

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, August 5, 1964.

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

QUESTIONS.

PETROL PRICES.

Mr. **HUTCHENS**: I address this question to the Minister of Works as Acting Leader of the Government. On May 5 of this year under the heading "Move on Gimmicks" an article appeared in the Stop Press of the *News* stating:

The Federated Retail Confectionery Refreshment and Mixed Business Association today decided to ask the Federal and State Governments to investigate petrol companies' cost structures in view of the prevalence of "give-aways" . . .

The Minister is aware that many petrol stations are giving away glasses, books and stamps: at the weekend I noticed that one station was advertising petrol at a much lower price than other petrol stations, and that it was giving to each customer a long-playing record. I do not know what would happen if someone called for half a gallon of petrol! It is evident that some petrol companies must be making huge profits if they are able to distribute these gifts. Can the Minister say whether the Government has received a request from the association and, if it has not, from his own observations does he deem it necessary to take action for petrol to be sold at a price that will be possible without the cost of the give-aways that are so prevalent at many petrol stations in this State?

The Hon. G. G. **PEARSON**: First, it is correct that the cost structure of the petrol companies is constantly under review in this State. The Prices Commissioner regularly obtains the quotations for the world market prices of petrol, known as Platts; they are examined and to the basic cost of petrol is added the Commonwealth petrol tax and the freight cost as ascertained from the world freight prices, which are readily obtainable. (I am not sure of the source of information about tanker freights, but I know, for instance, that in shipping generally the Baltic exchange rate is used for wheat chartering.) To this total is added a percentage for the distribution, handling and the employment of the petrol companies' capital. This capital is not the total capital, but the capital actively used in the industry. That determines the wholesale price, to which is added the resellers' margin,

with which we are all familiar in South Australia. A constant watch on all those factors is being maintained by the Prices Department and from time to time, or even at almost regular intervals, we have been able to announce reductions in the price of petrol in South Australia. The South Australian price of petrol is the price that is accepted throughout Australia. In other States where price control does not exist the authorities respect the findings of the South Australian Prices Commissioner and use the results of his findings and calculations as a base price for petrol.

Mr. **Millhouse**: Is the Minister confident of that?

The Hon. G. G. **PEARSON**: Yes, although I am subject to correction if I am wrong. In these circumstances I assume that the cost to companies for give-aways to which the honourable member has referred must be a charge on the advertising of their product. As the honourable member knows, fierce competition exists among petrol companies in Australia for the retail outlets to the public. In any such business of that magnitude advertising must be an important factor in the promotion of a product. Every company that offers commodities to the public indulges in extensive advertising on a national and local scale. Therefore, I should think that the give-aways are a part and parcel of the normal advertising information campaign of those companies. I cannot answer the question categorically because I do not know (nor have I had an opportunity to ascertain) the precise situation, but I believe that no request has been received from the Retail Mixed Business Association. If a request is received it will be investigated according to the terms of that request.

POTATO MARKETING.

Mr. **McANANEY**: Recently potato growers were told by the Chairman of the Potato Board that the board could not implement certain plans because regulations drafted in February had not been gazetted. Can the Minister say when those regulations are likely to be gazetted?

The Hon. D. N. **BROOKMAN**: I am not clear as to what the Chairman of the Potato Board actually said, but I do not think he stated what the honourable member has said in so many words. I spoke to the Chairman briefly yesterday about the honourable member's question (the honourable member having spoken to me personally about this matter) and the Chairman said he would

furnish me with a report, but it has not yet arrived. It may arrive later this afternoon, but in any event I expect it to be available tomorrow.

Mr. SHANNON: I have been in close consultation with my colleagues, the member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke) and the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney), who with me are greatly interested, on the problem facing the potato industry in South Australia today. The position in the industry has been explained to me, and I can vouch for its accuracy because I have investigated the matter privately. At present we are selling potatoes in South Australia at £51 a ton, while the Victorian price, as quoted on the Melbourne market exchange on Monday last, ranges from £41 to £45 a ton. It has been the custom for South Australia to adopt Victoria as the measuring stick when fixing the price of potatoes in this State in order to prevent this State from being flooded with Victorian potatoes. I am credibly informed that the South Australian Co-operative potato growers have been instructed that for the next two weeks they will have to wash and pack 100 tons of imported potatoes each week; that is, 200 tons altogether. Looking at their figures this morning, I discovered that the percentage of locally grown potatoes—to put it at its very politest—is negligible. A ton or two of locally grown potatoes is at present being marketed in this State, compared with hundreds of tons of imported potatoes. Obviously, the fear is that as soon as the imported potatoes are cleared Victoria will again become the measuring stick for the price of potatoes in this State, and our growers, who are at present not able to deliver potatoes because of the board's direction, will accept Victorian parity, whatever it happens to be.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is starting to debate the question.

Mr. SHANNON: I want to explain it to the Minister of Agriculture, with your approval, Mr. Speaker. Another thing about which we are concerned relates to the legislation passed by this Chamber last session to enable the Potato Board to put the potato marketing business in a position where the potato growers would be perfectly happy: in other words, in their own hands. I know the Minister will say, correctly, that the growers have the majority of members on the board, but whether or not those members are doing their job is another matter. That they are not carrying out the permissive moves prescribed by this Chamber is most obvious. There is a very disquieting rumour

current in the potato industry that the board is at present negotiating with the Potato Distribution Centre for the centre to act as its agent for a further five-year term. If that comes about, I may find it incumbent on me to make certain moves in this Chamber to either disband the board entirely—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot do that at question time!

Mr. SHANNON: I am not going to sit down and accept the position as it now appears to be developing. I issue that warning. Another aspect of this matter is disquieting. A certain merchant, who was in the business some years ago, has been given permission (I do not believe a licence has yet been issued)—

The SPEAKER: I think the honourable member has had sufficient latitude. He must ask his question.

Mr. SHANNON: Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether merchants should be permitted to wash potatoes and the right denied to the Potato Growers' Co-operative to be licensed as merchants for potato growers and washers? That is fundamental to this matter. If that right is to be denied the Potato Growers' Co-operative then I, for one, heartily disagree with that policy.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I think that this is the most unsatisfactory question I have been asked in this House. Usually members refrain from repeating what they call disquieting rumours. In this case, not only has a disquieting rumour been repeated, but a speech has been made referring to a whole lot of subjects that do not pertain to the question. I said to the honourable member last week that I would get a statement from the Chairman of the Potato Board dealing with the question he had raised about the importing of potatoes. I think that I could explain, to some extent, the motive behind the board's action in allowing these potatoes to come in, but I would prefer not to do so because I do not take responsibility for the actions of the board and I do not think it fair to the board for me to anticipate its reply. In the case of a board that is in the hands of an industry I think it is better that the House be allowed to have the benefit of the comments of the Chairman of that board. I did my best yesterday to ensure that I would have a report from the Chairman of the board today. In fact, only about half an hour ago I sent urgently for that report. I know the Chairman is busy and that he has been engaged in other jobs, but the

report may still come today. In any case, when it does arrive I shall make it available to the House and I think that is better than trying to explain the reason behind the board's actions.

I point out (and this is a fair thing that all members would acknowledge) that the Potato Marketing Act has been provided as the machinery for the industry to do certain things. Although we do not dictate to the Potato Board, we all recognize the principle that those in the industry shall have the power to run it themselves. As it happens, the board has a majority of growers elected by the producers. Therefore, to my mind it is pointless for a member to make speeches in this House saying that it is the responsibility of the Government when this matter is in the hands of the industry itself. I know that the board is seriously considering the possibility of making a move to take over marketing in the way referred to last year in the debate on the Potato Marketing Bill in this House; but I know, too, that whilst it is considering it the board can also see a great many difficulties that are not even suggested by the people asking for it to be done. Nobody tells the board how to solve some of the difficulties arising. It is a big undertaking for a board to change the system of marketing from the present system to a completely different one, as was suggested during the debate on the legislation. The fact is that the board sought the power to do just this in the amendment last year: it was not forced on the board. Having been given that power, the board is now examining the problem of how and whether to implement it. I cannot say how and when it will be implemented; I can say only that the board is considering this complicated problem at present. I do not feel responsible if the board has or has not taken certain action, but I am prepared to bring along answers from the Chairman of the board to questions asked by members of this House about the rumours that are heard. I am willing to leave this for the board to comment upon.

One other matter mentioned earlier is that of the regulations the board wished to have gazetted as a result of the amendment to the Act last year. I hoped to have a reply by the Chairman of the board, but this question has been asked before I had that reply. I think I am correct in saying that the board suggested a set of regulations that it had intended should be approved under the Act. Those regulations were forwarded by me to the Crown Law Office and certain of them were found to be of

doubtful validity (I must admit that I am subject to correction because I am speaking from memory), and they had to be altered. That is the reason for the delay in the submission of those regulations. That is as far as I can take the matter, but if I am wrong I shall correct this information later.

Later:

Mr. LAUCKE: I understand that the report concerning the question asked earlier this afternoon by the honourable member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) has now come to hand. In the temporary absence of the honourable member and on his behalf, I request the Minister of Agriculture to make that report available.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Since this question was asked, the report that I foreshadowed has arrived. Prepared by the Chairman of the South Australian Potato Board, it refers to the question asked by the member for Onkaparinga about the importing of potatoes from other States. The report is not signed by the Chairman, but is signed on his behalf by someone else and I am not sure who that person is. However, no doubt the Chairman will accept responsibility for it. I do not know where the Chairman is today, but I point out that every effort is made to answer members' questions at the earliest opportunity and this report is the result of an earlier inquiry I made, before today's sitting. The report reads:

At present it appears that the board erred in its assessment of local potato stocks. The failure of growers to deliver during June when the price at around £45 was favourable gave the impression that stocks were lower than previously estimated. This price attracted supplies from Victoria and washers who were unable to obtain stocks to maintain operation imported from that State. In order to maintain supplies, importation of a total amount equal to approximately one week's supply for Adelaide was arranged with the Western Australian Potato Board. This is the usual practice when South Australian supplies are low.

When the price rose to £60 per ton growers commenced to deliver in quantity. At present the market is over-supplied with the price at £51 10s. to growers. The relatively small stock of Western Australian potatoes on hand is being withheld. The position is expected to ease and supplies may even be short in a month or so. In recent months, a number of changes in marketing and distribution have been made by the board and further ones are under consideration. However, a change to distribution direct by the board instead of by its agent should have little or no effect on market supply and demand and delivery by growers.

I have a further report on one of the aspects of the question asked by the member for Onkaparinga, although this was actually prepared in reply to a question by the Hon. Mr. Hart in another place. This report reads:

Since the Act was amended a number of important changes have been made by the Potato Board on the receipt and marketing of potatoes. These changes include—

- (a) Delivery by growers direct to the board at its approved receipt depot. Previously delivery was direct to washers.
- (b) The potatoes are bought on behalf of the South Australian Potato Board, and a receipt notice to this effect issued to growers on delivery. The receipt is signed by an officer of the South Australian Potato Distribution Centre Ltd., the lawfully authorized agent of the South Australian Potato Board. The South Australian Potato Distribution Centre is responsible for providing finance for the purchase by the board.

Previously the distribution centre carried out directly the work of receiving and buying from growers and reselling to licensed merchants.

- (c) Inspection for grade standard has been arranged to ensure uniform quality of deliveries.
- (d) Organization of deliveries of fresh potatoes to washers and delivery of washed potatoes to merchants.
- (e) Regular accurate checking of merchants' stocks by the introduction of compulsory daily stock sheets.

Price control has been maintained and shortly measures will be introduced to improve grower and merchant registration and to enable registration of potato washers. Other improvements are being considered.

WHYALLA SEWERAGE.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Has the Minister of Works an answer to my recent question concerning sewerage in Whyalla?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Engineer-in-Chief reports that field design work commenced at Whyalla two weeks ago and on Tuesday, July 28, a foreman and 10 men were transferred to Whyalla to commence erection of the necessary offices, workshops and men's accommodation. Erection of the necessary buildings will consume approximately four months by which time sufficient field design and final plans will have been prepared for work to commence. It is anticipated that tenders for the supply of pipes will be called by mid-August and that laying of sewer mains will commence in November, 1964. I have approved the purchase, through the Supply and Tender Board, of many large items of plant in anticipation of the commencement of actual construction at Whyalla, so no problem exists in respect of that matter. I

think the honourable member may assume that as soon as the plans are advanced sufficiently for work to start, subject to manpower availability, work will proceed at a fairly rapid pace.

LITTLEHAMPTON ROADWORKS.

Mr. BYWATERS: Has the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Roads, a reply to my recent question about the completion of the construction of the road at Littlehampton?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, informs me that the reconstruction of the South-Eastern Main Road through Littlehampton is being carried out by the District Council of Mount Barker. Most of the work is completed up to the sealing stage, but the seal cannot be applied until the dry months of the year. The bituminous pavement will be constructed as soon as the base dries out sufficiently. In the meantime, the District Council of Mount Barker maintains the open surface base.

KIMBA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Can the Minister of Works say how much water is held at Kimba? What is the latest report on Poldas Basin, and what are the chances of Darke Peak and Kimba having a permanent water supply in future?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Unfortunately, the supply of water in the Kimba tanks supplying the township is low. Although useful agricultural rains have fallen in that area during the winter there has not been any intake into the reservoirs from which the tanks are filled. Although I am unable to say, without notice, how much water remains, I know that it is a small and disappointing supply. I have no doubt the Engineer-in-Chief will take steps as soon as necessary to augment the supply. We may still get a useful intake before the winter ends, which would relieve the situation. The position at Poldas Basin is that exploratory work is continuing rapidly and on a wide scale. The Government early last financial year approved of a substantial sum being spent on exploratory work, and later in the year—about two months ago—it approved of a further substantial sum for work to continue at an accelerated rate. The results, which are accruing from the explorations, are heartening and suggest that there is in the Poldas Basin a useful supply of good quality water. Pump testing is the real and ultimate test and in this basin that is carried out only

with difficulty because of the porous nature of the aquifer and the necessity to pump the water from the pump site. At this stage I cannot say that we have proved sufficient water in the Polda Basin to supply Darke Peak and Kimba, but I hope that in another four or five months we shall be able to supply more information so that the Chairman of the Public Works Committee will be able to re-open the investigation into a supply of water for Kimba. This reference is before the committee and, as members know, this committee was obliged to halt its investigation pending further information from the department about the Polda Basin. The quantity of water necessary from the Polda Basin will depend to a large extent on the requirements in the county of Buxton which surrounds the township of Kimba. If the residents of Kimba are satisfied, as they said they were originally, for a supply to be provided to ensure that the township has adequate water, the quantity required from Polda is reasonable but, if we are required to serve the whole of the agricultural area of the county of Buxton, that would require, I think, probably an additional 250,000,000 or 300,000,000 gallons a year. That quantity would take some time to prove and might not be available from the Polda Basin. We cannot apply all the resources of the Polda Basin to serving only one part of Eyre Peninsula, as extensions are urgently required to the north and north-west of the Tod River reticulation scheme, and some reservations from Polda must be made to give those people a share of the water.

SUPERPHOSPHATE.

Mr. HARDING: Following the introduction of the Commonwealth superphosphate bounty of £3 a ton in Australia in 1963, New South Wales superphosphate sales rose by 172,000 tons, an increase of 35 per cent. Can the Minister of Agriculture inform me whether a similar increase in the sales of superphosphate has occurred in this State following the introduction of that bounty?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will obtain the figures to illustrate the sales of superphosphate since that bounty was introduced.

NORTHFIELD PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. JENNINGS: The Minister of Education will remember that recently he attended the opening of a new swimming pool at the Northfield Primary School shortly after an unfortunate fire occurred, in which six temporary classrooms were burned down. At that gathering the Minister, in my presence as well as in

the presence of the school committee, referred to a new permanent infants school and he asked me to remind him on the following Tuesday in the House about this, which I did. The answer was given and appears on page 2066 of last session's *Hansard*. The Minister was reading from a report of the Director of Education that he had obtained, which states:

A longer range plan, however, is, I consider required at this school. For this purpose I suggest that consideration should be given to the provision of a new infant school building in solid construction with eight or 10 classrooms.

Naturally, I forwarded a copy of that question and answer to the school committee, which subsequently wrote to the Director of Education about the matter. Although I do not have a copy of that letter, I suppose the committee asked when something was likely to be done. A reply was received from Mr. Dodd, one of the inspectors of primary schools, containing a fairly general answer similar to which I have seen many times. The letter concludes by saying.

