believe. A coalition is a union of persons or parties into one body. You cannot have it both ways: you cannot retain your identity as an Independent and pledge your support to another Party.

Mr. Quirke: Unfortunately for you you have got that.

Mr. HUGHES: You cannot retain your identity as an Independent and pledge support to another Party. That is true. Therefore, the people of South Australia are under a

misapprehension as to the strength of the Government in this House.

Mr. Quirke: You wait and see.

Mr. Lawn: The Premier only has to say it is a vital issue and you will see.

Mr. HUGHES: I am at a loss to see what part the Wheat and Woolgrowers' Association and the Australian Wheatgrowers' Federation had to do with it. Apparently that is what the people in Ridley thought too, because an article appeared in the press after that stand was taken. If members examine the article they will find that that person was at a loss to understand the position. He thought the people of Ridley were the ones to be considered.

Turning to page 12 of Mr. Combe's book, I read:

The Opposition is the largest minority group of members in the House of Assembly who are not supporters of the Government. The prevalence of the two-party system in South Australian politics usually obviates any uncertainty as to which group is entitled to be called the official Opposition.

I think that paragraph is self-explanatory. People all over the State, many of them supporters of this Government, have been outspoken on the Government's attitude towards the wishes of the majority and its complete indifference to public opinion and, because of this, the Government is bringing Parliament into ridicule. When all other arguments have been swept aside a clear expression of the desire of the majority of the people in this State remains as they relate themselves to a specific Party.

I suppose never before in the history of the Liberal and Country Party has the Party generally been so definitely faced with the challenge of such a split Party. Apparently members of the Liberal and Country League are still smarting under the confusion and bewilderment experienced after the last elections and they are endeavouring, even now, to round up their scattered forces. Although the State elections have only just passed, the L.C.L. is actively engaged in campaigning for survival and that is not surprising when the results of the last elections are examined. I was interested in a newsletter published by the L.C.L., the contents of which were circulated around my district only a couple of weeks ago and throughout the State.

Mr. Ryan: Are they secret?

Mr. HUGHES: No. I had a reprint taken from the local paper and I shall read it to the House to show the fallacy of their claims. It is headed "Some Election Questions" and proceeds:

Following the State election, March 3, publicity was given to questions about the political situation. Some of the questions, and brief answers are—

Question: Why does the Playford Government retain office when it only has 18 elected members as against the A.L.P. 19 members, and two Independents?

Answer: It is the prerogative of a Government to remain in office as long as it commands the support of the majority of the members of the House. The two Independent members indicated that they will support the Government. This means that the Government has the support of the majority and can carry on. No other party could form a Government and it was the responsibility of the Government to continue in office.

Mr. Quirke: I think you had better stop there.

Mr. HUGHES: I don't think I should stop there. I am not reading the wrong script, and a significant silence has come over the other side of the House. The next question was:

Question: As the Liberal Government retains office on the support of the two Independent votes, what is the position with one elected as Speaker making equal numbers on the floor of the House?

Mr. Quirke: You have the answer now.

Mr. HUGHES: I have the answer here. It is as follows:

The Speaker of the House has a casting vote, which under an assurance of support from the Independents not to destroy the Government, will ensure the Government of a constitutional majority.

Question: Is it fair for the Liberals to retain office if the percentage of votes cast for the Parties is as claimed by the A.L.P.: 54 per cent A.L.P., 34 per cent the L.C.L.?

Mr. Ryan: There is silence on the other side.

Mr. HUGHES: Not a sound! Now this is their answer.

Mr. Heaslip: Where did you get those figures from?

Mr. HUGHES: I am reading them out of the honourable member's newsletter.

Mr. Nankivell: We do not claim them.

Mr. HUGHES: This is the answer:

Analysis shows the fallacy of this claim. Six strong L.C.L. districts were not contested—Eyre, Yorke Peninsula, Gouger, Angas, Albert, Rocky River. In these there would have been at least a two to one majority for the L.C.L.

That is not factual according to a man who visited my home a few weeks ago.

Mr. Jennings: Did they mention Hindmarsh and Semaphore?

Mr. HUGHES: I am coming to that.

Mr. Quirke: You could add to that Whyalla, Stuart and Port Pirie.

Mr. HUGHES: They have not forgotten any they wanted to put in but they forgot those they did not wish to put in. The newsletter continues:

The Independents hold strong L.C.L. districts, and a large percentage of the votes they secured represented L.C.L. votes, certainly not A.L.P. votes. In the districts of Stuart, Port Pirie, Whyalla no L.C.L. candidate stood but it is believed the Independent candidates were encouraged to stand by the A.L.P. in a bid to get people to the polls to vote for the Legislative Council. In those three electorates many L.C.L. supporters obviously voted for the official A.L.P. candidate. Finally, in Adelaide, Port Adelaide, Enfield, Edwardstown there was no L.C.L. candidate, but there was an A.L.P., a D.L.P., or a Communist. In these districts no L.C.L. supporter would wittingly vote for a Communist. Some might have voted for the D.L.P., but many voted for the A.L.P. This was a further boost to the A.L.P. vote. When all these matters are taken into consideration, the number of supporters for the L.C.L. would be little different from the number which supported the A.L.P.