. . . . I am afraid that consideration of a new building in solid construction at Northfield to replace existing buildings must await the completion of projects which are being planned to cope with areas of rapid development.

The committee, rightly or wrongly, sees some conflict between the answer given by the Minister to me, quoting the report of the Director, and the answer it received in correspondence from the inspector. Will the Minister take this matter up again to see what the current position is? I have a further question concerning this school. The six classrooms that were destroyed by fire were replaced with, I am glad to say, great expedition. However, I have now been informed that, whilst there was heating in the old classrooms that were destroyed, no heating was installed in the replacement classrooms. As a consequence I am told that, during the recent cold months, both teachers and pupils have been doing their lessons in overcoats. Will the Minister take both these matters up and give me a reply?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall be pleased to do so.

NAILSWORTH TECHNICAL SCHOOL.

Mr. CUMBE: Is the Minister of Education aware of the serious overcrowding at the Nailsworth Girls Technical High School? This school is situated on a few acres of land together with a large primary school as well as a large

infants school, the area of which does not even allow for an oval, incidentally. Whilst I appreciate that the opening next year, I hope, of the Gepps Cross Girls Technical High School will relieve overcrowding here to some extent, will the Minister ask his officers to investigate the position at this school to see whether the overcrowding can be overcome either by the acquisition of additional property to erect more classrooms or by the building of a solid construction type of classroom to replace the large number of wooden classrooms existing at the moment, which infringe upon the restricted playing area for the three schools combined?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

LYNDHURST WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. CASEY: The residents of Lyndhurst in the Far North-East are desirous of obtaining a permanent water supply. At the moment a 2in. main services both Myrtle Springs station and Witchelina from Leigh Creek. This main runs to within a few miles of Lyndhurst. I understand negotiations have been completed between the Electricity Trust and Lyndhurst residents whereby it has been agreed that about 20,000 gallons of water a year could be supplied if that main were extended. I also understand that the Chairman of the Pastoral Board has recommended to the Engineering and Water Supply Department the feasibility of this main, the extension of which represents only a few miles, which would service the township of Lyndhurst. Is the Minister of Works in a position to reply?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As I understand it, the main now in existence is a private one, by which the proprietors of the station draw water from the Aroona reservoir through an arrangement with the Electricity Trust. Some problem would be involved, as I think the honourable member would appreciate, in tapping a private main as the basis of a scheme for departmental supply to Lyndhurst. I do not suggest that the problem would be insuperable but it would have to be studied, of course, together with the agreements between the owner of the pipeline and the department regarding the amount of entitlement of water, priorities for the entitlement of water and also maintenance and replacements, in due course, of the main itself.

Mr. Casey: I do not think there would be any difficulty there.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: People in the north are most co-operative and I accept the honourable member's comment. I will take

the matter up with the Engineer-in-Chief to see whether it is possible to make such an arrangement. If it is not possible it might alternatively be possible for a progress association or similar body at Lyndhurst to come to some arrangement that would be helpful, although I know that the honourable member would not relish that idea because it would involve certain problems.

STURT GORGE.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Last Sunday I went to an area, which I had not visited for some time, in company with my family and some friends. I refer to the Sturt Gorge, below the site of the floodwaters control dam now being built. It is a lovely spot and still almost unspoiled, and it would be eminently suitable for a national park, particularly as it is so close to developed areas. So far as I can ascertain, nearly all of the gorge is owned by one body, but I am not entirely certain of that. Will the Minister of Lands investigate this suggestion with a view to acquiring the Sturt Gorge as a national park?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: It depends on ownership, of course. If it is freehold land we would not attempt to acquire it, but negotiations could be entered into between the owners and the Land Board. If the honourable member will give me particulars I shall have the matter investigated.

BERRI FERRY.

Mr. CURREN: On Tuesday of last week I asked a question of the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Roads, regarding the duplication of the ferry service at Berri. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, informs me that the Berri ferry approaches for the duplication of the service are being constructed by contract. The contractor was slow in constructing the first coffer dam as he used timber for that purpose. He proposes to use steel sheets which the Highways Department makes available in accordance with the specification for the construction of the approaches on the Berri side, which should expedite matters. The contractor states that he expects to complete the work during September, provided the rise in the river is not higher than expected at present.

RAILWAYS PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICER.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I noticed in yesterday's *Advertiser* a letter suggesting that the Government should consider the appointment of a

public relations officer for the South Australian Railways. The letter went on to say that there had been an alteration in services and pointed out that in Victoria (and I know this is the position in New South Wales) many tracts were issued with a view to encouraging passengers to use the railways. I feel that this is a very worthy suggestion. Such a move could be worked in co-operation with the Tourist Bureau, and many people who now use cars could be attracted to the railways. It would be a novelty for some of our young people to ride on a train. I consider that this public relations officer could do good work towards increasing the number of passengers and thus increasing revenue. Can the Minister of Works say whether the Government will consider such an appointment?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I think there is a difference between a public relations officer and a publicity officer, and what the honourable member really is asking is whether the Government would consider the appointment of a publicity officer. I would think that a public relations officer's duties concern the relationship of the railways with the public regarding the soliciting of business and generally maintaining good relations. A publicity officer is more of an advertising concept to attract tourists' patronage and civilian patronage to the railways. All I can say is that the Government will consider the suggestion and, of course, discuss the matter with the Railways Commissioner.

WAROOKA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. FERGUSON: My question relates to the poor water service at Warooka. The Clerk of the District Council of Warooka has informed me that at some periods of the year when the council is using water for roadmaking purposes some of the septic tank systems fail to operate successfully. Will the Minister of Works ascertain whether it is possible to do something about improving the service at Warooka?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: This is the first I have heard of this problem. If it is merely a matter of careful utilization of the supply that is available, then I think the remedy is self-evident. However, if there is a widespread problem—and, of course, it would occur in the higher levels of the town, so it would not be capable of simple solution—then it will require a more major overhaul to overcome the difficulty. I will refer the honourable member's remarks to the Engineer-in-Chief for a report.

WHYALLA DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. LOVEDAY: For some years the City of Whyalla Commission has been endeavouring to get a more complete plan of the development proposed at Whyalla. From time to time the Lands Department and the Housing Trust have presented to the City Commission plans relating to a single area of the next development, and this, of course, prevents the local government body from seeing its way very far into the future. Now that the population has reached more than 18,000, and seeing that the prospective development can be more fully visualized, can the Minister of Lands say whether the Lands Department, in company with the Housing Trust, could project a plan which would be more complete and enable the local government body to at least see a number of years ahead?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: I do not know the problem itself, but I can appreciate the difficulty of the local government authority. I will make inquiries and see if what the honourable member suggests can be implemented.

PORT PIRIE OCCUPATION CENTRE.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Education received a report from the Chief Psychologist (Mr. Piddington), following his recent visit to Port Pirie, regarding the establishment of a centre there for retarded children?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: No, I am sorry to say I have not. I have been expecting a report from the Chief Psychologist, and I have inquired of my secretary about it from time to time. I will ask either the Director or the Deputy Director to let me have an immediate report.

KAPUNDA COPPER.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Will the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Mines, obtain from his colleague a report on the results of the Mines Department's copper ore deposits survey at Kapunda and on whether private organizations have made representations for permission to mine these deposits?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes.

RADIATA PINE.

Mr. HARDING: My question relates to the treatment or impregnation of radiata pine for use in telephone, telegraph and electric light poles, and for general purposes. Can the Minister of Forests say whether there is an increasing demand for impregnated radiata pine and for what purpose it is required?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: A fairly heavy demand exists for impregnated radiata pine and this is being met by outside operations in certain respects. In some parts of the State small plants are being put in to meet local demands. The position regarding railway sleepers is not so satisfactory because the supply of hardwoods is cheaper in general, than the pinus-treated timber. There is a growing demand for poles and only this week a provision was arranged whereby the finish of telegraph poles will be improved: the surface of the pole will now be smoother and easier to handle and the quality of the product will be better. However, in general, I believe the demand for pinus-impregnated timber is increasing.

PORT PIRIE AIR POLLUTION.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question regarding the air pollution survey at Port Pirie?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Director of Mines reports that the air pollution sampling programme by the Mines Department is still in progress at Port Pirie. By the end of December, 1964, this programme will have been in operation for two years, and the results will then be evaluated.

PRIMARY PRODUCERS' DECLARATIONS.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Works, representing the Premier, a reply to my recent question about primary producers' applications for licences in the Port Lincoln area on the West Coast?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The honourable member asked this question of the Premier, who has supplied me with a report from the Registrar of Motor Vehicles. It is a lengthy report and I will not read it all, but it is available if the honourable member wishes to see it. The gist of it is that cases mentioned by the honourable member may be handled without undue inconvenience to the owners in one of the following ways:

(1) If a person living at Lock intends to purchase a vehicle in Port Lincoln, he could obtain a certificate from the police officer at Lock before proceeding to Port Lincoln. The case would be the same as a person living in the country purchasing a vehicle in Adelaide, where no police officer could be expected to give a certificate.

(2) If the above is not practicable, he could lodge the full fee accompanied by an uncertified declaration, followed later by a police certificate, after which a refund of the amount of the concession would be made.

I agree with the statement made by the honourable member that the onus rests on the

primary producer as to the accuracy of his declaration, but as indicated above I do not think this relieves the department of the obligation to verify the circumstances in considering entitlement to a concession.

DRAINAGE RATING.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Irrigation a reply to my question of yesterday regarding applications from fruitgrowers at Cadell for alterations in drainage rating?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: It is not possible to indicate at this stage when the Drainage Committee will next meet to deal with outstanding cases as no information has been obtained for submission to the committee. Action will now be taken to have field investigations made for those concerned at Cadell and in the other irrigation areas. Any adjustments arising out of the inquiries are expected to be effective this financial year.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

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

(For wording of amendment see page 135).

(Continued from August 4. Page 213.)

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh): When I was granted leave to continue my remarks last night I was about to refer to the remarks made by the mover and seconder of the motion. I congratulate both the mover and the seconder on the excellent material in their speeches, which I read with much interest. I believe that both members are to be commended for the great work they must have put into their speeches. These were obviously speeches made by Government supporters and both members went to much trouble to build up the prestige of the Government, and I do not blame them for that because this is the type of speech that we would expect from them. The member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) made one remark that I think was as important as any other utterance he made. I agreed with him when he said:

As mentioned earlier we spend millions of pounds on research for increased primary production. We have been successful in that respect but we should spend more time and money to find out how a permanent balanced economy can be achieved.

This is important, but it was said before the amendment was moved by the Leader of the Opposition. Every member of Parliament, and every member of the public, should be concerned about the economic position of this

State. We should not, when talking of the achievements, lose sight of the fact that, although there have been achievements, our economic difficulties are great. I do not wish to be unduly critical but facts should be made known to the House about our public debt.

This has been increasing rapidly over the years and is now causing concern to many people, including the Auditor-General. A recent edition of the *Statesman's Pocket Year Book of South Australia* quoted the State public debt as follows: 1934, £183; 1939, £184; 1944, £178; 1949, £187; 1954, £281; 1957, £359; 1959, £377; 1960, £396; 1961, £416; and 1962, £436. With an increasing population the State's public debt has been growing rapidly and there must be a day of reckoning. Compared with other States, these figures are more alarming. Although the public debt for South Australia at June 30, 1962, was £436, the latest figures as at June 30, 1963, show that the public debt in New South Wales was £267; Victoria, £242; Queensland, £258; and Western Australia, £396. These are Commonwealth figures, but it is worth while considering the Auditor-General's Report for the financial year ended June 30, 1963. Under the heading of "Debt Charges" the report states:

The Public Debt, comprising bonds, bills, stock and debentures and other interest bearing indebtedness of the State at June 30, 1963, was £464,000,000, equivalent to £460 a head of population, an increase of £24 per head during the year under review.

These figures differ from those I gave a moment ago but they take in all the indebtedness rather than that of a certain indebtedness. The report continues:

Interest bearing indebtedness has increased over the past 10 years (from £197,000,000 in 1953) by 135 per cent, but the amount per head has risen only by 81 per cent due to gain in population. The total payments on account of Debt Charges, *i.e.*, interest and sinking fund payments for 1962-63, were £22,744,000, representing 24.35 per cent of the Consolidated Revenue payments. Some of this amount was recovered from the earnings of public utilities and statutory bodies whose financial transactions were not included in the Budget. The payments for interest and sinking funds were £7,069,000 in 1952-53 (16 per cent of budget payments) and £16,076,000 (23 per cent) in 1958-59. The expenditure from Loan moneys on capital works results in recurring debt charges each year. Many of the works considered necessary to meet demands arising from increased population and the development of the State and to provide social services on an increasing scale, will not recover costs. To the extent that such works do not meet operating costs and debt charges, an increasing burden will be imposed on the taxpayers. Last year I stated that, because of this, it was necessary that costs of individual

works should be the subject of closest review to enable the maximum return to be gained from Loan moneys available. I do not consider that this is being done to the greatest possible extent in all cases. Whilst the proposed work is no doubt justified (and in major projects this is examined by the Public Works Standing Committee), I am of the opinion that closer reviews could be made in an endeavour to provide the facility at a lower cost. Although the Public Works Standing Committee examines this aspect for projects referred to it, and has effected many reductions, the move for economy must of necessity emanate from departments. In determining the standard of projects, full consideration should be given to the burden of interest and sinking fund payments which will be payable yearly over a long period of time.

The Auditor-General has said something there that members on this side of the House have been saying for a long time. In addition to the Public Works Committee, for which we have nothing but the highest praise in the way it applies itself, there should be a public accounts committee to examine all expenditure after the work has been carried out to see why the actual cost often exceeds the estimate. If this is not done, the public debt will continue to increase, and taxation and other charges will increase so that we will be placing a burden on a posterity that will curse this Parliament for its neglect of these responsibilities. With this increasing debt it is evident that the Government has become aware that something has to be done. It intends to remedy this matter, but in the wrong and improper way. On the first day of this sitting I asked the Premier a question about tax reimbursements paid to the State. He willingly admitted that this State would receive £200,000 less than it received last year. With all due respect to the Premier, last year a special grant was made for unemployment. Sir Thomas Playford and his officers should have been able to estimate fairly accurately the amount that would be forthcoming for reimbursement on this occasion. They should not have waited for the Loan Council to meet and then come back to say, "We didn't get the money we expected to get," because the Government must get the money it expects, for this is all determined on a formula agreed to by the Premiers at a conference five years ago. It was a formula that was unanimously agreed upon as being satisfactory for the reimbursement of moneys from taxation.

We acknowledge the fact that over a period of five years circumstances can change considerably and that a system that was satisfactory in 1958 or 1959 could be quite unsatisfactory today. Nevertheless, I repeat that the

Government should have been in a position to know what it was going to receive from taxation reimbursement but, unfortunately, on July 9 we look at our *Advertiser* and read "Premier draws Budget Picture." This article contains a forecast of the increased charges and so forth, which is most alarming. I draw attention to the fact that the Premier said in substance, during the course of his policy speech in February, 1962, that the Government was confident that it would not have to raise taxation charges on the people. He went on to say that if the charges were to be brought to the level of other States the taxpayer in South Australia would have to pay an additional £3,000,000. The saving to the taxpayer was made possible by the good administration of the Government! That is what I am complaining about because, if that is possible by good administration, I suggest that something has gone wrong with that administration when the Government now finds it necessary to increase taxation. I now refer to the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Millhouse: You have dragged us to the point at last.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I was amazed yesterday when the member for Mitcham commented on this matter and quoted certain figures that got away from the point of the amendment. I congratulate the honourable member on his skilful handling of figures and the skilful way he quoted from only portion of the amendment.

Mr. Lawn: He said he supported paragraphs 2 to 5 of the amendment.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I do not think he did, but my colleague can elaborate on that later.

Mr. Millhouse: The member for Adelaide had better have another look.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I think I know what he said, but I am not saying that he supports the amendment. The honourable member, quoting figures, dealt with the general situation from as far back as 1949 to show the various rises. However, the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition asks for an inquiry to be made from July 1, 1963, up to the present time. The Leader does not go back over a long history of South Australia at all. If the member for Mitcham were to look at the figures he would find that the increases over this period were as follows: Sydney 1.9; Melbourne 1.9; Brisbane 2.3; Adelaide 2.6; Perth 2.5; and Hobart 1.9. The average increase for Australia was 2.1. We in South Australia over the period regarding which we are seeking

the inquiry have sustained the greatest increase in the cost of living in all the States.