On the bottom appear the words, "L.C.L. Newsletter, June, 1962".

Mr. Ryan: Do they make a charge for that, or is it free?

Mr. HUGHES: I think, Mr. Acting Speaker . . .

Mr. Lawn: You have frightened the Speaker out; he has gone to lie down.

Mr. HUGHES: I must respect the Chair. Mr. Acting Speaker, I will not go back to the first two questions, because time would not permit it this afternoon and in any case I think I have effectively answered them already.

Mr. Jennings: There was nothing to answer, but you have answered them, anyhow.

Mr. HUGHES: Let me come to the third question. Apparently this was intended to act as oil upon the troubled waters. It is all very well for the purpose of political tactics to hurl around the State a list of questions, complete with answers, based purely on supposition. But, Mr. Acting Speaker, it is another matter to make these attempts to redeem the Party stick in the public mind. Why did the writer of the newsletter not tell all the facts? I did not hear a sound when I read from this newsletter a moment or so ago, so it must be true that Labor did receive 54 per cent of the primary votes and the L.C.L. 34 per cent. Why did the writer not say that a certain number of seats were not contested by both Parties? He did not mention that.

Mr. Hall: We have to leave something for you to say.

Mr. HUGHES: It was very conveniently left out. Why didn't the writer say that if the House of Representatives' figures were taken as a guide for those 19 seats not contested by both major Parties Labor would have had 56 per cent of the votes and the L.C.L. 44 per cent?

Mr. Jenkins: That's only assumption!

Mr. HUGHES: It is fact!

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HUGHES: I have all the facts brought right up to the present.

Mr. Shannon: Did anyone mention that you put up a couple of dummies in certain seats?

Mr. HUGHES: The honourable member should have been here and heard what I had to say about that newsletter. Time would not permit me this afternoon to put all the facts before the House. However, I want to say for the benefit of members opposite that in the 20 seats contested by both Labor and the L.C.L. 48.73 per cent of the votes went to Labor and 45.88 per cent to the L.C.L. Those figures gave for those 20 seats a two per cent swing to Labor over and above the Commonwealth elections. If we take the House of Representatives' figures, corrected by the two per cent swing to Labor, and apply them to the other 19 seats, the result, as I have pointed out, would be 56 per cent of the votes to Labor and 44 per cent to the L.C.L. For the benefit of the member for Stirling, I can say that 55.9 per cent went to the A.L.P. and 44.1 per cent to the L.C.L. Let them also sop this one up! After eliminating the D.L.P. candidates, their preferences heavily favoured the L.C.L.

Mr. Quirke: What does it add up to?

Mr. HUGHES: What a question! I know it has been interesting to the honourable member and to some members opposite. They are not fictitious figures, but figures that I can vouch for.

Mr. Lawn: They haven't enjoyed the last three-quarters of an hour.

Mr. Quirke: But what does it add up to?

Mr. HUGHES: It adds up to this: that this Government should not be holding office today, and the honourable member knows it.

Mr. Quirke: But why?

Mr. HUGHES: I have finished with that point now, and honourable members opposite are glad to know that I have finished with it. They did not laugh a moment ago, but were silent. A Minister of the Crown, speaking in my electorate in support of a candidate, claimed that State elections were never a test of the

electorate because some seats were not contested. We know that to be quite true; the newsletter which I read mentioned it, but for a very obvious reason it failed to mention all the uncontested seats. Mr. Acting Speaker, despite the fact that the Government has been assisted by an extremely competent anti-Labor daily newspaper, and the existence of an unprecedented vicious anti-Labor splinter group, it has lost the confidence of its own supporters. The Minister went on to say, in the speech that I referred to:

As a principle, members of Parliament should be responsible to the electors and the electors only, as was the case with the L.C.L. members.

Mr. Shannon: I think that is pretty sound.

Mr. Jennings: But it is not true.

Mr. HUGHES: The Minister had taken the Labor Party to task and explained to his audience that the A.L.P. members of Parliament were under the control of a central executive and that the position had reached serious proportions, but that this was not so with the L.C.L. members: they were responsible to the electors only. If any honourable members wish to read word for word what the Minister said they can do so in the local newspaper in the Parliamentary Library.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Do you deny that you take instructions from Grote Street?

Mr. HUGHES: Apparently the people in my district were not prepared to have that put over them. They knew full well that the whole statement was without foundation, both regarding the A.L.P. and the L.C.L. In answer to the Minister, A.L.P. members are not under the control of a central executive.

Mr. Shannon: If you read the speeches from your side of the House on the Constitution Act Amendment Bill—

Mr. HUGHES: I have just told the Minister that A.L.P. members are not under the control of a central executive, but all L.C.L. members are under the control of a central figure—and not one of them can deny that. If any honourable member opposite entered this House thinking otherwise, then he must have been very sadly disillusioned.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Do you recall the Long Service Leave Bill?

Mr. HUGHES: I was not here then. When the Leader of the great A.L.P. in South Australia spoke to the people on February 7 over the radio he said:

If you give my Party a mandate to form a Government one of its first jobs will be to introduce legislation to Parliament to ensure equitable electoral boundaries.