Mr. Ryan: They are Commonwealth figures, too, not ours.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Yes, they were produced not by the Labor Party but by the Commonwealth Statistician. The honourable member said that the States could not control prices, but I want to know from the Government and its supporters who is right on this question. Where are we getting to? I take the House back to 1948. I visited the library this morning and examined the *Advertiser* of May 25, because a referendum was held on May 29, 1948. Prominently displayed was a four-spread column advertisement which stated, "A Personal Message to The People of South Australia." That message states:

I say this to you. You may vote "No" on Saturday in the full knowledge that when Canberra control ceases your South Australian Government will introduce legislation to control prices and rents as may be necessary. The message is signed "T. Playford, Premier."

Mr. Millhouse: That was before I started to have any influence on the matter, though.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I love to see the honourable member pinning tickets on himself. The advertisement continues:

To keep controls within your own State vote thus: 2 Yes, 1 No. Authorized A. S. Dunk.

Mr. Dunstan: The honourable member's predecessor!

Mr. Millhouse. No. He was the General Secretary of the Liberal and Country League.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Yes. In any case, the advertisement is authorized by the Liberal Party. We must not forget that there were other advertisements saying, "We can and we will control prices." This was the voice of the Liberal Party. Now the member for Mitcham says we cannot control prices, and I think he is correct.

Mr. Millhouse: I think everybody realizes that price control is a futility.

Mr. HUTCHENS: On a State basis, yes. The honourable member has attempted to mislead Parliament most miserably. The fact is, of course, that the increases in prices in South Australia have been alarming, and far more alarming than in any other State in the Commonwealth. This was particularly so in the quarter preceding the basic wage increase. The *Advertiser* of July 4 contains the figures given by the Statistician, which show that the cost of living in the city of Adelaide increased by 4s. It further stated that the quarterly consumer price index issued

by the Commonwealth Bureau of Statistics showed an increase in Melbourne of 3s., in Sydney 3s., Perth 2s. 9d., Brisbane 2s. 6d. and Hobart 9d. In South Australia the increase was 4s. The important factor in this is that food prices in Adelaide rose by 2s. 9d. The increase in food prices in Melbourne was 2s., in Perth it was 2s. 6d., in Brisbane 2s., in Sydney 1s. 9d., and in Hobart 3d. The increase in prices occurred before the alteration to the basic wage by the Commonwealth Arbitration Court, and, of course, this had a great bearing on the increase awarded by the court.

Immediately we get an increase in wages there is much talk of foreshadowed increases, and the Government itself has encouraged this because in the very same breath it is talking about putting up charges and taxes. There is very little chance of controlling prices from the State angle.

Mr. Clark: The little control we have had has helped to some extent to keep prices down.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I agree that it has helped. However, to be fully effective it must be controlled by the Commonwealth. The fact that the increases in South Australia are more than those in the other States is possibly somewhat beside the point. The fact is that there has been an alarming increase in costs and wages. I believe that wages are a natural follow-on from the increase in prices, and now it seems that prices follow the increase in wages, very often without justification. In 1949 price control from a Commonwealth angle was abolished and handed over to the States, and when one compares the basic wage then with what it is today I think it proves the point made by the member for Mitcham. The basic wage was £6 6s. in 1949, and this year it is £15 3s., an increase of 140 per cent. I would say that there has been a similar percentage increase in prices. This is something that just cannot go on. The Commonwealth Treasurer has issued a warning on this matter. An extract from the *Australian Economy* 1964, under the heading of "Employment, Output, Expenditure and Prices", states:

For almost three years now economic activity in Australia has risen—slowly and rather patchily at first, broadening later and, in recent months, at a markedly quickened pace. It is now very high. As to prices, it seems inevitable that some increases will occur in the coming months. But this need only be relatively small and there is every reason to believe that, given the right efforts and attitudes, it can be contained and prevented from initiating a cost-price spiral.

That is a plea that the cost structure should not increase. There should be an endeavour by private enterprise to stabilize the economy by not increasing prices. However, the Commonwealth Government is hopeless in trying to control price increases. Therefore, we as the Labor Party and as people interested in and concerned for the welfare of the country and the economy of the country believe that some inquiry should be made in this State, because people are suffering. I do not think there is any great degree of hardship on the people who are fully employed and receiving a wage or salary that is adjustable: it is people on fixed incomes, those who have invested their savings and those who are receiving pensions and superannuation payments, who are suffering because there are no provisions for the adjustment of their incomes until such time, in many cases (particularly the pensioners), as the Commonwealth Budget is presented. In the meantime, those people are suffering and must pay the increased prices without any increase at all in their incomes.

I believe this factor has some definite bearing on the economy of the nation. We in the Labor Party are concerned about the economy of this country. I cannot understand the complaints that we so often receive about the Labor Party not being sincere in this matter. It was suggested yesterday, I think pretty forcibly, that we were only playing with something and were not sincere.

Mr. Millhouse: Would you care to answer some of the specific questions I raised?

The SPEAKER: This is not question time.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Let me say that the Labor Party has been anxious to support recommendations that were made by a committee set-up by the Commonwealth Government to investigate necessary amendments to the Constitution. This committee was appointed from both sides of the House—six members from the Government Party and six members from the Opposition—and it brought down a number of recommendations in respect of moves to control the economy of the country. Both Labor Party Leaders in the House of Representatives and in the Senate have said on behalf of the Labor Party—and the Party has said it in its conferences time and time again—that if the Government is prepared to introduce legislation to give authority to the Commonwealth Government to handle what the member for Mitcham says the States cannot handle effectively, they are prepared to support a referendum along those lines. But what happens?

The Liberal Party sits snug; it does nothing about it at all, and it allows the Australian economy to drift as it is today. I hope the House will support the Leader's amendment, and I am confident that we will have the support of the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) on this issue.

Mr. Millhouse: What about saying how the committee would go about the job?

Mr. HUTCHENS: It has always been known that a Government or a Parliament can elect a committee and serve it with terms of reference to get the type of answer it wants. In reply to the member for Mitcham's interjection, the Labor Party has not harnessed the committee with terms of reference so that it will supply the Party with the answer it wants. The Party wants an answer that is in the best interests of the people of South Australia and the terms of reference for the committee have been left as open as possible.

Mr. Millhouse: You cannot get it unless it is proper.

Mr. HUTCHENS: What is proper to the Opposition and what is proper to the Government are two different things.

Mr. Coumbe: Do you know what you are asking for?

Mr. HUTCHENS: We know what we want and that is specifically stated. There are none so blind as those who do not want to see and none so dumb as those who do not want to speak. We have asked for an inquiry and if the honourable member wants us to tabulate it into small terms we will not do it because we want the broadest possible interpretation made. The committee agreed on some recommendations. Unfortunately for Australia we have 13 wage-fixing authorities—six State Parliaments, six State tribunals, and the Commonwealth Arbitration Court. Australia is growing up: its Constitution was framed over 60 years ago. Since then, we have had the gramophone, wireless, automation and atomic energy. These were unknown 60 years ago. Then primary production was the dominant factor of each State and industries were almost insignificant, but today they are playing an important part in Australia's economy. Australia may soon be faced with problems relating to the European Common Market; then we will have to act more quickly and not as six independent States, which would place the country in an impossible position.

After considering the evidence submitted to it, the committee could make some recommendations. The member for Mitcham said most frankly that the States cannot effectively

control prices. I agree and this lack of policy will endanger the economy. We must have a central authority that will stop the buck-passing that is now going on to the detriment of Australia. I believe that private enterprise can play an important part in the development of the economy of this country.

Mr. Millhouse: It is nice to hear a Socialist say that.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I believe, and the Labor Party believes, that private enterprise, while it is truly competitive, is the best enterprise of all. We have never said anything to the contrary.

Mr. Coumbe: I hope other members of your Party will not be cross with you for saying that.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I know the policy of the Party.

Mr. Millhouse: You must be one of the few that do.

Mr. HUTCHENS: That is a witty argument. I know that the member for Mitcham is a much better authority on the policy of the Labor Party than the policy of the Liberal Party and that is understandable because the Liberal Party does not have a policy at all. I believe that companies like General Motors-Holden Proprietary Limited and Chrysler Australia Limited could try to obtain an export market for Australia and make greater efforts than they are in this direction. They could put their very good cars on the overseas market at a price that would establish sales. I believe that if this were done it would increase employment in Australia, build up our prestige, and help establish an overseas market that in the years to come would result in a more favourable trade balance than Australia is at present able to enjoy.

I thank the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) for his suggestion on the future of the sewage farm. This is in the district of my colleague, the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings), and is adjacent to my district. It has an important bearing on many nearby districts and I subscribe wholeheartedly to the proposal advanced by the member for Torrens for the establishment of a committee made up of representatives of the Railways Department, the Highways Department, the Engineering and Water Supply Department who, with the Town Planner and council representatives, could investigate and make recommendations about this valuable land. I acknowledge the facts as the honourable member stated them: that the department may require part of this land in the interests of

the State. I also support the view that a certain part of it should be retained for parks and reserves, if possible, because, with the metropolitan area growing, the retention of land for this purpose is necessary.

I shall digress for a moment to compliment the Town Clerk (Mr. Veale) for the magnificent work he has done in developing our parks since his return from overseas some years ago. I believe Adelaide has every reason to be grateful to Mr. Veale for the initiative he has shown in this regard. I am proud of our parks and, as a South Australian, delight in showing them to many visitors from other States.

I now turn to that part of the Governor's Speech referring to housing. Paragraph 13 states that during the year the South Australian Housing Trust expects to complete 3,000 houses. I believe that the Housing Trust is a most efficient department: I have had many dealings with it and have always received courtesy, consideration and helpful assistance from its officers. However, I understand that it did not complete 3,000 houses, but that the figure was 2,858. In the Governor's Speech last year no reference was made to the number of houses completed, but in 1962, in paragraph 16 of the Governor's Speech of that year,

reference is made to housing being maintained at a steady output of over 3,000 houses a year. The trust however, did not exceed 3,000 houses in 1961-62, because the houses and flats built for 1962-63 totalled 2,752, of which 1,091 were in the metropolitan area, 722 at Elizabeth and 868 in the country. Unfortunately, the houses built in the metropolitan area were built in the outer areas. The number of applications received by the Housing Trust should be considered in relation to the number of houses built. The Housing Trust report states:

The number of formal applications for housing accommodation received by the trust during the year ended June 30, 1963, was 9,829. This number includes 1,983 applications received during the financial year in respect of the trust's new house rental-purchase scheme and reflects the widespread interest there is in this scheme. In the previous financial year, 1961-62, the number of applications received was 8,161 (including 1,009 rental-purchase applications); for 1960-61, 9,099; for 1959-60, 8,786, and for 1958-59, 8,803. These figures do not include applications made in the earlier years for emergency dwellings.

The number of applications exceeds the houses built by more than 500 a year in every case. The following table shows the number of houses, single and double units and flats built to June, 1963:

	Single Units.				Double Units.				Flats.			
	Metro-politan.	Coun-try.	Eliza-beth.	Total.	Metro-politan.	Coun-try.	Eliza-beth.	Total.	Metro-politan.	Coun-try.	Eliza-beth.	Total.
1958-59	844	345	434	1,623	294	332	572	1,198	136	48	—	184
1959-60	607	456	656	1,719	304	506	312	1,122	96	71	—	167
1960-61	518	371	529	1,418	482	582	532	1,596	86	83	10	179
1961-62	466	458	507	1,431	690	482	402	1,574	102	18	—	120
1962-63	459	468	362	1,289	634	400	360	1,394	69	—	—	69

The following table sets out the applications for houses and flats received by the trust dur-

ing the year ended June 30, 1963. The figures in brackets are those for the previous year:

	Rental-Purchase All Groups.	Applications Excluding Rental-Purchase.			
		Metropolitan.	Elizabeth.	Country.	Totals.
For rental-purchase houses	1,983 (1,009)	—	—	—	1,983 (1,009)
For rental houses (brick or timber) and flats	—	2,210 (2,353)	1,324 (1,123)	1,978 (1,661)	5,512 (5,137)
To purchase houses or to have houses built	—	902 (885)	978 (616)	454 (514)	2,334 (2,015)
Total applications under these schemes	1,983 (1,009)	3,112 (3,238)	2,302 (1,739)	2,432 (2,175)	9,829 (8,161)

In Adelaide, as in every capital city, blighted areas are an eye-sore. No figures are available to show how many substandard

homes are in the metropolitan area. An inquiry was held and a report tabled in September, 1940, which stated:

SUBSTANDARD HOUSING CONDITION IN DETAIL.

Municipality.	Total No. of Houses in the Area.	Number Classified B, C or D.	Per Cent.	Number Classified as B.	Per Cent.	Number Classified as C.	Per Cent.	Number Classified as D.	Per Cent.
Adelaide.....	7,716	3,009	39	1,994	26	964	12	51	7
Hindmarsh	3,402	993	29	666	19	309	9	18	5
Port Adelaide ..	7,588	1,402	18	940	12	438	6	24	3
	18,706	5,404	29	3,600	19	1,711	9	93	5

A Class—Houses structurally sound, in good order or needing repairs or renovations and provided with reasonable amenities and fit for habitation.

B Class—Houses undesirable to be used for habitation by reason of structural conditions, bad state of repair or lack of amenities.

C Class—Houses unfit for habitation and demolition necessary.

D Class—Houses of the very worst type.

This report brought into existence the Housing Improvement Act, 1940-47, which provided for:

- the improvement of substandard housing conditions.
- the housing of persons, including war widows, of limited means.
- the construction and sale of houses.

The South Australian Housing Trust has taken over the function of the provision of (b) and (c). Applicants for assistance under provisions of section 27 of the Act are told that whilst provision is there, funds have never been available.

The Premier, in submitting the Bill to establish the Act, said, among other things:

Its objective is to improve the adverse housing conditions under which many people are living, especially in the metropolitan area of Adelaide. . . . In the first place the committee was appointed to inquire generally into the operation of the Building Act and among other things as to whether provisions of that Act should be altered so as to facilitate the clearance of insanitary, old, crowded, or obsolete dwellinghouses and the erection of new dwellinghouses in their stead. . . . There is no denying the facts contained in the report are extremely disquieting. . . . The committee stated that the standards upon which the survey was based were conservative and practical and a study of it seems to bear out its claims. I am assured that the facts are indeed understated rather than exaggerated. . . . I can say without hesitation that the committee based its investigations upon practical ideas and did not in any way

indulge in sentimentalities. It tackled the question from a practical point of view, and the House can accept the report with great confidence. The figures I have given are by no means the whole of the story. In addition to the 2,254 dwellinghouses which the survey has reported on as actually unfit for habitation, there are in the metropolitan area another 4,616 houses which have been classified as undesirable to be used for habitation by reason of structural condition, bad state of repair or lack of amenities. . . .

It is not merely a matter of building a few hundred new cottages to overtake the growing housing needs of our people, or condemning and pulling down a few old houses in the back streets of the city. In the City of Adelaide more than 11,000 people live in substandard houses, and of this number more than 3,800 live in houses reported to be unfit for habitation. In the three worst areas, the city, Hindmarsh and Port Adelaide, the number of people living in substandard houses is actually 20,800, and I am informed that the total number of inhabitants in substandard houses in all the areas included in the survey exceed 26,000 of whom 7,600 are children under 15 years of age. . . . Behind the cold figures of the statistical tables contained in the report of the Building Act Inquiry Committee are distressing facts that affect the day by day lives of thousands of our fellow citizens. Very many of these influences can have only evil effects. We are told "Blessed are the poor", but it is doubtful if the poverty there referred to is manifested in the slum. There is nothing ennobling about dirt, lack of reasonable privacy, absence of sunlight and fresh air, insanitary conditions and vermin. All these may be found within the radius of a mile from this House.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: Where are these conditions?

Mr. HUTCHENS: I am quoting remarks made by the Premier in regard to conditions existing in the Adelaide metropolitan area, namely, the run-down areas.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: When?