That is what Mr. Walsh told the people in his policy speech and that speech resulted in this comment from an editorial in the *News*:

Labor's policy speech for the State elections, delivered last night by the Opposition Leader, Mr. Frank Walsh, is perhaps one of the most imaginative for many years. . . . It contains many proposals for deep consideration. One thing that will be widely accepted is Labor's desire to have a more equitable distribution of electoral boundaries. If elected, Labor would be expected to make this one of its earliest reforms. There are ideas in this policy speech that could take closer testing. All credit to the Labor Party policy-makers for having advanced them. The proposals have a quality of sincerity and of determination. . . .

That was one of the many favourable comments made after the speech by our Leader. Government supporters seem to be doubting much of the material I am presenting to the House. This is what Mr. Walsh had to say in his policy speech on constitutional and electoral reform:

The present unjust electoral system was originated by Act of Parliament in 1936 which provided for 13 metropolitan seats or electorates and 26 country, without taking any account of the respective electors in two groups of electorates. In other words it was laid down that there were to be two country as against one metropolitan electorate. The first election under this system occurred in 1938 when the enrolments in the metropolitan area were 212,000 as compared with 153,000 in the country. Today, enrolments in the 13 metropolitan electorates have increased to 333,000 whereas the 26 country electorates only have a total enrolment of 199,000 after excluding the district of Gawler which has had a colossal population increase in recent years.

As a matter of fact the average number of electors in country electorates is approximately 7,000, whereas the number of electors in Gawler has increased by more than 6,000 since the last election and there are now 19,000 electors in that country district. Therefore it would appear that the present Government is not even prepared to consider a fair distribution in the country electorates. There has also been a disproportionate growth in the number of metropolitan electors as compared with the country, and over a period of a little more than 20 years the rate of increase in the enrolments in the metropolitan area has been more than twice that of the country areas.

The Labor Party believes in democracy, democratic government and in the control of Parliament by democratic methods. One fundamental principle of democracy is that people should be able to change the Government if they want to, but this is very difficult to achieve in South Australia. We had substantial overall majorities in the last three State elections, but they were not sufficient to change the Government under the Playford rules of Parliamentary elections. However, I am convinced that even with the unjust system of electing Parliament in this State, the electors will be convinced with our sound policy and return a Labor Government to office on March 3.

In pursuance of that policy the majority of electors went to the polls firmly convinced with the soundness of our policy and with the desire to elect a Labor Government. Why? Because they were tired of the undemocratic way in which the Government was being elected to office. It has been kept in office by a gerrymander that would be a disgrace to any civilized country.

Mr. Shannon: Your Party voted for it once.

Mr. HUGHES: The Premier is endeavouring to keep it that way. My claim is substantiated by an editorial in the *News* of Tuesday last under the heading "Come off it, Sir Thomas!", which states:

The talks yesterday on State electoral reform between the Government and the Labor Opposition were about as complete a travesty as could be imagined.

Surely the Premier, Sir Thomas Playford, did not believe for a moment that there was any hope of acceptance for his suggestions.

Nor is it conceivable that he went into the talks prepared to accept anything that the Opposition might put up.

The Premier opposed any sizeable increase in the House of Assembly, but proposed the creation of another Legislative Council district to return an additional four members.

The Labor representatives at the talks later protested that, under the Premier's conception of a fair deal, they could obtain 58 per cent of the overall vote and still fail to win a constitutional majority in the Assembly.

As far as the Premier's Legislative Council proposal is concerned, *The News* repeats its contention that the only true solution is abolition. There is no need for an upper house.

If this is impossible of achievement—and there are strong indications of it in the foreseeable future—then let the council be elected on a complete adult franchise. In its present set-up it is not a true house of revision, but merely a house of reaction.

The only proper and sincere way to approach the problem of electoral reform is through the appointment of an independent commission with liberal terms of reference enabling it to reach conclusions unfettered by political strings.

Nothing would be gained by tying such a commission down to specific proportions as between country and city seats—certainly not the two to one proportion observed at present.

Considering again yesterday's abortive discussions, which were doomed from the start, there is no escaping the impression that Sir Thomas Playford was indulging in a little political window-dressing.

He can now, even if speciously, claim to have looked into the matter of electoral reform as he promised during the last throne-shaking elections. But this is not good enough, Sir Thomas! Political sophistry might be an amusing game for the participant. It is an affront to the electors.

Despite the democratically expressed wishes of the people, the present Government has con-

tinued in office and, by so doing, has completely ignored a substantial overall majority of public opinion. This afternoon I want to say that the people who contribute towards democracy know something about the rights for which they are subscribing. Looking up Webster's dictionary, I find the definition of "democracy" is:

Government of the people. A form of government in which the supreme power is retained by the people and exercised either directly or through a system of representation and delegated authority.

Mr. Shannon: That says nothing about one vote one value. Webster must have overlooked that!

Mr. HUGHES: Oh, Mr. Speaker!

Mr. Shannon: "Oh, Mr. Speaker"—yes!

Mr. HUGHES: That definition does not exist in this Parliament, and the honourable member knows it. Power, or Government as we know it, is in the hands of a minority section of the people designed to frustrate the expression of the majority of people, which could hardly fail to react against the development of this country.

Mr. Shannon: As a country member, you favour one vote one value?

Mr. HUGHES: Of course I do; there is no doubt about it.

Mr. Shannon: Your country people would tell you differently.

Mr. HUGHES: What has the present system achieved in my district? That is the question I am asking the honourable member. It is difficult to say how much inclination and incentive faculty of our community has been affected. Its influence must be considerable and it can hardly be doubted that a monotonous environment will breed a revulsion of opinion. The people of South Australia will rise up and say, "Away with these things! They are for the minority groups or the privileged few." One will find that that will happen if this is allowed to continue. It is necessary that consideration be given to this unsatisfactory position that has arisen affecting the free and democratic institution as we know it and which we have been taught to respect.

Briefly, I should like to touch on the role that the Public Service is playing in the development of this country. It was good to see in the press recently the Attorney-General of South Australia conceding that a State undertaking had to take over problems that were too difficult for private enterprise. That, Mr. Acting Speaker, coming from a supporter of private enterprise is indeed a tribute to the men and women who comprise the Public

Service in this State. Let us look at the remarks of the Attorney-General as reported in the press of May 17 of this year. This appeared in the *Advertiser* under the date mentioned:

Role of P.S. Increasing.

With the development of Australia, the ambit and responsibility of the Public Service were increasing very much "whether we like it or not", the Attorney-General (Mr. Rowe) said yesterday. Mr. Rowe was opening a one-day conference of the Royal Institute of Public Administration at the University of Adelaide. "I think that must be so if we are to progress as we have in the past", he added. For every pound which private enterprise spent in establishing new industries or expanding existing industries, Governments had to spend another pound to provide roads, hospitals, health and educational services, and in some cases, housing.

In many instances the Public Service had to take over and try to solve problems which had been too difficult for private enterprise.

The Public Service had management experts, similar to those in private enterprise. "I think the press could do more than it does to create a better feeling towards the Public Service", he said. "When some action by the Public Service benefits the community the public should be told of this."

I can remember when the Public Service was held up to ridicule because of red tape. No matter how competent a member of the service was, it was beyond him to have business expedited because of the failure to have someone with enough authority to say either yes or no. During the five years that I have been in Parliament, I have found that the Public Service has built up a reputation for high efficiency. No doubt, Mr. Acting Speaker, there are honourable members on both sides of the House who will disagree with me. I have heard complaints from members concerning the amount of time that has elapsed between making representations to a department and a reply or report coming back. In some instances I believe this to be true and, of course, in some cases there could be a good reason for this. I believe that the respect for the Public Service today has been brought about by the appointment of management experts, men who realize that good public relations are essential to the well-being of any country.

One of the finest articles that I have read on public relations appeared in the June issue of the *South Australian Public Service Review*. It is a very fine article explaining public relations, written by the association's General Secretary. If I had not taken up so much of the time of the House this afternoon, I should be tempted to read it to honourable members. But in it there is a psychological condition of

efficient work. I say this afternoon that interest in public relations is necessary if the work is to be well done. The public expenditure of a growing State is rapidly expanding as new functions are taken over by central or local authorities. The enormous sums now spent by the State involve a considerable redistribution of the national dividend and this, in turn, vitally depends completely on the administrative ability of the managerial staff of the respective departments under the Public Service administration. Interest, of course, in the work is necessary if the work is to be well done.

My experience of the Public Service is that it attempts to imbue each worker with a certain amount of responsibility, to let each feel that his or her job is one of trust, and that there is room for the exercise of his or her independent judgment. The article I was quoting continues:

The Chairman of the Public Service Board of Victoria (Mr. A. Garran), speaking on "The Public Servant—His Responsibilities to the Community", said the Public Service was a profession "of the new type". The public servant exercises his profession "on behalf of the Government for the people". Other points by Mr. Garran included:—

The Government must have priority in the public servant's loyalty when it came to a "meeting of interests" of the Government, the public, the Public Service and public opinion. "Reasonable" red tape was necessary. It should be neither "thrown overboard" nor abused. Above all, a public servant must be dedicated to his job because "he has an interest in the proper government of the country and the welfare of the people as a whole".

How true it is that one must be dedicated to his job. Unless loyalty is given in exchange there is always the danger of maladministration, waste and bungling, and the service would soon fall into disrepute. The day has passed when the public servant was expected to work under conditions that applied in his father's day. However, there is still room for improvement, particularly in office accommodation. Today the young educated person looks for a position where office accommodation is of modern standards. Naturally the Public Service is losing some of the best brains of the country because the Government in the past has not faced up realistically to the need for providing large new offices that would serve as an inducement to those whose qualifications would merit their being singled out as excellent leaders in the State's development. I have pleasure in supporting the amended Address in Reply.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River): I support the mover and seconder of the motion.

Mr. Ryan: The amendment or the motion?

Mr. HEASLIP: The member for Light made his maiden speech in moving this motion and those who heard it—and I include Opposition members as well as Government members—will agree that he did well. He is a young man and the State and Parliamentary circles will see and hear much of him in future years.

Mr. Ryan: Are you making your final speech?

Mr. HEASLIP: The seconder of the motion, the member for Angas, is well known and he made a speech of the calibre we expect from him. Unfortunately, for the last six years we have been deprived of the opportunity of hearing him talk from the floor of the House, but now that he is back with us we welcome him. I congratulate him on his appointment as Chairman of Committees. I am sure this Parliament will benefit from his ability as a debater.