Mr. HUTCHENS: In 1940. The Premier went on to say:

Apart from higher conditions, we cannot afford the cynical shiftless indifferent attitude to existence and social order which is likely to be encouraged in men and women by the feeling that, for no fault of their own, they are condemned to live in houses little better and sometimes worse than places in which animals are sheltered. . . . It is obvious to anyone who pays a visit to localities where there is any aggregation of these houses that there are areas where conditions cannot be permanently improved by pulling down a house here and there and repairing some of the others. Numbers of poor dwellings crowded together on small allotments situated in narrow streets and lanes constitute "slum pockets". . . . These pockets provide the most difficult problem of all and if neglected, become veritable plague spots. Here, if any improvement is to be effected, the action to be taken must be radical. The entire area must be cleared and replanned.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: You are not saying that these conditions exist now, are you?

Mr. HUTCHENS: I am grateful for the honourable Minister's interjection. The very houses that I have shown in picture in the report tabled in this place in 1940 were from my own area and were unfit for human habitation. They were made available at that time to tenants at a few shillings. They are still standing today but the rents are not a few shillings: they are a few pounds! I have no fault to find with the Premier's reference to these "slum pockets". I agree with every word but I repeat that many of the places referred to then still exist today, in my own area as well as that of the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan). Such areas require redevelopment: not a spasmodic shifting here and there, but a clearing of the entire area.

Mr. Riches: The Housing Improvement Act might have some bearing there.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Yes, that has been on the Statute Book since 1940—24 years. The areas needing particular attention are in Adelaide, Walkerville, Unley, Thebarton, Kensington Gardens, Norwood, St. Peters and Hindmarsh. I shall deal particularly with the Brompton and Bowden area, but first I acknowledge that the Town Planner has done much work in that regard. He has redrawn the old area and made suggestions regarding industry, commerce and residential areas. The Hindmarsh council is most grateful to him. In addition, I personally express my thanks and that of the council for the interest the Attorney-General has shown in the redevelopment of the Bowden-Brompton area. So far so good, but here comes the trouble.

I am not suggesting that this redevelopment can take place in 12 months, or in five years. It may take 10 or 20 years, but a start must be made now on the redevelopment of our settled areas. Otherwise this will be a recurring problem for all time. The Brompton and Bowden area contains houses that are not fit for human habitation, but they are situated alongside houses in Croydon that are considered to be of a fairly high standard. However, I am afraid these houses could also become substandard, and this is something that is happening throughout the world. Something must be done now. The Premier said 24 years ago: "We need to set up now a co-ordinating authority . . ." However, it would take about £3,000,000 to do this redevelopment work in Hindmarsh and we cannot do it overnight. I have here an extract from a Birmingham authority which I will not read but which shows what has been done there by co-operation between the central and local governments, the latter in England having greater authority than is the case in South Australia. Turning to Victoria, I refer to the annual report of the Housing Commission of Victoria for the period of July, 1961, to June, 1962. It deals with slum reclamation and states:

The slum reclamation programme has continued to progress and, in fact, has begun to gather momentum. This is the direct result of a co-operative scheme entered into with councils and private redevelopers. Under the scheme, seeking the co-operation of councils, the Melbourne City Council is contributing £312,000 over three years, Prahran City Council £140,000 over three years, and Port Melbourne City Council £17,000 over one year toward the cost of land acquisition and clearance. Other councils have indicated their willingness to co-operate in the same manner.

In Melbourne the authorities are running into trouble which we will obviously encounter here: money is running out and, with only local resources available, only a limited amount of work will be able to be undertaken. We have to make a start in South Australia such as has been made in Victoria and New South Wales. When we have made that start I believe we should then go to the Commonwealth Government in accordance with the recommendations made by the Housing Commission in the 78th recommendation of its report, which states in most emphatic terms that this is a national problem and that, therefore, the Commonwealth Government should assist. If we allow these blighted areas to remain, costs will be greater for reform schools, for hospitals, and for health generally,

and we will be suffering to a great extent. Such action as I suggest would be cheaper in the long run.

Mr. Sydney Maslen, an experienced and learned officer from the United States of America, selected the Bowden-Brompton area and prepared very elaborate plans. After Mr. Maslen's departure from South Australia, and after his report was submitted, the Town Planner came in and agreed with that report. In this Brompton-Bowden area we have 265 acres where some redevelopment has taken place through the efforts of private enterprise, but this has been spasmodic and unplanned. These interests are building on the old streets, and they are erecting huge factories alongside existing houses. Something along the lines of what the Premier suggested 24 years ago is required. Such work cannot be done in pieces: the area has to be cleared and redeveloped, with new streets and new alignments. At present it is unplanned development, and it is most unsatisfactory.

It is clear from the reports by the Town Planner and by Mr. Maslen that private enterprise cannot in itself do this work, although it must play a part. The Bowden-Brompton area, with its large number of small, substandard houses on small allotments, is, I believe, crying out for planned development. This area is remarkably well situated, adjoining the City of Adelaide and with its north-eastern boundary overlooking huge park lands, and it would be most suitably situated for high density and splendid accommodation. It is served by a number of important main roads, with Torrens Road on the north and the Port Road on the south. The railway runs almost in the centre of the area, and the proposed freeway will be nearby. I believe the area could be redeveloped, with the correct priorities given to commercial, industrial and residential requirements. This blighted and almost slum area could become one of the most beautiful in the metropolitan area of Adelaide. Compulsory acquisition will be necessary, but that will be cheaper in the long run and it will have to be done because there is no other way. What I have suggested has been done practically all over the world, and it has been to the advantage of the people in more ways than one. I urge Parliament and the Government to consider this matter, and I hope prompt action will be taken. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, as amended.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER (Angas): In rising to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply as originally moved,

I associate myself with the remarks of other members who paid tribute to the former members of this Parliament who passed away during the past year. I refer to the late Hon. Sir Walter Duncan, who was a member of the Legislative Council for 44 years, during 18 years of which he occupied the position of President of the Council, a term of office that was eclipsed only by Sir Lancelot Stirling, who was President for 31 years. During Sir Walter's Presidency I had close associations with him, particularly during my term as Speaker, and I learned to respect his political sagacity and his very wide knowledge of Standing Orders, which I frequently discussed with him.

Sir Shirley William Jeffries was a member of this Chamber for 20 years, and for 11 years of that time he was a Minister of the Crown, being Attorney-General, Minister of Education, and Minister of Industry and Employment. The late Sir Shirley was a very conscientious Minister of Education, and I understand that during his term of office he saw to it that he visited every school in South Australia—a Herculean task in itself. Another member of this Chamber, the late Mr. William Jenkins, was member for Stirling from 1952 until 1963, a period of 11 years. He was a member of the Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement from 1956 to 1963, and at the time of his demise he was its Chairman. Those of us who knew the late Mr. Jenkins can say with all sincerity that he was a very conscientious member of Parliament who was ever anxious to help his fellow members and his constituents. The late Mr. J. O. Critchley was a member of this Chamber, as the member for Burra, from 1930 to 1933 inclusive. Later, for a period of, I think, 12 years he was a Senator for South Australia. To all these members we owe a deep debt of gratitude, as do the people of South Australia, for the meritorious service rendered by them in the interests of the people of this State and of the State as such. Together they gave an aggregate of 78 years of service.

It is with very deep regret that I learned last night from the member for Hindmarsh (Mr. Hutchens) that the health of the member for Semaphore (Mr. Tapping) is such that it is doubtful whether he will be able to resume his seat in the Chamber this session. All members have learned to respect the member for Semaphore for his fine gentlemanly qualities, and I would express the hope (as I am sure other members here would, too) that he may be rapidly restored to health and that we might

again see him in his usual place before the end of this session. Mention was also made by the member for Hindmarsh of the fact that the member for West Torrens (Mr. Fred Walsh) and the member for Victoria (Mr. Harding) will not be with us next year as members of this House. We realize that those members have signified their retirement from politics. Both these gentlemen have, as members of this House, pursued their duties most diligently. They have, I think, carried out the exhortation of Shakespeare: "And do as adversaries do in law: strive mightily, and eat and drink as friends." Those gentlemen have represented their constituents well; they have striven in their constituents' interests, but when the House has risen they have eaten and have drunk as friends. I trust that in their retirement they may have many happy and healthful years ahead of them.

May I also congratulate the member for Eyre (Mr. Bockelberg), who moved this motion, and the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney), who seconded it, on their fine speeches. Both of them have shown us that they are fully aware of the problems with which their respective districts are confronted. They have also demonstrated that their respective electoral districts have made considerable progress over the years. The district that I have the honour to represent (Angas) can show, too, considerable progress over the years, and particularly in the more populated area of Barossa. Thanks to benign providence that area of my electoral district is blessed with fertility of the land, a good climate, and persons able to take full advantage and to make the best use of the land in the area. So that land, which within the living memory of man was virgin country and unproductive, today testifies, by the abundance and variety of the crops it produces, to the supreme profusion with which there is renewed from year to year the old Biblical promise of seed time and harvest.

I go further and say that benign Governments, past and present, have by their munificence, financial help and assistance from time to time done much to further the interests of the district. They have provided the economic climatic conditions to enable the area to thrive and prosper. Providence, as I have said, has been benign, but it sometimes also frowns and we experience times when the going is perhaps not as good as we should like it to be, when the frost or the hail strikes and crops and harvests are laid low to some extent. Fortunately, however, last year the Barossa

area experienced an outstanding grape harvest, the harvest of 1963-64, and the difficulty was to dispose of it.

Here, I pay a tribute to the excellent work done by Mr. Murphy (Prices Commissioner) and his officers. Because of over-production of grapes it was difficult to find a ready market for them, but Mr. Murphy spared no effort to arrange markets. He kept in constant contact with the growers' organizations and the growers personally, and it was largely through his outstanding efforts and the efforts of his officers that eventually it was possible to market the entire harvest. I pay a warm tribute to him for the outstanding service he rendered during the last vintage.

I refer now, briefly, to the 31st Annual Report of the Australian Wine Board, for 1962-63. In 1962, when speaking to the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, I referred to the fact that the importation of wines by the United Kingdom from Australia had decreased considerably in the post-war years. I pointed out that prior to the last war Australia was exporting to the United Kingdom a little over 3,000,000 gallons of wine annually. In the immediate post-war years the total export of wine to the United Kingdom had dropped to about 500,000 gallons, and in 1951-52 it was 733,000 gallons. The Australian Wine Board report shows that the export of wine from Australia to the United Kingdom in 1962-63 was 1,075,722 gallons—admittedly an increase over the quantity exported in 1951-52. But my point is that, although that increase is about 50 per cent over the 1951-52 figure, it is not commensurate with the increase in the quantities of wine being exported by foreign countries to the United Kingdom.

In 1951-52, the United Kingdom imported from France 1,963,000 gallons. In 1962-63, that had risen to 5,207,551 gallons, an increase of 200 per cent. In 1951-52, the United Kingdom imported from Spain 2,229,000 gallons. In 1962-63, the figure was 6,505,027 gallons, an increase of 190 per cent. The corresponding figures for imports from Italy were as follows: 462,000 gallons in 1951-52 and 1,721,458 gallons in 1962-63, an increase of 270 per cent. Other foreign countries exported to Great Britain 308,000 gallons in 1951-52 and 1,326,392 gallons in 1962-63, an increase of 303 per cent.

It is rather disturbing to know that the exports from these foreign countries to the United Kingdom have increased from 200 per cent to 300 per cent respectively, whereas Australia's increase over that period has been

only 50 per cent. It is all the more disturbing when we are cognizant of the fact that we are members of the British Commonwealth of Nations, and I deplore the fact that no greater preference is given to Australian wines so that we can obtain a bigger market in the United Kingdom. Should Great Britain enter the Common Market, the position may become more serious because she will no doubt be bound then to further increase her imports from European countries associated with the Common Market. I realize that it is necessary to find other markets for our wines and that much is being done to capture other markets. Considerable activity is taking place in some of the South-East Asian countries. The position is being explored in Japan, and I understand that some South Australian wine firms have already secured a small hold on the Japanese market. It is interesting to note from the report to which I have referred that exports to New Zealand have also increased in recent years. The proposal considered at a recent meeting of wine grapegrowers to the effect that greater quantities of wine could perhaps be sold in the United Kingdom if a one-label wine were marketed merits serious consideration. This method has been adopted in the past by South Africa.

My chief object in speaking to this motion is to draw the attention of the House, and particularly of the Minister of Agriculture, to the serious position in which a very important primary producing industry in this State finds itself; I am referring to the apricot industry. I dealt with this matter briefly when speaking to the Address in Reply some years ago, and I have also raised it in questions. A position has now been reached which I think is so drastic that unless something is done immediately the apricot growing industry faces extermination due to the ravages of gummosis, which is also known as apricot limb dieback or bacterial gummosis. Its effects can be best described by my quoting from an eminent authority named Wright, who states:

Though the apricot is subject to few diseases, it suffers more from that termed "branch dying" than do most fruit trees. They lose branches suddenly, often when laden with fruit, leaders collapse in young trees, main branches perish here and there in trees just coming into profit, while those having covered their allotted space lose one branch after another till the trees are spoiled. These symptoms afford evidence of gum disease, closing the channels of the wood and then preventing the nourishment of the branch above the point of infestation; in fact, 99 per cent of the cases of

"branch dying" are due to gum disease, caused by the fungus *Coryneum Beijerinckii*. Gum disease (gummosis) is distinguishable for an exudation of thick gum clinging to the branches. It is a highly contagious disease. The disease is present in South Australia, particularly in the non-irrigated areas, and in those areas it is particularly prevalent in the Barossa district. It is found in Tasmania, New South Wales and Victoria, but to a far lesser extent than in this State. It is present also in New Zealand and California. It was first discovered at Angaston in 1898, but not much notice was taken of it for about 20 years because during the first 20 or 30 years its devastating effects on apricot orchards were not so noticeable. However, in 1932 Mr. J. B. Harris, who was then employed by the South Australian Agriculture Department, estimated that 10 per cent of the apricot trees in the Barossa district were more or less affected. He drew attention to the seriousness of the disease, and a pamphlet entitled *Dieback of Apricot Trees in the Barossa District* was issued. The Agriculture Department was apparently impressed with his findings and in 1936 arranged for the establishment of an experimental apricot orchard, which belonged to Mr. Bert Boehm, of Light Pass, and which contained 296 trees. Infected limbs were cut out every year, and fresh infections that occurred every year were removed. It was discovered in 1944 that no less than 42 limbs were freshly affected in that year. However, in the next few years this investigational venture was abandoned. In 1938 Mr. D. B. Adams, Bachelor of Agricultural Science and a plant pathologist at the Waite Agricultural Research Institute, in a valuable report, said, *inter alia*:

The disease has attracted most attention in the Barossa district, but observations in other non-irrigated apricot areas of the central part of the State suggest that it is equally as common and severe there as in the Barossa district. In individual orchards the extent of the spread of the disease is related to the age of the trees. A careful study of the trees in a 20-year-old orchard may reveal that half the trees show signs of the disease while in some cases the proportion may be much higher. The rate of the development of the disease is generally slow but by the time the trees are 30, the loss by death of individual branches or of whole trees is often so great that the maintenance of the block becomes uneconomic. Gummosis is undoubtedly an important factor in determining the economic life of the commercial apricot orchards in the non-irrigated parts of South Australia.

In 1944, further investigations were carried out by Mr. Bert Boehm at Light Pass which revealed that of 100 apricot trees planted in

1916 only 11 were free from gummosis at the end of 1944. Unpolluted by the disease, the 100 trees should have averaged 24 sound limbs each—a total of 2,400 limbs—in 1944. The disease, however, was responsible for the dying off of 1,167 limbs and for reducing the productive capacity of the trees by about 50 per cent.

In 1947-48, a further survey revealed that in the Barossa district an average of 35 per cent of 10-year-old trees and 68 per cent of 30-year-old trees were infected. In other South Australian apricot growing districts, the

extent of the infection was just as drastic, except in the Upper Murray areas where an average of only 23 per cent of 30-year-old trees was infected. A survey was made in 1962 by Mr. W. S. Smith, a retired orchardist from Angaston, at the request of the Angaston branch of the Australian Dried Fruits Association, and a block of 25 trees in each of three mature orchards was examined. The results are tabulated in a table that is too lengthy to read in detail and I ask leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Site.	GUMMOSIS SCHEDULE.						Intact. Per cent.
	Dead.	Butt Infections.	Clean.	Limbs Removed.	Limbs Intact.		
1	8	5	12	272	172	38.5	
2	4	18	3	293	151	35.0	
3	4	6	15	148	252	63.0	

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: This table shows that of the 25 trees located in site No. 1, 38.5 per cent of the limbs were intact; at site No. 2, 35 per cent of the limbs were intact; and of the 25 trees in site No. 3, 63 per cent of the limbs were intact. Investigation further disclosed that an average of 44.6 per cent of the tree productivity remained. Mr. Smith is stated to have commented, following the survey, as follows:

If a complete survey of all gardens were possible I would, without hesitation, say that the percentage of trees and limbs affected would be much higher than the figures given in my survey. I noticed quite a few gardens where the owners had ceased to work them, the disease having taken a complete toll.

In the September, 1962, issue of the *South Australian Journal of Agriculture*, Mr. W. D. Mount, dealing with planting trends of canning fruits said:

In the non-irrigated areas apricots, peaches and pears show a decline in acreage since 1960, the greatest loss occurring in apricots with 220 acres. The most significant trend in the decline in apricot acreage is in the non-irrigated areas. Gummosis is taking an increasing toll, and new plantings cannot keep pace with the wastage. I have checked the *Statistical Register of South Australia* to ascertain the figures therein in regard to orchards in South Australia in the decade 1953-54 to 1962-63 and these figures tell the same story as that related by Mr. Mount. In 1953-54, the acreages of orchards in the hundreds of Nuriootpa and Moorooroo (and I mention these hundreds because the Barossa Valley is the only commercial fruitgrowing area in them) were 2,071 acres and in 1962-63 that number had fallen to 1,771

acres. I have a table specifying the acreage for each of the 10 years to which I have referred and as it is too lengthy to read I ask leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

BAROSSA VALLEY ORCHARDS.

	Acres.
1953-54	2,071
1954-55	2,095
1955-56	2,126
1956-57	2,086
1957-58	1,930
1958-59	2,036
1959-60	1,867
1960-61	1,820
1961-62	1,873
1962-63	1,771

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: The table shows that there has been a decline in acreage to 1,771 in 1962-63, from 2,071 acres in 1953-54. The table shows clearly that the decline has been to the extent of 300 acres in this decade—300 acres of orchards in the Barossa district.

It can be safely assumed that the loss of acreage in apricot orchards is due to the devastation caused by gummosis. Any person driving in the Barossa area through the apricot orchards will notice the extent of the devastation caused by this disease. Also, there have been very few new plantings of apricot trees for some years past. A check was made on new plantings and revealed that the Barossa orders from a leading nursery decreased from 3,400 apricot trees in 1951 to less than 500 in each of the years 1961 and 1962. The position is so desperate that many persons are leaving

the apricot industry and selling their holdings; or else they are simply neglecting the most seriously affected portions of apricot orchards or grubbing the trees and resorting to other avenues of primary production.

It may be asked whether anything has been done over the years to arrest the calamitous situation of the apricot industry and in fairness I must say that much research work has been done since the 1930's by the South Australian Department of Agriculture, the Waite Research Institute and the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization. I pay a tribute to such men as D. B. Adams, M. V. Carter, R. L. Wishart, W. J. Moller, J. B. Harris, L. C. Smith, W. S. Smith, H. W. Tulloch, B. Boehm and others for the outstanding work they have done in the interests of the apricot-growing industry. In 1952, I was privileged to introduce a deputation representative of the fresh and dried fruit industries in this State to the then Minister of Agriculture (the late Sir George Jenkins). This deputation stressed the seriousness of the position and urged the appointment of a full-time research officer into the disease of gummosis. The then Minister was impressed with the deputation and within a short time Mr. D. M. Carter was appointed full-time research officer. He continued for only about a year and then he accepted another appointment and the vacancy has never been filled. Since then no concentrated full-time research has been carried out.

Many interesting facts have been discovered as a result of the research work. For example, damage is caused by a fungus of the eutypa species, which grows through the wood of the apricot tree and blocks the sap channels. The disease is widespread among trees over 10 years of age and causes a progressive loss of branches every year. Pruning tools used on effective wood can also carry the disease to healthy trees. The most important means of spreading gummosis is by air-borne spores arising from old dead apricot wood. The fungus can survive in this wood for many years, fresh spores being given off whenever enough rain falls to wet it thoroughly. The fungus growing in the dead apricot wood is responsible for giving off these spores and I understand that, in a square inch of dead apricot wood that is infected with gummosis fungus, over 1,000,000 spores can be given off. During wet weather, given the right temperature, these spores become air-borne and then affect the trees at the point where pruning has taken place where there is a wound in the tree.

Many more gummosis spores are in the air during spring, summer and autumn than in winter; therefore, research officers advise that pruning should be done in the month of June. No method of curing infection is known once it occurs. Some control can be exercised by grubbing and burning all old apricot stumps; by pruning trees on the modified system in June; by cutting out and burning all infected limbs when attacked; by disinfecting and sealing all pruning and saw cuts; and by disinfecting the secateurs after use on each tree. Obviously, if an apricot grower has to resort to this extra work it means extra cost, and, bearing in mind that the apricot orchard badly affected by the disease is already uneconomical, it becomes more uneconomical with these additional costs. In spite of the valuable and significant research findings, research officers say that it is still not possible to control the disease. Some positive and immediate action is necessary to save the apricot industry from eventual extermination by gummosis. The industry is too valuable to the district I represent and to the State to allow it passively to pass into oblivion.

Mr. Riches: Don't they recommend a cessation of pruning?

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: That has been recommended, but it is not the complete answer as it has its problems. One can adopt the modified pruning method or cease pruning, which eases the situation to some extent, but it does not eradicate the disease or give complete and effective control of it. The importance of the apricot industry to the State is realized when I point out that the annual production of canned, dried and fresh apricots is worth over £1,000,000. As stated by Mr. D. Trescowthick of Angaston, in a paper read to the Australian Dried Fruits Association State conference in 1962, the apricot is easy to grow and is by far the most popular of the soft fruits; it has its own contribution to make in the diet and health of man; it is a hardy grower and a regular cropper; it does well in a wide range of soils, and its diseases—with the exception of gummosis—are easily controlled by one or at the most two routine sprays. This fruit is eagerly sought by canners, jam and glace manufacturers, and is also in great demand in its dried form. Given control of gummosis there is hardly a limit to its production and the expansion of the industry.

I have no doubt from opinions expressed to me by persons actively engaged in the apricot industry that it may be doomed to

eventual extinction unless the ravages of gummosis can be effectively checked without delay. That this is no understatement of the situation is borne out by the unanimous passing on September 24, 1962, of a resolution by the State conference of the Australian Dried Fruits Association, submitted to it by the Angaston branch. The resolution states:

That the spread of gummosis in the Barossa Valley and other apricot producing areas in South Australia has now become so alarming that unless more funds are allocated for an intensification of research operations the apricot industry would appear to be doomed to extinction. In view of this it is requested that strong representations be made by the board of management to the appropriate authority for an allocation of more personnel and funds for more intensive research into the prevention of gummosis.

I understand that this resolution was forwarded to the Minister of Agriculture who subsequently received a deputation of two members of the board of management of the association. I last drew the Minister's attention to this matter on September 25 and October 16, 1962. On the former date I asked the Minister:

Is the Minister of Agriculture aware that for a half a century horticulturists in the Barossa Valley have been fighting a losing battle against the ravages of the disease of gummosis in apricot orchards; that the Angaston branch of the Australian Dried Fruits Association considers that the apricot industry may be doomed to extinction because of this disease; and that some gardeners have ceased to work their apricot orchards because of the marked fall in productivity owing to the disease? Will the Minister take the initiative in sponsoring an intensification of research work on combating gummosis in terms of the resolution passed yesterday by the State conference of the Australian Dried Fruits Association?

The Minister informed me that he would obtain a considered report and on October 16, 1962, in answer to my further question he said, *inter alia*:

... progress in gummosis research could be accelerated if funds and personnel were available. In planning research programmes, however, attention must be paid to all aspects, and bearing in mind that gummosis is only a minor problem in the irrigated areas, it is felt that a fair proportion of the total effect is being directed towards gummosis research.

Mr. Shannon: Gummosis is not so rampant in irrigated areas.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: That is so. Surveys in irrigated areas have shown that 23 per cent of 30-year-old trees are affected, whereas up to 50 per cent are affected in the non-irrigated areas. The Minister referred to the disease as a minor problem in the irrigated areas. It is a major

problem in the non-irrigated areas and particularly in the Barossa district where there has been a decline in the apricot acreage of 220 to 300 acres in the past 10 years. What the Minister stated is a minor problem in the irrigated areas of the Upper Murray district today, can tomorrow be a major problem. He agreed that more personnel and funds were necessary for an intensive research programme, and referred to some of the research work that had been carried out.

In the interest of an important primary industry I implore the Government and the Minister to initiate without delay an intensification of research work in combating gummosis and to appoint a full-time competent research officer for that purpose. I also suggest that such research officer collaborate as far as possible with officers of the Research and Agricultural Extension branches of the University of California, who are doing extensive investigation work, gummosis being particularly rampant in the Santa Clara County of California. Dr. W. H. English of that university who is spearheading an intense research programme visited Australia and New Zealand late in 1962 to obtain first-hand knowledge of the technical complexities of the disease in Australia and New Zealand. I assure the Minister that research officers will have the full co-operation of the apricot growers in this State in all investigations undertaken, for they fully realize that only through the combined effort of the industry and research workers will it be possible to bring gummosis under effective control.

Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart): I, too, support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, and will also be supporting the amendment that has been moved by the Leader of the Opposition. I join at the outset with other members in paying a high tribute to the work of men who served their constituents and the State in this place with distinction over many years. I express my regret at their passing. I remember that one of the first men I met when I came into this Chamber was the Hon. Sir Shirley Jeffries, and I greatly admired his character and courage. In possibly the darkest days this State has known he was charged with the responsibility of administering the most difficult of all portfolios: it was his unhappy duty, under instructions, to move for a reduction in teachers' salaries, and I know that he was not happy about that. It was also his duty

to administer the unemployment relief that was then issued in the form of a dole, which, he once told me, was demoralizing in the extreme, and something to which he would never again be a party. They were difficult days but he faced them with courage; his integrity was never challenged and he left behind him evidences of forward thinking and planning.

Later this afternoon I shall refer to the work being performed amongst Aborigines in my district. It was the late Sir Shirley Jeffries, as Minister of Education, who came on to the reserve and first of all (even when no legislative authority existed for the action that he took) demonstrated a personal interest in the welfare of Aborigines, and helped establish a school. The great pity of it is that the State did not accept responsibility for educating our aboriginal children in those days. Had it done so, much of the problem would not be with us today. I also formed an attachment with the late Mr. Jenkins, the member for Stirling, who was always in touch with his people and kept members informed of the requirements of his district. I found him a most humane colleague with whom we could all work happily. He came from the West Coast and knew some of the hardships associated with early settlement in that area. He never lost sympathy for people of the out-back.

Senator Critchley always impressed us with his sincerity of purpose and outlook. He was untiring in representing his district, and he applied himself energetically to his duties when he represented the State in the Senate.

In opening this session, His Excellency the Governor referred to the fact that this year marked the 25th anniversary of the opening of the extension of this building in which the Legislative Council now meets. I should like to pass on to the House a thought for which I am indebted to Sir Robert Nicholls, who was Speaker in those days and with whom I used to travel from Port Pirie to town in the train regularly every week. He told us that when our forebears built this place they planned a structure that would stand for a thousand years. That statement captured my imagination, for I thought, "Here is something that is worthy of the State." What a fine structure it must be that a building should stand for a thousand years. We were here when the excavations were made preparatory to building the extensions and we wondered what kind of foundations would be required for a structure that was to last a thousand years. The superstructure was of South Australian marble and

underneath the marble there was granite and underneath the granite the small red clay brick with which we build our homes. Sir Robert, during this illustration, said: "Here is a perfect illustration of society; a small unit knit together forms the firm foundation for the erection of the superstructure." It seemed to me that that was a thought, worthy of being repeated today.

I want to examine the legislative programme that the Government has placed before us and the work that is being done throughout the State in the light of the fact that it is on the little people that we form the foundation of the society in which we live. But I believe that the upward trend in prices that has been referred to in the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition will have its final and crushing effect on these very people. This House should pay more attention to the amendment and its purpose than it has been wont to do hitherto. The amendment merely seeks to draw attention to the fact that this rise in costs has been going on, not since an increase in the basic wage was granted but since the beginning of this year—and even before that. In spite of past promises it would seem that it has been beyond the thinking capacity of our economists, as well as the capabilities of Parliament, to do anything to relieve this situation. The 4s. a week increase that affected the cost of living was established before the basic wage had any effect at all, and that is what we must keep uppermost in our minds. Nothing is being attempted to hold down these prices at their source.

The member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) devoted the whole of his address in this debate to asking the House to pay attention to legislation which was introduced last year and which will have the effect of increasing the cost of every commodity consumed on Eyre Peninsula. Because he did that, some members thought he was side-tracking the issue raised by the Leader when he moved the amendment. The incidence of the ton-mile tax on Eyre Peninsula, as pointed out very ably by the Chairman of the District Council of Franklin Harbour and stated here by the member for Whyalla, will undoubtedly increase the freight rates on all the commodities taken to Eyre Peninsula and thus increase the cost of living. In turn, this will have an effect on the farm labourer and on the people who serve the farmers, and to my mind that is just as important as the effect it will have on the price of wheat. This is a Governmental charge,

and it is a charge that we are all responsible for having incurred.

I voted for that legislation because I realized that action was necessary concerning interstate road hauliers. I believed it was necessary in order that legislative authority should be in the hands of the Government to deal with the situation that could have arisen in which ore would be taken from Broken Hill to Port Pirie by road. I believed, on the evidence and statements made in this House, that this legislation was working satisfactorily in other States, and I accepted (I am learning not to accept the statements glibly made when Bills are being introduced) the assurances that the legislation would not impose undue hardships on any section of the community, and particularly not on the primary producers. I fell for this one! That legislation was introduced on November 12 and passed two days afterwards.

What is a member to do in the face of legislation passing through the House so rapidly? We cannot inquire in other States on matters of this kind, and we must accept the statements that are made to us. I believe that those statements were made in good faith and that the probable effect of this legislation on Eyre Peninsula was entirely overlooked. The legislation affects not only Eyre Peninsula but all of the area north and west of Port Augusta. Fancy charging a ton-mile tax on those roads to the north and north-west of Port Augusta! It is ridiculous, and I think it is a mistake in the legislation. I do not mean that the legislation is not necessary: I believe that it is necessary, but I believe a mistake was made in that due regard was not given to the situation that we should have foreseen could happen in these areas following its introduction.

Before the increase in the basic wage takes effect we have already had increases supposedly as a result of that determination. We have already experienced increases in prices, and the Government has indicated increases in service charges. This leads me to another thought in passing. The Premier has told us that he will have about £200,000 less available to him this year than he had last year. Because of that, one of two things must happen: there must either be a curtailment or a postponement of works in the various departments (and I know that some departmental heads are worried about what their allocation will be) or an increase in service charges. But, Mr. Speaker, at this very time the Premier announces that he can find £500,000 for a concert hall for

the City of Adelaide. There is a reduction of £200,000 in the money available to the Premier and costs and service charges must increase, yet there is no difficulty at all in promising this huge sum for a concert hall for the metropolitan area.

Mr. Ryan: That was promised in one of his Wednesday night television shows.

Mr. RICHES: It is in His Excellency's Speech. Last year I asked the Premier whether there was any money at all at his disposal out of which he could help a little community in the Flinders Foothills which has no television, no picture theatres around the corner, and no facilities for entertainment of any kind, but the people of which want to build a little hall in order to serve their community. Even a few hundred pounds would have been of assistance to them. However, the Premier replied that there was no line on the Estimates out of which he could grant any assistance whatever, and he was not prepared to place a line on the Estimates in order that these people could be helped. But here in the city, where the people have television, theatres that they cannot fill, and picture theatres that are closing, it is no trouble at all to get pound for pound for money that the metropolitan area can raise for a concert hall; and this is promised as a solemn undertaking from the Leader of an equally divided Parliament, without consulting Parliament!

Mr. Freebairn: Are you opposed to the concert hall?

Mr. RICHES: Yes, I am, unless the same treatment can be given to the country; I give the honourable member that assurance right now. I think that if concert halls are necessary and that they have any call on the public purse, it is in those areas where it is not possible for any other facilities to be provided. Surely the areas that have a prior call are those where there is no television, where there is no *Her Majesty's Theatre* and no theatres that cannot be kept in operation for the full 12 months now. If the State is in an affluent position and can afford a concert hall, let the people have a hall and an opera house and everything else that they want, but not at the expense of rising costs of service to the people as a whole and not, on the other hand, saying to the people in the outback areas that there are no funds from which they can be assisted when they want to build a hall in which they can meet together.