Mr. Lawn: You would prefer him as Speaker though, wouldn't you?

Mr. HEASLIP: We have been informed that Her Majesty the Queen and Prince Philip will visit Australia soon and I am sure that when they visit South Australia every citizen will look forward to welcoming them.

Mr. Ryan: There might be a Labor Premier when she comes here next year!

Mr. HEASLIP: Even if there is a Labor Premier—and I need not say more—I am sure that irrespective of creed or beliefs he will welcome our Queen royally. I do not suppose that there has ever been a time when the bonds between the Commonwealth of Australia and the Old Country were more in need of strengthening than at present with the Common Market looming—and in my opinion there is no doubt that England will join the Common Market. Although the bonds will be strained, I am sure they will not be broken.

Mr. Fred Walsh: The Prime Minister hinted that they might.

Mr. HEASLIP: We have had problems before and we have overcome them and we will do so again, but it is opportune that Her Majesty and Prince Philip should visit Australia soon. I am sure we will extend a royal and loyal welcome to them. I congratulate the Minister of Education on the honour bestowed on him by Her Majesty. Sir Baden Pattinson has been Minister of Education for many years and he has had a major task in building up the Education Department to its

present status. With the increasing number of schoolchildren he has had a mammoth task. It is not merely a question of the Government providing money but of administering and apportioning that money where it is most needed and in keeping pace with the increasing growth of South Australia. I congratulate the Speaker on his elevation to the Chair of this House.

Mr. Lawn: Are you going to make him a knight too?

Mr. HEASLIP: I have not the right to make or the prerogative of making him a knight.

Mr. Lawn: Don Athaldo could do so, couldn't he?

Mr. HEASLIP: Whether he will be made a knight or not I do not know, but I do know that with all his years of Parliamentary life and his activity in public affairs he will observe the dignity and decorum of this place as we have become accustomed to it in the past. I do not suppose there is a more aptly-named member in this House than the member for Wallaroo. I listened attentively to the major portion of his speech but the main word that emerged was "Wallaroo".

Mr. Fred Walsh: He said a lot about primary producers.

Mr. HEASLIP: He represents primary producers, but all that came up in his speech was Wallaroo.

Mr. Fred Walsh: No, you could not have been listening.

Mr. HEASLIP: I was listening, but as you know Wallaroo—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must not say "you".

Mr. HEASLIP: I apologize. When the honourable member's speech appears in *Hansard* members will find that for every time "primary producer" appears "Wallaroo" will be mentioned five times.

Mr. Fred Walsh: He meant the electorate of Wallaroo.

Mr. Lawn: Aren't there any primary producers in Wallaroo?

Mr. HEASLIP: The electorate of Wallaroo was not mentioned. He referred only to Wallaroo and the waterfront. I could not think of a better name for the honourable member than "Wallaroo". His speech was confined to Wallaroo, and the districts around Wallaroo did not count. Although it is a rural electorate Wallaroo alone counted. The first thing the honourable member did was to query a statement by the member for Barossa about loading a shipment of oats in 24 hours. He

said that the conveyor belt was not capable of doing it. Being the member for Wallaroo he should know that at that port the Government installed a belt with a capacity of 400 tons an hour. If he went to school and learnt arithmetic he would know that 24 times 400 tons amounts to 9,600 tons, yet he said it could not be done. When questioned he said that at Wallaroo they worked eight hours a day. If that is the honourable member's view of the working hours of primary producers this State will go broke within a decade. If primary producers worked only eight hours a day our secondary industries would die because there would not be enough overseas credits to keep things going. Then he mentioned increases in freight rates to the United Kingdom and Europe, and said there had been an increase of five per cent. He said that the waterside workers at Wallaroo were blamed for it.

Mr. Hughes: I did not say it was the waterside workers.

Mr. HEASLIP: If members read *Hansard* they will see that the honourable member did say it. The Leader of the Opposition, strange to say, also brought up the matter of the mode of transport used by trade missions. He advocated the use of Australian ships.

Mr. Ryan: Why shouldn't they be used?

Mr. HEASLIP: If anyone wants to add another burden on to the primary producer, by all means use them.

Mr. Ryan: You cannot substantiate what you are saying about the member for Wallaroo.

Mr. HEASLIP: I know that our primary products are being moved from Australia by overseas ships, and that the freight rates charged for them are much lower than the rates charged for our own ships.

Mr. Hughes: We have no ships.

Mr. HEASLIP: We have some, but if we use them to take our products overseas we must pay more in freight rates.

Mr. Fred Walsh: Didn't the Commonwealth line of ships keep the freight rates down?

Mr. HEASLIP: The rates charged for overseas ships are lower than those charged for our own ships. Mr. Hughes also said, again about Wallaroo, that attention must be given to the turn-round of ships. I refer members to the time when bulk handling was introduced in this State. I want the present member for Wallaroo to know that his predecessor, also a Labor member, said something about bulk handling.

Mr. Hughes: I am not worried about my predecessor.

Mr. HEASLIP: I am concerned about the attitude of Opposition members on these things, and about reducing costs to primary producers. In 1955, when the Bulk Handling of Grain Bill was discussed, Mr. McAlees, the then member for Wallaroo, said:

This is a Bill I cannot allow to pass without comment. I have been a member of this House for a few years and I have never heard Wallaroo mentioned so much as during yesterday and today. I do not know whether it has any application to the fact that we generally speak well of the dead. I take it that this Bill could be the beginning of the end of Wallaroo. I am not opposed to bulk handling and know of no-one who is, because we must progress with the machine age, but what I am opposed to is that the Government is prepared to guarantee £500,000 to the company to introduce bulk handling at Wallaroo.

He concluded his speech by saying:

I hope the Bill will not be passed until the Government sobers up and formulates a scheme to help those people who will be left in distress in Wallaroo.

The present member for Wallaroo advocates a quicker turn-round of ships, which we advocated in 1955. Then the Opposition, including the then member for Wallaroo, opposed it. I represent a primary producing area and I want to reduce costs of primary production. The then member for Wallaroo opposed the move, but the present member for Wallaroo advocates it.

Mr. Clark: You would not have got the Bill through but for the Opposition support.

Mr. HEASLIP: We got some support from the Opposition. Mr. McAlees opposed the 1955 proposal, but the present member for Wallaroo has made a complete turn-about and advocates a quicker turn-round of ships. Most of his speech was along these lines, but in the closing three-quarters of an hour he spoke about the Opposition having the right to govern.

Mr. Ryan: You don't deny that?

Mr. HEASLIP: I do not deny anything. I believe in having a test. We have already had one test this session. We came to this place as the elected representatives of the people, and the Playford Government is still in power. At present we have a no-confidence matter before the House and the majority of members here will decide it.

Mr. Ryan: Which majority?

Mr. HEASLIP: The majority of the members elected to this place.

Mr. Jennings: How were they elected?

Mr. HEASLIP: That does not matter at all. We are the elected members to this place.

We have been sent here with a mandate to govern.

Mr. Ryan: Mandate from whom?

Mr. HEASLIP: The people, and we are here to represent them.

Mr. Ryan: Only 34 per cent!

Mr. HEASLIP: Every member of this House is sent here by the people to represent them. I do not wish to waste time arguing this matter, but this is where it is decided. The Playford Government has a majority, and so is the Government. I turn now to His Excellency's Speech, and I shall deal with paragraph 4, relating to primary production, which was dealt with by the member for Wallaroo. I hope I shall confine myself to primary production and primary producers, the people I represent, and not deal with industrial affairs. In paragraph 4 His Excellency said:

Despite excellent opening rains seasonal conditions during the past year were not good and yields were in general below average, although better than at first anticipated. My Government continues its policy of extending and increasing research and scientific services in all fields of primary production and is doing its utmost to ensure that the best use is made of all available resources in the light of scientific and technical advances.

I could not agree more, particularly in respect of the increasing research and scientific services; but I think we have to go much further than that if primary producers are to get out of the difficulties they now face. They are in real trouble, despite what many people think. Some seem to think that one has only to go on the land, plant seed or buy sheep, and everything else happens, but that is not so now. Anyone who borrows money to purchase a property and has to pay interest on it will, without any doubt, go into liquidation. In other words, primary production is not economic now.

Mr. Quirke: It yields only two per cent.

Mr. HEASLIP: Exactly. If primary producers are more efficient they may make three per cent, but that is all they will make, and to do that they will probably be working for less than the basic wage. Figures released by the Commonwealth Statistician (Mr. Archer) show that exports during the year were valued at £1,071,000,000—a record figure for Australia. This was the first time that exports had exceeded £1,000,000,000. In the previous year exports were valued at £928,000,000. Estimates published recently by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics showed that of the increase of £143,000,000 in exports in 1961-62, 64 per cent, or £91,000,000, was accounted for by increases in exports of rural origin.

Exports of rural origin were valued at £791,000,000 compared with £700,000,000 in 1960-61. Of the whole total of £1,071,000,000, almost £800,000,000 came from the country. The imports during that period necessary to keep secondary industries going amounted to £833,000,000, plus £200,000,000 of invisible charges. In other words, imports during the period in which we had record exports exceeded our exports. We would have had an adverse trade balance had overseas people not had confidence in this country and invested in it, and we could not have made our trade balance in the last year, which was a record year. If we had a drought we certainly could not afford to bring in as many things as we are bringing in to keep secondary industries operating at the present. These imports were in a year when there were credit restrictions. When credit restrictions are lifted, imports will increase.

I have pointed this out to indicate the important part played by primary producers in this country's exports and in keeping people in secondary industries. What is happening to them? I shall quote figures from the *Statistical Register of South Australia* on primary production to show members opposite the dire straits in which primary producers find themselves. Although some believe that they are well off, they are anything but well off.

Mr. Riches: With drought, Menzies and Playford, how could they be?

Mr. HEASLIP: This country will be in real trouble if we have a drought.

Mr. Jennings: We are in it now, aren't we?

Mr. HEASLIP: I am afraid we will be in much more trouble. In 1952-53 the value of agricultural, pastoral, dairying, poultry and bee-keeping production was £140,000,000. In 1959-60 the gross value was only £115,000,000.

Mr. Hutchens: And the value of money had declined in the meantime.