Mr. Bockelberg: Don't they build halls in the country without crawling for money?

Mr. RICHES: I am speaking about what is happening in the Flinders Foothills. Not all communities are affluent, and it stands greatly to the credit of the community I am speaking of that they have been able to raise the money that they have raised and that they are going on with their little hall and holding the community together. All power to them. I say they have the same claim on the public purse as the metropolitan area for the concert hall in Adelaide. My attitude probably will be to ask support for a reduction by, say, £1,000 in the amount for the concert hall to help the people where I believe that assistance is most needed. These are the things which could help make life a little easier in the country centres. How are we to encourage people to go out to the country if everything they have to provide by way of facilities and decent living has to be purchased at a greater cost and under greater difficulty than it can be provided in the metropolitan area? Let the honourable member tell the Adelaide City Council to build the concert hall under its own steam, for that is what the people in the country are being told to do. See how many friends he will make and how many voters he will influence!

Mr. Lawn: The council finished up with an overdraft this year, didn't it?

Mr. RICHES: I do not know; I am indebted to the honourable member for the information. If that is so, it only makes the situation all the worse. I am not unmindful of the fact that the people in the country contribute, too, albeit indirectly, to the revenue of the Adelaide City Council when they purchase their goods over the counter. His Excellency had this to say in paragraph 17 of his Speech:

The Department of Aboriginal Affairs has increased its activities, the financial allocation for the current financial year amounting to nearly £675,000, a substantial increase over the figure for the previous year.

He went on to say:

In July, 1963, the department took over the Koonibba Mission and a full staff has been appointed.

I want to take this opportunity of expressing my appreciation to Mr. Millar and the Department of Aboriginal Affairs for the great work being done and for the results that we can see in so short a period. His Excellency, in paragraph 30, said:

My Ministers are considering legislation designed to preserve aboriginal rock carvings and other items of historical interest in the State.

I am glad that action is being taken along those lines as well because, although I have not seen them, people who have tell me that there are large quantities of rock carvings, not rock paintings, the work of Aborigines, which should be preserved and which have been subjected to vandalism. I am glad that the Minister has that matter in hand.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: They will be preserved all right provided we do not let too many tourists loose on them.

Mr. RICHES: I agree. I do not want to leave this question of Aborigines for the moment because I believe that the programme being followed in South Australia at present is good; it is a concerted attempt to deal with a very real problem, and good results are being and will be achieved if only the people will let the department alone and give it an opportunity to carry into full effect the programme it has outlined.

I understand that South Australia is spending more per capita on aboriginal welfare than any other State in the Commonwealth. I am of the opinion that in our treatment and understanding of Aborigines we are leading the other States. It may well be that some of the other States have erected buildings but that is only a minor part of the work involved in dealing with this problem of assimilation and of lifting restrictions and giving an opportunity to the Aborigines. I believe that the Aborigines, when they take their place in the white community, seek nothing more than the opportunity to win and merit our respect—and they can. The present policy being pursued by the Department of Aboriginal Affairs is working to that end. Having regard to the fact that people have to live and desire to live in areas far removed from a city, houses are being built at Beltana and other places in the outback. An improvement has been noticed near Port Augusta on the reserve known as Umeewarra.

I want now to refer to a letter that appeared in the *Advertiser* of Thursday, July 23 of this year, in which we saw these "complimentary" remarks:

Port Augusta, despite the recent improvement, is still one of the worst reserves in Australia.

This writer was referring to an interview given by Dr. Gale. According to this writer, 3,000 people passed through this reserve in 1959. I shall not comment on that figure. When I first took an interest in Aborigines and when the problem was first brought to official notice in Port Augusta, there would have been 20 of

them in the whole area; now there is a population of 400, with 100 children in the schools. Those people have come there from all directions—some from Queensland, some from the North. They have left other places to come to Port Augusta, which is "one of the worst reserves in Australia".

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: At that time or now?

Mr. RICHES: This letter was dated July 23, 1964. The 3,000 people were there in 1959. I do not know anything about that but there are 400 there today and a gradual build-up has taken place. I think the test whether a mission or reserve is successful or not is the attitude of the Aborigines themselves: if the young people passing through that mission go to other States, into hospitals, on to farms and into the teaching service, and then choose to come back at every opportunity they get, it seems to indicate that they hold the mission in high regard.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: You do not agree that that reserve is the worst in Australia?

Mr. RICHES: I hope to make that abundantly clear before I have finished with this letter. It also states:

There is not a single building to give any of these transients shelter and the expectant mother, the sick and the healthy all walk the same path to the local rubbish dump to salvage a few sheets of rusty corrugated iron to give them shelter.

What kind of people does he think live in Port Augusta with this sort of thing going on on the outskirts of the city? I have never read such drivel in all my life. The actual situation is that there is provision for transient Aborigines, two-room galvanized iron buildings with cement floors, so that, if the people coming in from the outback have never lived in a house before, they can live near the town while they are waiting for medical treatment; they can live on the reserves the same as they have been used to living in the outback. They chose to go back when they had finished their medical treatment.

It has been shown to us that the idea of a fire at the end of a room and draughts is foreign to the Aborigines, that they will catch colds, and even worse, more quickly under those conditions than in any other provision that can be made for them. A fire in the centre of the room for them to curl around, as they have been accustomed to do all their lives, is what they want, and these buildings have been built for the transient Aborigines.

Then the next step is to provide houses as soon as families can live in them. Those houses or cottages are provided on the reserve. The last time I was there some wire doors were off their hinges, there was a broken window, and the houses needed painting. When I was told that that place was occupied by people who had come off the sandhills only two months previously and when I remembered some other houses that I had visited in other parts of South Australia on an election campaign, when I had knocked at back doors, I thought the effort of the Aborigines was not so bad after all, by comparison.

Mr. Clark: You are not going to name any particular area, are you?

Mr. RICHES: No, I am not looking for arguments, but I have not been entirely unobservant when going around the State. The department has called for applications from tradesmen for permanent employment in keeping these places in good repair. Still there are one or two wurlies on the reserve. Every now and again they are taken away, but somehow or other they re-appear. Accompanied by Pastor Doug Nicholls, who also knows something about Aborigines, Mr. Weightman and I went to the reserve and saw those wurlies. One man was asked whether we could do anything for him, and he asked, "Why can't I live in one of those places?" meaning the places for the transient Aborigines. Mr. Weightman said, "We want you to live in a house. These are only for people not used to living on a reserve who come down to see a doctor and then go back." The man said, "I don't want to live in a house. You have to have furniture in a house, and I don't want anything to do with furniture. I want one of those." Of course, we must not have any regard to the wishes of an Aboriginal! He must be put where we want him to go, according to the people who write letters to the *Advertiser*.

After the families live in cottages for a while, the department takes them into the town, where they do remarkably good work. I could drive members around Port Augusta, and I would defy them to pick out which houses were occupied by Aborigines. I could drive them around Housing Trust areas of double-unit houses where Aborigines occupy houses next to white people and they would not be able to pick which house they occupied. However, they must be educated to these standards, and Port Augusta would not welcome people not educated in hygiene, how to look after themselves in the street, or how to live

without being an embarrassment to themselves in the process. I believe members can see at Umeewarra the whole problem—and many problems are associated with lifting the standard of Aborigines.

I have always had the greatest admiration and respect for those prepared to live among Aborigines and to show them how to cook meals, wash linen, and look after a home. I think they are greater authorities on aboriginal welfare than those who suddenly find an interest in aboriginal welfare by attending a meeting in Adelaide. I make it clear that anything I say about Aborigines does not apply to those living around the city, because I do not know the situation there; however, I do know something about those who come from the outback areas and live on the fringes of a town. I know the problems associated with this matter. When I see work being done by people who give long hours and a lifetime of service both in the department and out of it, I say, "Well done. Anything we can do to assist them in their work, the better." Listen to this from the letter—this is a beauty for those who know something about the Education Department:

In aboriginal education South Australia lags very much behind the other States. The far too widely held concept that secondary education is the ultimate as far as Aboriginal people is concerned is entirely without foundation.

Whoever holds that view but this writer? Whoever in the Education Department, or as far as I know outside it, associated with Aborigines has ever held that the ultimate as far as Aborigines are concerned is secondary education? That view has never been held. The letter continued:

With such ideas being held by those in charge of aboriginal education, it is not surprising that South Australia is still the only State without an Aborigine at the university. There are reasons why there are no Aborigines at the university, and I will touch on them. This is a libel on and an affront to the men of the Education Department who have applied themselves assiduously, with everything they know how, to lift the educational standard of children throughout the State. Earlier this year it was my privilege to open an in-service conference of all the Education Department teachers of all the aboriginal schools in South Australia, and it was a thrill to me to see that amongst them was an Aboriginal employed by the department as a fully-qualified teacher. Those men are dedicated, and saying that the officials hold this stupid idea and that they

are not sympathetic is making a statement that should be thrown back into the writer's teeth. The late Mr. Jack Whitburn worked long hours and put in a terrific amount of planning to make sure that not only qualified teachers but all the facilities needed for teaching were available. More than that, he made sure that the most important qualification was that the teacher should have an understanding of and patience with the people being taught.

I have a daughter who teaches Grade I children at the Willsden Infant School, and she has a very close friend who is a departmental teacher and who teaches Grade I children at Umeewarra Mission. They went through college together, and they compare notes. At my home not long ago they were discussing work at the schools, and they told me that my daughter's class was at least six weeks ahead of the class at the mission school. I asked why this was; I said, "You both have the same qualifications as teachers. You have everything needed at both schools. The Apex Club at Port Augusta acts as a school committee for the mission to make sure that the facilities necessary for teaching are provided." My daughter said, "I can tell you that the children I teach have some help at home. The little children in the mission have no help in their homes." In addition to that, there is no permanent employment for many of these people at Port Augusta. They must go into the station country or along the railway line to obtain employment. Sometimes they take their families with them, so a fortnight is lost from their schooling here and perhaps three weeks somewhere else. This all adds up to making the first year, and I suppose every other year, more difficult for the children.

If a child can take its place with other children and attend school without being in any way embarrassed, that child is taken into one of the Port Augusta schools. We want to see how they fare there. Some of them are in high school and all honourable members know that plenty of aboriginal children who have had the same opportunities as white children have made good. I think there is much to answer for in some of the other parts of the State where people have been living under conditions similar to those enjoyed by honourable members for two and three generations. Why have these people not been given better opportunities in the past? That question must still be answered and that is what led me to say earlier that had the Government accepted responsibility for educating aboriginal children when Sir Shirley Jeffries

first set up the school at Port Augusta far greater progress would have been made by now towards lifting these people to their rightful place in society. When that school was established it was done in a surreptitious manner so that nobody knew whether it belonged to the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Public Works Department, or the Education Department, especially when it came to wanting repairs done to it. However, that is past history and from January, 1963, the Government has accepted responsibility for some of these reserves and when one sees what has been done in the provision of buildings and teachers and bears in mind that the Act has only been in operation for 12 months, one cannot point a finger at those charged with the responsibility of administering that department.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: Are you going to send the newspaper correspondent a copy of your speech?

Mr. RICHES: If I did not believe there was a story to be told I would not put pen to paper. However, this debate has given me the opportunity to tell the House that at Umeewarra a definite attempt is being made to lift the standard. I do not need to tell the Minister this. At this very juncture the amenities block is being completed for the aged Aborigines at the reserve. This block has a dining room any honourable member would be happy to use and from it three hot meals a day will be provided for pensioners on the aboriginal reserve. This is a better provision than that made in the city. A building is being erected for a full-time matron and plans are completed for new flats so that some of the pensioners will not have to walk so far to obtain meals and other services. In addition to the dining room, bathrooms have been provided and provision has been made for bathing the elderly. People will not queue up to apply for that type of job, and because of that I am not prepared to criticize those attempting to do it. It is not necessary to get social workers from overseas to tell us what is needed: the work is in hand and is being done. Instead of its being the worst in Australia in this regard, I think we can put out the challenge that our provision is the best.

His Excellency's Speech stated 400 houses have been built in South Australia under legislation that provided that the Government could sell them on a £50 deposit. I make a plea that the hopes that were engendered in the hearts of people wishing to own their

house and seeing the opportunity for this in the announcement of this legislation will not be dashed, but fulfilled. Whether under State or Commonwealth legislation there is no more heartbreaking task for a member than to have to tell people whose hopes of obtaining satisfactory housing have been built up, that their hopes have been dashed to the ground. I want to know how many of these 400 houses have been built in the country. The only houses that are available in Port Augusta under this scheme are timber frame dwellings previously erected at Radium Hill and now re-erected at Port Augusta.

I want to see this scheme work; it is a good scheme and nobody has proved that it is not economically sound. The Housing Trust has to find the same sum to build a house for rental as it does to build one under this scheme. However, under this scheme it immediately gets back £50 in cash as deposit and regular weekly payments thereafter. Also, it has excellent tenants living in its houses and they pay all the rates. Therefore, it is an admirable scheme from the trust's point of view and the house purchaser is purchasing equity instead of merely paying out rent. The purchaser takes a pride in his house and it is the nucleus of the family he seeks to build up around him. It is a fine scheme and I should like to see the Government continue with it.

Young people listened with interest and hope when the Prime Minister announced in his last policy speech that the Commonwealth Government would make grants of £250 to young couples under 36 who were buying their own houses. The Prime Minister said that the scheme would date back to November, 1963, and that those who had saved £750 over a period of three years would be entitled to a grant of £250. The Prime Minister's policy speech reads:

First, there is a special difficulty experienced by young married people, particularly in the age group up to 35, in financing the purchase of a dwelling. We will provide a Commonwealth subsidy of £1 for every £3 which a person in this age group deposits or shall have deposited, over a period of at least three years in an identifiable account at an approved institution, to be released, upon or after marriage, for home building or purchasing purposes. The maximum subsidy for one house will be £250. Thus, by the Commonwealth subsidy, £750 saved in this age group for a home after marriage will be increased to £1,000. For obvious reasons, this will not extend to the purchase of State houses, or for the purchase of house and land costing more than £7,000.

This appealed to me greatly. I believe that the basis of our society and the strength of our way of life can be found in the homes that can be established and anything that will encourage thrift in young people is sound. If young people can be established in their own homes, we will be doing something for the people (the small units I referred to earlier) who make up the foundation of our society. Having made a promise like that, why in the name of heaven cannot the Prime Minister stand up to it and carry it out? Why does he have to set up a committee and trim it here and there and find out how many people can be cut out of this scheme? How many hopes have been dashed to the ground as a result? What a grand thing it will be in this country when we can place reliance on the promises of the leaders of the people.

Let us consider the length to which the Commonwealth Government has gone in order to water down these provisions. Every young person who heard the Prime Minister had a right to believe that, if he was within that age group, had saved £750 in three years, and wanted to purchase a house, he had every right to expect that he would receive the £250 grant. It was not until a fortnight ago that the booklets were issued. It was discovered by four people who had seen me and were hoping to get help, that they were not eligible as they had started the foundations and were building their own houses. As money had come in instead of putting it into the bank, they had spent it on cement and had put their foundations down, but this precluded them from the scheme. I do not know how many were eliminated by that restriction. A final date to the period of saving has been fixed and all young people who had been planning to get married in a couple of months or at Christmas, found that if they had entered into negotiations for the building of a house, the date on which they had signed the contract was the closing of the savings period and that what they saved after that did not count.

Mr. Millhouse: You have to start somewhere, and the election date was a good one to choose.

Mr. RICHES: I am not talking about that: the honourable member is missing the point. I am talking about the closing date placed on the saving period; that is, the date one signs the contract, and then a saving of 12 months before that is worked out. If a couple had saved £400 in the last 12 months that had no effect at all: £250 is the limit. The Government must have saved thousands of

pounds and dashed the hopes of many people by that restriction. Young people have to be careful about where they have their money invested. Many teachers have been to me who have had their savings in a voluntary savings group with the Education Department, but they are not saving within the meaning of this Act. Their only chance is to take the money out of that group as quickly as possible and to purchase a block of land. The scheme was good and people had every right to believe that they would be entitled to the grant after hearing everything said and having seen what was printed, until the issue of this booklet. I make a plea that when promises are made those who make them should honour them and not dash the hopes of young people who, we hope, will have regard for the Australian way of life and hold high the ideal that Parliament places before them. I consider that in this respect thousands have been let down, and my experience would not be unique. I know many of those who have been to see me about this matter.