Mr. HEASLIP: It had, yet the gross value of our products had dropped by about £25,000,000. The net value of that same production in 1952-53 was £113,000,000; in 1959-60 it was £85,000,000. The net value had dropped by £37,000,000.

Mr. Hutchens: That is a most important industry to our economy.

Mr. HEASLIP: Exactly! I agree with the member for Hindmarsh and that is what I am trying to say. We are producing more than we produced in 1952-53, but the amount

received by the producers is down by £37,000,000.

Mr. Fred Walsh: Australian productivity generally has increased.

Mr. HEASLIP: I would not say that. I have not finished yet. I am quoting from the *Statistical Register of South Australia 1959-60, Part V (a)—Primary Production*. Now, we have the position that the net income of primary producers is down over that period although they are producing more. That means that the primary producers receive less money, but we have more primary producers today than we had in 1952-53. Now, we come to the other side of the picture and I quote from the *Statistical Register of South Australia 1958-59, Part V (b)—Secondary Production*. During the same period—the last eight years—the wages and salaries paid to each employée, excluding working proprietors, in 1952-53 averaged £779 18s. a year. Females were employed, too, but I am dealing solely with males. In 1959-60 that wage had risen to £1,088.

Mr. Fred Walsh: But by how much had the cost of living risen?

Mr. HEASLIP: I am not disputing whether this is right or wrong: I am merely trying to show what has happened. I do not say that these people are receiving too much money. I do not know whether they are getting enough but I know the effect this increase is having on primary production.

Mr. McKee: Are rural workers included in that figure?

Mr. HEASLIP: No.

Mr. McKee: No, because no award exists for them.

Mr. HEASLIP: The employee's wage jumped from £779 18s. a year in 1952-53 to £1,088 in 1959-60. Now, what effect is that having on primary producers? Costs are going up in primary industries and all these increases are affecting primary production.

Mr. Jennings: Are you going to support our amendment on land tax then?

Mr. HEASLIP: I am debating rural production. I do not think I have the support of all members opposite and I believe some of them query my figures. I shall now quote what the Commonwealth Leader of the Opposition had to say when speaking on the Budget debate in August 1961. This is not his whole speech but I am only taking out the paragraphs in which he speaks of rural industry. He said that:

The Budget, while pretending to help the Development Bank by increasing its capital

by £5,000,000 was really insulting the rural community. Not only was this sum too small to be of any real help, but the sickness that afflicted the countryside was extremely serious. In 1956-7, wages and salaries in the primary industries amounted to £2,827,000,000 while farm incomes totalled £520,000,000. Four years later in 1960-61, wages and salaries had increased by £743,000,000 but farm incomes had fallen by £53,000,000. Under those circumstances it was difficult to understand how anyone could stay on the land while getting less and less and paying more and more for everything he needed.

That does not come from my Party; it comes from the Leader of the Opposition in Canberra.

Mr. Jennings: We agree with that.

Mr. HEASLIP: I am pleased to know that members opposite agree with it, because if they agree with that—

Mr. Fred Walsh: We did not say whether we agreed with it or not. What was the date of that statement.

Mr. HEASLIP: Evidently all members opposite do not agree with that statement.

Mr. Jennings: I agree with the statement.

Mr. HEASLIP: This statement was made during the debate on the Budget in the House of Representatives on August 22, 1961. It is not old; it is current history. It is quite new and although it is what the Leader of the Opposition said in the Commonwealth Parliament I cannot agree more. If members opposite are in agreement with that they will be out to help primary producers and lower their production costs.

Mr. Jennings: So we are.

Mr. HEASLIP: I am glad to hear that and to know that members opposite are behind primary producers. I have here a pamphlet that has been received by all members, entitled *Premium*. This is the official journal of the Australian Insurance Staffs' Federation and it is registered at the General Post Office, Melbourne. On the first page I read "Federation acts to protect five-day working week." I turn the page over and read "Late news on five-day week front—application to vary adjourned." I turn to another page and read "More annual leave sought—1960 decision recalled." On the same page I read "Preparation for salary claim." The following statement appears: "Federation gains victory in long-service leave case." On another page we have "Victorian teachers seek salary adjustments." Another statement says "The aim of the Federation is a five-day, 35-hour week." Members opposite said they supported attempts to reduce the costs of primary producers. Can any honourable member say that any one of

these things will reduce costs? Everyone of them represents increased costs. Then we see a balance-sheet, and towards the end of the book the words "Five day bank week in Victoria":

Mr. Fred Walsh: In the next issue we will see where they are going to have an increase in margins.

Mr. HEASLIP: On the next page we see the words, "Five hour work day." I turn the page again and find the words, "Reduction in working hours as an answer to unemployment." This book consists of those sort of things.

Mr. Jennings: If you could get away with it, would you still favour slavery?

Mr. HEASLIP: I am not talking about slavery. I have not even mentioned reducing wages.

Mr. Fred Walsh: You have been talking about it.

Mr. HEASLIP: No, I have not mentioned it. I am quite sure that if this country is to survive it will not do so by reducing hours. This problem started after the conclusion of the war. When people overseas were crying out for us to supply them with goods, what did we do? We had strike after strike, and then we came into the 40-hour week when all the orders were available to us and we just could not take them.

Mr. Fred Walsh: And we have never had better times than we had in the following years.

Mr. HEASLIP: It was a tragedy that Australia did what it did then.

Mr. Riches: None of the things you have mentioned apply to agricultural workers.

Mr. HEASLIP: Rural workers in those days worked in the same way as they do today. I have never heard of rural workers going on strike or asking for a five-day week or a five-hour day. Primary producers and rural workers have to pay dearly for the few privileges they get, for the freedom they have of being able to work 70 hours or 40 hours as they please, knowing that if they do not do the job today they have to do it tomorrow—for the privilege of being able to say, "I am going away today and I will do the job when I come back tomorrow." For those small privileges they are paying dearly. I believe that something must be done if our primary production is to remain healthy; it is not healthy today. We can adopt a system of subsidies, but I do not believe in subsidies.

Mr. Jennings: Do you favour the recognition of Red China?

Mr. HEASLIP: That is a Commonwealth matter, and if I said anything on that it would only be my own view and would not carry any weight whatever. I am glad that we are able to sell wheat to China.

Mr. Fred Walsh: And you will be more glad if they pay for it!

Mr. HEASLIP: I know the first payments have been made, and there is no reason why the second payments should not be made. At least we are feeding under-nourished people, and that is only humane and decent, even if we do not get paid for it; it is not left on the ground to rot, but is being used as it should be used.

Mr. McKee: Provided they keep paying.

Mr. HEASLIP: Irrespective of whether they pay or not, it is going to something useful. I do not want primary industries to get to the position where secondary industries are today. I believe that secondary industries are necessary; indeed, I do not think we can populate Australia without secondary industries. I am sure that primary production alone cannot populate Australia and never will be able to do so, but primary producers working hand in hand with secondary industries can produce the export credits that will enable secondary industries to develop. The unfortunate thing is that today we have already reached the stage where secondary industries cannot compete on overseas markets because their costs have gone up to such an extent. If credits are to be created overseas it cannot be on the back of the primary producer; secondary industries have to carry some of it, and must reach the stage where they can export.

Mr. Fred Walsh: We have reached the stage in Australia where we have to grant credit in order to sell some of our products.

Mr. HEASLIP: I am speaking of the cost of production, and the granting of credits has nothing to do with that.

Mr. Fred Walsh: You were talking about credits overseas. I don't think you knew what you were talking about, really.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HEASLIP: I was talking about creating credits overseas whereby we could purchase goods to keep secondary industries going. Primary producers are earning credits overseas today which are used in turn to import raw materials and machinery to keep secondary industries in production.

Mr. Fred Walsh: Wouldn't it be better to use the word "wool"?

Mr. HEASLIP: No, I don't think so. If the honourable member wishes, I can give him

the amount that each primary product contributes. Wool is a major factor.

Mr. Ryan: What is the ratio between wheat and wool?

Mr. HEASLIP: In 1959-60 the figure for agriculture was £35,500,000 and for pastoral it was £61,500,000. Dairying was £14,750,000, poultry was £3,500,000, and bee-keeping was just over £250,000. These figures are for South Australia. Therefore, out of a total of £116,000,000 wool contributed £61,000,000. It can be seen that all parts of primary production play an important part.

During recent years we have had some criticism about the standard of classing of Australian wool. An article which I have here, of Japanese origin, states:

The standard of classing of Australian wool has not improved despite warnings from many sections of the wool industry last year.

I have some views on this subject, being a wool-grower and a wool classer myself, having classed my own clips and also employed wool classers to do it, and having lived adjacent to other people who have not had a wool classer yet sold their wool. On one occasion I employed a wool classer and paid him £33 a week plus board and so on. My neighbour, to whom I had sold my sheep, sold his wool and without any classing at all it brought more per pound than my wool.

Mr. Ryan: That was a result of your classing!

Mr. HEASLIP: No, I paid a qualified classer. However, we get these complaints.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Were they sold at the same sale by the same broker?

Mr. HEASLIP: At the same sale, but by a different broker. It is essential that wool-growers should prepare their clips as well as possible. Why should overseas buyers complain about our classing when they pay growers twopence a pound less for properly

classed wool than for unclassified wool? Many of the complaints are not legitimate, although some are. It does not encourage growers to pay big wages to have their wool classed when another man gets a higher price for his unclassified wool. I believe that this problem could be overcome to a certain degree by the inclusion of wool-classing as a subject in our area schools. I should like the Government to have a good look at that suggestion.

Mr. Ryan: Would the wool-buying pies have anything to do with the price?

Mr. HEASLIP: It is all linked up. I commend the Government for its extension of electricity to our country areas. It has made available to the Electricity Trust £500,000, which will enable it to reduce country tariffs to within 10 per cent of those operating in the metropolitan area. What is more important, it will enable an extension of the single wire earth return system to many of those who today have no electricity. They are the people in whom I am interested. I am not so worried about the reduction of price because everyone, as far as I know, agrees that it is cheaper than that made by his own plant, and is glad to have it. The same applies to water. Booleroo Centre has a water supply, but I should like Wirrabara to have one too. Many people in my district do not have a reticulated water or electricity service. On my property I have neither. My object is to see that as many of these people as possible get these amenities as soon as feasible. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. HUTCHENS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.12 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, July 24, at 2 p.m.