Reference was made to the Government's acquiring more reserves for the people throughout this State, and I pay a tribute to all responsible for what has been done. This House has heard me urging repeatedly that reserves should be acquired in the Flinders Ranges, and the announcement that 95,000 acres was purchased and negotiations were proceeding to obtain reserves around the Mambray Creek area, and that the Government was considering further areas should they become available in the future, made good reading indeed. A paucity of reserves is obvious in South Australia when one has regard to reserves available to people in other States. Our population is increasing rapidly, and land will not be obtained easily for reserves: it will be harder to obtain as the years go by. The obtaining of reserves and preserving what is on them is a measure that I endorse completely. I have seen the Government take over a reserve as a tourist resort, and immediately a road is put in someone has a claim to the big timber in the reserve. I have seen it cut down, and the Port Augusta power station is built on piles taken from stately gums cut down in the Flinders Ranges. Immediately an access road is provided it is almost automatic that value is found in trees that should be preserved for the people. I never believed that these trees belonged to those who have a title to graze the land. They are a heritage that belongs to all, and one that we should safeguard now and in

the future. I hope that this policy continues and that additional reserves will be held for posterity.

Some references have been made to the Final Report of the Industries Development Committee sitting as a special committee on decentralization. This committee was not charged with the responsibility of bringing back recommendations to the Government on any specific industry in any particular area, but was charged with the responsibility of answering a set of questions placed before it by this House. The committee was not charged with the responsibility of reporting back to the Government but of reporting back to you, Sir. The report was made available to this Parliament, as a Parliament, for members to consider and criticize, and if they thought the suggestions recommended were suitable then to advocate their implementation. They were the duties of the special committee as I saw them. Some misapprehension was created as a result of the curtailment in the printing of the report in some newspapers. Several statements were made, one by the Mayor of Mount Gambier, that this committee subscribed to the belief that electricity charges should be at least five or ten per cent higher or have some loading in country areas compared with city charges. The committee did not recommend anything of the kind. It drew attention to the fact that the Government had previously announced that all country centres should receive a service at a charge of not more than 10 per cent above that applying in the metropolitan area, but in places that was not being carried out: the committee recommended that it should be. That did not stop the critics. A meeting of all mayors in the State was called to discuss decentralization. Where was the meeting held? It was held in the Adelaide Town Hall. By meeting in Adelaide, the mayors added force to the argument of those who say that it is not convenient for industry to be established outside the metropolitan area.

Mr. Speaker, I am a Socialist and I believe that the true answer to decentralization can rest only in a planned economy under a Socialist Government. While it is left to private enterprise is it not natural that the interested parties will carefully examine not whether industry can prosper in the country, but whether somebody else cannot do even better by establishing industry close to the city? If we are to establish an industry at Clare must we not have regard to the fact that somebody might get in before us at Gawler and beat us

to the market under the present system? The Industries Development Special Committee's report is factual and does not paint an entirely rosy picture. Every suggestion put before it, from every part of the State, was carefully examined at great length and mentioned in the report for further examination by members of this House.

One comment of criticism that I should make is not levelled at the committee but at this House: I never could understand how this House could expect a full and thorough report on decentralization of industry if leaders of the industries to be decentralized were not to be consulted. The captains of industry should have appeared before the committee and given evidence. When the committee pointed this out in its first report and asked this House to give it the powers of a Royal Commission, the House rejected that request and, in those circumstances, Parliament has the best report that it could expect, and there has not so far been a better one submitted from any inquiry in the Commonwealth.

Mr. Millhouse: I do not think the committee in that first report asked for those powers.

Mr. RICHES: Yes, it did.

Mr. Millhouse: I do not think that is quite accurate.

Mr. RICHES: I moved the motion.

Mr. Millhouse: I do not remember being quite so inconsistent as to support the motion as a member of the committee and to vote against it in this House.

Mr. RICHES: I shall be glad to refresh the honourable member's memory. I must say, though, that he was a valued colleague on the committee, as, indeed, were the Secretary and departmental officers concerned. Another matter exercising my mind relates to my own district. I was keenly interested in what the member for Angas (Mr. Teusner) said today about the ravages of gummosis in the orchards in his district. I have also been intensely interested to hear from time to time the representations that have been made by the member for Chaffey (Mr. Curren), who impressed me as being very much alive to everything that is going on in his district. He is a forceful representative. Whether it is because my particular district is not represented so forcefully I do not know, but I think we are receiving a poor deal from the Agriculture Department. Why is it that immediately a fruit fly outbreak occurs in the metropolitan area an announcement can be made that all the people whose gardens are stripped of fruit will be compensated and that

compensation will be paid without further Acts of Parliament or discussion in this place? However, if the fruit fly happens to strike at Port Augusta nothing can be done until a special Bill is introduced each time compensation is to be paid, and if for some reason the Bill is not passed people in my district are left in the cold.

Mr. Loveday: Would your fruit fly be a rural or country fly?

Mr. RICHES: They seem to fly fair distances because this one came from Western Australia. The departmental officers did an excellent job last summer in controlling the outbreak, thus eradicating the fly. We all have hopes that it has been completely eradicated. I think everybody believes that, and if any further outbreak occurs it will be only as a result of importation from other States. Surely when legislation is being introduced this session, as I hope it will be, provision can be made for compensation to be payable at the discretion of the Minister as the occasion demands, without the necessity of introducing legislation every time an outbreak occurs. I carefully studied His Excellency's Speech and I cannot see any reference to the Government's intention to introduce an amendment to the Fruit Fly Act but two words give us much hope: they are "other matters". I hope that that will cover the situation. In conclusion, I draw the House's attention to a remark made by the presiding judge at the last session of the Port Augusta circuit court. It appears that a number of young men awaiting trial had to remain in gaol from February to June. In case after case the judge inflicted a penalty and immediately released those men because they had served their sentence before they came to trial. That is not good enough.

Mr. Clark: What if they were found not guilty?

Mr. RICHES: They served their sentences just the same. The judge said that it was most unsatisfactory and I am sure that that is something this House would demand to see discontinued. I am sure that the Attorney-General's Department will carefully examine the matter. I can assure the department that the judge's remarks has this House's full support. I am sure this will have the support of every member because it is something entirely foreign to our conception of British justice.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood): I do not suppose I need say that I rise to support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you going to talk about it?

Mr. DUNSTAN: I certainly am and I shall deal with the honourable member in doing so. I shall deal with the figures that the member saw fit to cite and I shall also deal with those figures he did not see fit to cite but must have had in his possession to be able to cite those that he did cite. If the honourable member will contain his impatience he will be able to hear me in a short time.

Mr. Millhouse: I can scarcely wait.

Mr. Clark: What a pity that dinner will interrupt the debate.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes. I join with the Leader of the Opposition in expressing regret at the failure of His Excellency's advisers to make any reference to the spiralling prices and the rise in the cost of living.

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

Mr. DUNSTAN: The Prices Commissioner, one member nominated by the Trades and Labor Council, and one member nominated by the Chamber of Manufactures, should be appointed to inquire into all aspects of price increases in South Australia since July 1, 1963, and to report to this House on Tuesday, October 6. Mr. Speaker, following on previous basic wage increases it was clear that it was possible for the economy to contain those increases without any inflationary spiral. Indeed, this was pointed to quite specifically in the basic wage judgment—the majority judgment—which has just been handed down.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you speaking of the judgment of the Chief Judge? That is only just a majority.

Mr. DUNSTAN: As the Premier can inform the member for Mitcham, only just a majority is still a majority, however it is obtained. Their Honours said:

In arriving at our decision we have looked at movements in the economy since 1961, including price movements and productivity movements, and we have considered the present state of the economy and the future to the extent that it is predictable. We have not reached a decision to lump together price and productivity movements since 1961, nor have we merely looked at future movements in productivity as suggested by the employers. We have endeavoured to look at the economy in the round and base our decision on its capacity since 1961, its capacity now, and its capacity for the predictable future.

Then they said:

At the time that the 12s. increase was awarded we were told that it would lead to price increases and so to other economic difficulties. In fact, since the 1961 decision

there has been virtual price stability, although there are now signs of an upward tendency. We are conscious of changed and changing economic circumstances, and in particular that the 12s. was awarded at a time when the economy was comparatively depressed following governmental measures in 1960. We consider, however, that the desirability of adhering to the 1961 approach, for the reasons already given, should be the determining factor in this case.

Following on that 12s. increase, it was clear that there was no significant price movement: the consumer price index remained steady for a considerable period thereafter. There was no really significant price increase, and the basic wage increase was not passed on to the consuming public. It was possible in those circumstances to contain the basic wage increase within the financial structure of employment in this country.

Well, Sir, it is clearly the view of the commission at the moment that the granting of a £1 increase in the basic wage is intended to be the grant of increased purchasing power, given the existing price structure, and that therefore this increase given to the working people of South Australia is a just one, given price changes and productivity changes and the general state of the economy, which should not be eroded by a series of unjustified price increases by the business community in this country. But already at the time the basic wage judgment was handed down it was clear that the general price structure in the community was showing an upward trend, not because of an increase in costs, Mr. Speaker, but because since the economy was rather more buoyant and since in many areas it was not particularly competitive, employers thought that they could get more out of the public if they increased prices. The honourable member does not believe that any interference by Government should take place in this process. So far as I can understand his reasoning on this, I understand him to suggest that market forces in Australia, the laws of supply and demand operating within the market, should fix our prices for us. When these are automatic in a competitive economic system, it is not only futile as far as any effective interference is concerned: it is futile, too, to interfere with this process. According to him, the Government cannot affect the process, and what is more it is not proper to try to do so. I hope I am not misrepresenting him here.

Mr. Millhouse: By and large that is so.

Mr. DUNSTAN: No economist would argue that this position is in any way valid unless there was a situation of perfect competition,

and perfect competition exists in almost no sphere of our economy today. The fact is that where sellers are able to exploit the market (and they are, over a wide range of products that must be bought by the average working man in this community) they will exploit the public to get the maximum return for their investors, and they are able to do this, unjustifiably, in the absence of some form of interference. I believe, given the price increases that we can already see taking place in this economy, that we should have an immediate inquiry to see what measures this Parliament should take to protect the consuming public, and to see to it that the just increases in their incomes that the court has granted will not be eroded unjustifiably by people who are exploiting the present sellers' markets within the community, or exploiting the monopoly position.

The honourable member would have us believe that there is really nothing untoward in price increases in South Australia, that they are in no way to be deprecated. After all, he would have us believe that there is nothing in South Australian price increases that is out of line with the general situation in Australia. He would say, "Well, if you can point to 1.3 per cent increase in South Australia, this might have occurred in the last quarter; but, if you take the position over a period of years, the South Australian index figure shows a lower increase than is the case in other States, and therefore there is nothing for us to worry about."

Mr. Lawn: We also have the lowest basic wage.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Exactly, and the price indices the honourable member quoted in no way indicate relative price structures.

Mr. Millhouse: But they indicated relative price rises, didn't they?

Mr. DUNSTAN: They indicated the rate of price rises over a given period of years, and the honourable member has decided to take the best year (that is, 1953) and relate the question of price increases to that period of 11 years. He says, "As over 11 years our prices have not increased in relation to other States, why worry about anything?" The fact that in the last quarter there has been an alarming increase in South Australia compared with other States is of no moment to the honourable member, but it is a matter of moment to the average person who has to work on a given wage and has to keep his wife and children on a wage. I do not know whether any people on a wage in the Mitcham district talk to the

honourable member—but talk to anybody on a wage and the first thing he asks is: “What is the Government doing? Why is it not doing something to protect the fact that the court said that justifiably in Australia we should have an increase in our purchasing power and it is being taken away from us overnight, just like that.” As we have pointed out before, the basic wage judgment was handed down. There was already this increase in this State. The June quarter showed an increase of 1.3 per cent in Adelaide. In fact, the consumer price index as between the capital cities showed an increase in the consumer index points of 1.2 per cent in Sydney, 1.2 per cent in Melbourne, 1 per cent in Brisbane, 1.6 per cent in Adelaide, 1.1 per cent in Perth and .3 per cent in Hobart. The average of the other States was a long way below the South Australian increase—and that was before the basic wage judgment was handed down. But, since the basic wage judgment has been handed down, we have had a whole series of further increases, and these are in many cases increases that are utterly unjustified by the financial structure of the company that is making them.

Let me take just one example to show honourable members opposite what we mean. Of course, when we talk on something that they do not like to hear about, suddenly an air of blank puzzlement comes over honourable members opposite. They retreat into a state of assumed mystification and cannot understand what it is all about. If I may spell it out for them in simple terms in this particular case, no doubt they will see what we are getting at. Let us take newspapers, the *Advertiser* newspaper in South Australia—

Mr. Ryan: Is not that the propaganda sheet of the Liberal and Country League?

Mr. DUNSTAN: Certainly a member of its board sits as a representative in another place, a member of the Party opposite. This newspaper, which occupies a monopoly position in South Australia, has a monopoly of the morning newspapers. It is the monopoly morning newspaper.

Mr. Millhouse: Don't forget the *Australian*!

Mr. DUNSTAN: The *Australian* is not, in fact, an early morning delivered newspaper, as the honourable member well knows. Just recently the *Australian* has been showing what must, from the point of view of the honourable member, be a commendable tendency to outdo the *Advertiser* politically. But, as far as morning newspapers delivered so that people can read them at the breakfast table are concerned, the

Advertiser has a monopoly, and it would be a monopoly extraordinarily difficult to break, given the hold that the *Advertiser* has on not only the newspaper industry but ancillary industries, as I shall show in a moment. According to the balance sheet of the *Advertiser* for the year ended December 31 last, the net profit increased in the year to £677,000 as compared with £448,000 in 1962, a pleasant little increase! Further, there was a bonus issue of one for one on shares held. This was financed from the premium and share reserves and the assets revaluation reserves. The official record of the Adelaide Stock Exchange shows that the earnings to ordinary capital were 43.2 per cent, the dividends distributed were 15 per cent, and the tangible assets both for the 5s. ordinary shares and the bonus shares were 17s. 6d. The profit for the year, according to the company's Chairman in his speech to the annual meeting, was a record for the company and with the progressive growing of profit more could be released to the shareholders in the way of dividends. By the issue of one bonus share for each share held, with a dividend of 10 per cent instead of the 15 per cent recently paid, the shareholders would receive an increased income of 33½ per cent in the year. That is a bit more than £1 a week increase in the basic wage, proportionately.

The Chairman said that over the 12 months the newspaper had carried a larger proportion of advertising columns than had the *Sydney Morning Herald* or the *Melbourne Age*, comparable papers in the larger States, and that much of the profit earned had been ploughed back into the company's plant, buildings, etc. The *Bulletin* report on this score was very interesting. The company's radio station 5AD was being kept on the air 24 hours a day, Sir Lloyd Dumas said. He also said that the company's three country stations—5MU, 5PI, and 5SE—had no competition in the areas they served, and that the broadcasting network made a substantial contribution to the company's group profit. He also said that in Television Broadcasters Limited, which operated ADS7, the company had a 40 per cent interest, and that an eight per cent dividend had been paid in 1963.

Later in his report the Chairman said that in January, 1961, Vardon Price Limited, a subsidiary of the company, was acquired. This was merged in 1962 with Griffin Press, formerly a department of Advertiser Newspapers Limited. He went on to discuss the *Advertiser's* printing industry, and said that

it was one of the largest printing houses in the country. The *Bulletin* report stated that two companies in the packing business had sought refuge from interstate marauders in the arms of the *Advertiser*. These were National Paper Industries Limited, the largest paper bag manufacturers in the State, and Vuepak Holdings Limited, which was engaged mainly in the printing of transparent and flexible packaging. The National Paper Industries Limited takeover involved an issue of £125,000 in share capital. The Vuepak deal took place in 1964 and it was finally decided that the *Advertiser* would offer two of its 5s. shares *ex bonus* for each five Vuepak 5s. shares. In both cases the existing management remained. The Chairman said that his board believed that, even on a short view, the link-up with those two companies would mean increased profits and substantially greater strength to the parent company and that, taking the long view, as the population of this city and the State grew, the company would have a broader base and greater diversification. In fact, of course, this company is showing a remarkable profit, yet it has recently increased the price of its daily newspaper by one penny for the 200,000 papers sold every morning, and we can expect that this is only the beginning. What will happen when there is a transfer to decimal currency?

Mr. Millhouse: Perhaps you will explain one or two points. First, how long is it since there was last an increase in the price of the newspaper, and secondly, do you think this will have any bad effect on advertising rates?

The SPEAKER: Order! This is not a debate between the honourable member for Mitcham and the honourable member for Norwood.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Thank you, Sir, but I am delighted to answer the honourable member. I do not know how long it is since there has been an increase in the price of the paper, but what has that to do with whether a price increase is needed in order to make a profit? The company will make a 25 per cent increase in profit in an already profitable enterprise, after having made a bonus issue of one for one, on which the shareholders will not pay a penny piece in taxation. Despite this, they have to increase the cost of the paper by 25 per cent to 5d. That will be only the beginning; what will be charged when a change is made to decimal currency? If the newspaper does not cost 5 cents, I shall be extremely surprised, and that will

be equal to 6d. We should be inquiring into this sort of thing. A daily newspaper is necessary to an informed democracy. Anyone in this community who wants to exercise his rights as a citizen has to have a daily newspaper because he has to be able to read what is going on.

Mr. Heaslip: What is the price of the equivalent newspaper in New South Wales?

Mr. DUNSTAN: I do not know. If the honourable member is referring to the *Sydney Morning Herald*, I do not remember the price.

Mr. Millhouse: There are convenient gaps in your knowledge.

Mr. DUNSTAN: That has nothing to do with it. The honourable member does not seem to realize that the whole question here is whether this newspaper needs more money in order to be able to carry on effectively and pay a fair return to its investors.

Mr. Heaslip: What has the N.S.W. Labor Government done about it?

Mr. DUNSTAN: I trust the Labor Party Government in New South Wales will press on with its often repeated demands that there be some kind of overall price-fixing structure in this country. However, what concerns us at the moment is getting an inquiry into the situation right here and now. The member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) does not have any power to do anything about what happens in New South Wales, but if he exercises his mind correctly I have no doubt that he can combine with honourable members on this side of the House in taking some steps to do something about the situation here. I cannot understand how honourable members can really suggest that the exploitation of a monopoly situation to fleece the general public in this way can be justified at the moment. How can they suggest that the economic process so works that the public is fully protected in a situation like this? It clearly is not. If they believe in wage fixing why don't they believe in protecting the wage that is fixed? In fact, the situation that is now arising was, to a certain extent, forecast in one of the minority judgments in the basic wage case as follows:

With a buoyant economy, the ready availability of money and the inclination to spend more freely, there is a distinct possibility that the way is open to pass on increased wage costs. The plain fact is that the judges can see that unscrupulous people in this community are prepared to pass on wage costs without any justification at all for doing so because they can exploit the situation in the

economy at the moment. That is what they are doing. What are honourable members opposite prepared to do about it? They say "Why does anybody raise such a thing—what are they talking about?" What we are talking about is: how are the ordinary men and women in this community going to be able to carry on their lives and undertake their responsibilities?

I shall now turn to another matter that I would urge upon honourable members opposite so far as it has been urged upon us by members of the public. It has certainly been urged upon the Government by members of the public, but so far with no success. The member for Mitcham sometimes cites passages from the more obscure publications of the smaller universities in the United States of America where various people are prepared to talk in most antediluvian terms about the economy. I shall read to him, and other honourable members opposite, the position that obtains in America under its Federal laws relating to unfair trade practices. He will see that America, that haven of rugged individualism and private enterprise, has found it necessary to take action through the State to protect the ordinary consuming public from utterly improper practices. Unfortunately, we do not have similar provisions in the laws of this community and there are people here who have bright ideas from America on the way in which they will conduct their businesses. They are having a good old programme since there is no restriction upon them here. One of the things found most damaging to fair trade practices in the United States of America has been bait advertising, and that is rife in South Australia at present. Day after day in our newspapers one particular company is perhaps the worst offender in this respect, and I have a series of advertisements here in which this company has clearly indulged in bait advertising. Let me inform honourable members how the Federal Trade Commission in the United States of America has decried bait advertising:

Bait advertising is an alluring but insincere offer to sell a product or service which the advertiser in truth does not intend or want to sell. Its purpose is to switch consumers from buying the advertised merchandise, in order to sell something else, usually at a higher price or on a basis more advantageous to the advertiser. The primary aim of a bait advertisement is to obtain leads as to persons interested in buying merchandise of the type so advertised. No advertisement containing an offer to sell a product should be published when the offer is not a *bona fide* effort to sell the advertised product.

No statement or illustration should be used in any advertisement which creates a false

impression of the grade, quality, make, value, currency of model, size, colour, usability, or origin of the product offered, or which may otherwise misrepresent the product in such a manner that later, on disclosure of the true facts, the purchaser may be switched from the advertised product to another. Even though the true facts are subsequently made known to the buyer, the law is violated if the first contact or interview is secured by deception.

No act or practice should be engaged in by an advertiser to discourage the purchase of the advertised merchandise as part of a bait scheme to sell other merchandise. Among acts or practices which will be considered in determining if an advertisement is a *bona fide* offer are: (a) the refusal to show, demonstrate, or sell the product offered in accordance with the terms of the offer; (b) the disparagement by acts or words of the advertised product or the disparagement of the guarantee, credit terms, availability of service, repairs or parts, or in any other respect, in connection with it; and (c) the failure to have available at all outlets listed in the advertisement a sufficient quantity of the advertised product.

What has been happening here is that a certain company dealing in electrical goods has been publishing advertisements in which various kinds of electrical equipment are advertised for sale as brand new at very low prices. "Brand new" is a fairly relative term in relation to some of these things, because the models advertised are models that have been superseded for a long time. They may have come directly out of the crate without being used by anyone previously but, in fact, they are not brand new in the ordinary sense. What is more, they are generally dealt with in such a way as to be entirely unattractive to the buyer when he inspects them. For instance, a check in relation to this firm some time ago revealed that it had advertised five brand new refrigerators all under £100; brand new sealed unit; full freezer; 49 guineas; 11 cubic feet. Upon examination it was found that the 11 cubic feet refrigerator as illustrated—and it was illustrated with two beautiful crispers sitting there—did not have crispers at all. In fact it was chipped and had obviously been dropped in the crate. Of course, people rushing in to see it could then be asked to look at something else that was a better recommended product at more advantageous terms by the seller. There was a brand new sealed unit with roll-out shelves advertised for 69 guineas. It was illustrated and described in glowing terms—a deposit was no problem. However, although described as new, the inside lining was badly chipped and pieces were broken out. The unit was dirty and the "full width freezer" consisted of an L-shaped shelf but no door was attached.

Mr. Jennings: They had the same radiogram going for about six months.

Mr. DUNSTAN: What they did with the radiogram, as a matter of fact, was to put a purple piece of cloth on it to make it look wildly unattractive to any prospective buyer.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: It was made to look regal.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Of course it looks very nice in the advertisement, but anybody seeing it would fall back about five paces in horror. This is the sort of thing that is going on the whole time. The managers of this concern freely admit what they are doing. They do not deny it. They say, "Oh yes, we are indulging in bait advertising; that is quite right." They spend much money in advertising; they get the customers in, and there is nothing illegal in it. This is improper trade practice because the honest traders in South Australia are inevitably damaged by this kind of competition. There are firms who want to deal honestly—

Mr. Millhouse: Why is this dishonest?

Mr. DUNSTAN: It is dishonest because those people I mentioned are not really advertising goods that they want to sell.

Mr. Millhouse: But they are goods that are there to be sold.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Oh yes, but not as the advertisement represents them. The advertisement is clearly deceptive. It would undoubtedly fall within the terms of the Federal Trade Commission's provisions in the United States of America. It is clearly improper trade practice. The Premier, who has been given all this material previously, knows what is going on but so far the Government has utterly refused to do anything about it. Here again is an area where rugged individualism and free competition, unrestricted by the State, is not acting in the best interests of the public. Here is something that we ought to regulate as has been done in the United States of America to protect the consuming public and to protect those people in industry—and there are many of them—who do believe in dealing fairly with their customers, giving them an honest deal by not being deceptive in their advertising.

It would require little amendment of our law to provide adequately for this and to write in similar laws to those of the Federal Trade Commission or those passed in numbers of the States of the United States of America. Florida, for instance, has passed through its Senate a Bill to deal with this matter, details of which I have here. This is something to

which we should urgently attend; it is no use leaving it to the Commonwealth Parliament which is going to introduce, we understand at some time in the unspecified future, something relating to restricted trade practices, although what it will actually be we know not. This is something that should fall within the purview of our State administration. We can do something about it in this Parliament and I hope we will very soon.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River): I join with previous speakers who expressed congratulations to His Excellency the Governor and Her Majesty the Queen. I also join with members who have previously expressed their sentiments regarding the mover and seconder of this motion as originally moved. I am sure that we all enjoyed the speech of the member for Eyre, who gave us much information; he covered his district well, and I congratulate him on the way he moved the motion. I am sure we will hear much more of the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney), who is a new member

Mr. McKee: If he is still here.

Mr. HEASLIP: I have no doubt that he will be here. The honourable member will contribute very greatly, in my opinion, to the debates and the matters brought forward in the House in the future. I join with all members in expressing condolences to the families who have been left by the deaths of former members, with whom most of us worked. I refer to Sir Walter Duncan, Sir Shirley Jeffries, and the late Mr. William Jenkins. I did not have the opportunity of meeting Senator Critchley very much and therefore I did not know him well. I offer condolences to the families of all those past members.

Turning to His Excellency's Speech, one of the first items mentioned, as usual (and rightly so), is primary production, which still is all-important to the economy and the welfare of the people of South Australia and throughout Australia, because all our real wealth comes from the land. I know the Government is being blamed because it is said that far too many people are leaving the country and coming to the city. We are told that we should do something about decentralization. I maintain that the people who are in the country today are producing more than ever was produced before. To a large extent, this comes about through the activities of the Government in introducing legislation and passing on the results of scientific research. This enables farmers to be better farmers because of the knowledge they

gain. I refer particularly to weed control, legislation in respect of which was amended only last year.

Mr. McKee: Which weed are you talking about?

Mr. HEASLIP: The honourable member has lived in the country for some time and will know that we have quite a few weeds, not only in the country either.

Mr. McKee: There are a few opposite tonight, too.

Mr. HEASLIP: There are a few, particularly in the country, that I should like to get rid of. I know we have weeds in the metropolitan area as well as in the country. My memory goes back to the time when myxomatosis was introduced. Before its introduction to control rabbits, 13,000,000 sheep was probably the record number carried, but for several years now we have been carrying more than 16,000,000 sheep. The partial eradication of the rabbit and the resultant increased carrying capacity was made possible through science and the scientific approach fostered by the Government.

Mr. Hughes: We will have to try to carry even more sheep in the future.

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes, I am sure that we will. As science comes to our aid and as we know more about husbandry and better farming we shall carry more stock and produce more cereals. Trace elements play an important part in this. One thing, however, over which we have no control is the weather. Given an adequate rainfall, I am sure that in the future we shall produce more primary products in the way of wool, meat and cereals.

Mr. Lawn: If prices continue to spiral, all the householders in the metropolitan area will have to carry their own stock!

Mr. HEASLIP: The honourable member keeps on about prices, prices, prices. There is nothing happening today that has not happened during our lifetime and the lifetime of our forefathers. Prices, prices—up and up! Of course they are going up, not only in South Australia and in Australia but all over the world. It is common knowledge that that is going on all the time. No nation in the world has been able to control it.

Mr. Ryan: And the Grosvenor Hotel has increased its charges?

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes; but it did so only because it traded on such a small margin of profit that, if someone wanted accommodation, he could not have it unless the hotel increased its charges. In other words, it would go broke and could not give a service if it did

not increase its charges—and it was all brought about by the increase in the basic wage.

Mr. Ryan: Rubbish!

Mr. HEASLIP: I know only too well what I am talking about, and the extra cost loaded on to that industry was largely because of the increase in the basic wage. I can tell the honourable member that prices would not have increased had it not been for the increase in the basic wage. That applies to most things, too. People have been forced to increase their prices if they are to carry on. I have heard much about this—but I am being side-tracked; I did not want to get on to that subject now.

Mr. Lawn: You didn't want to touch on prices?

Mr. HEASLIP: Not for the moment. I want to congratulate also the Wheat Board which, despite an all-time record wheat harvest, managed to dispose of it at satisfactory prices.

Mr. McKee: To whom did the board sell it?

Mr. HEASLIP: To whom do you think? But it was made easier because the Commonwealth Government accepted one of the things that I recommended in the Address in Reply debate 12 months ago: the producers' guaranteed price for export wheat was increased from 100,000,000 bushels to 150,000,000 bushels.

Mr. Ryan: Who started that stabilized export price?

Mr. Jennings: Did you recommend exporting to Red China?

Mr. HEASLIP: I have heard it said that we Australians should not feed the starving; that we should not look after our Aborigines because we do not like them or because they are a different race. Red China is a different country and we do not believe in what they believe in—but that does not mean that we should not feed them. That is up to us. I also congratulate the bulk handling authorities on the way in which, despite the fact that they have been operating for only a few years, they handled the quantity of wheat that they handled last year. However, I sound a warning note. Wheat this year will not be as easy to sell as it has been in the past. European countries, Canada and many overseas countries have increased their crops, and their present crops are huge compared with last year's. In this connection it is the people who have rushed into bulk handling (they have not exactly rushed in; it is a part of their way of life now) who will find that it is impossible to build economically sufficient silos to carry bulk wheat for a period of 12 months or two years.

We cannot store wheat in bulk as we did in bags.

Mr. Ryan: They are improving the type of storing, aren't they?

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes, wheat cannot be stored in quantity in bulk as it can in bags. It cannot be stacked the same as bagged wheat; and expensive silos must be built to hold the quantities if it is held longer than 12 months.

Mr. Ryan: You are storing it longer now than you did when bulk handling first started, aren't you?

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes, but the honourable member is talking of the moisture content now. The silos are doing a good job now, and I think they could hold wheat almost indefinitely in respect of weevil and dampness. Those problems have been overcome, but I am speaking of the physical capacity to store bulk wheat as against bagged wheat.

Mr. Hutchens: If they hold it for two years instead of one they must double the capacity of the silos.

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes, and the silos are expensive. Further, if they are to be used only once in six years instead of every year (and the turnover is twice a year now), once they are full they cannot be emptied, and they cannot be filled again. It is as simple as that. I am giving a warning now that the difficulties of storing wheat in bulk will be greater than ever they were when wheat was stored in bags.

Paragraph 10 of the Governor's Speech deals with roads, and I am particularly interested in this subject. I know that there is a shortage of money and that there will probably be a curtailment of Government spending—and I am not opposed to that, for I think it is only right. We had a special grant last year when we had unemployment, and that grant was for the purpose of employing people. Today we have almost over-full employment and, although my attitude may not be popular, this is one time the Government can steady down in spending money and leave it to the industries to carry on.

Mr. Ryan: Not to the extent of creating unemployment. You would be opposed to that, wouldn't you?

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes. I would not think that anybody in this Chamber wants unemployment.

Mr. McKee: You are opposed to the 60-hour week aren't you?

Mr. HEASLIP: I have worked it for so long I cannot oppose it. I am particularly interested in a very small road in my district:

the Murraytown to Booleroo Centre road. Although it is a very bad and rough road, it carries school buses. It is the main road from all of the western side of Booleroo Centre to the hospital; that is, from Wirrabara as far north as Melrose. It can be a dangerous road, and should be sealed. I have been told that there has been agitation regarding that road for over 15 years. I wish we had sufficient money to be able to complete that road. I hope that it will be done soon, because it is such an important road to the people who depend on it for their education and for transport to hospital.

Mr. McKee: How is it that the member for Gouger has better roads in his district than you have in yours?

Mr. HEASLIP: I think that we are lucky to have the roads we have. We have good roads, but I am speaking of a particular road. It is good to be able to get into a car and travel 200 miles without leaving the bitumen, and the Minister of Roads and the Government have done a good job in that respect. This afternoon I heard a member of the Opposition—I do not remember who it was—say that the Liberal and Country League did not have a policy.

Mr. Ryan: We have five minutes to spare while you think about who it was.

Mr. HEASLIP: I do not remember who it was; it may have been the member for Hindmarsh (Mr. Hutchens). Last session the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act was passed; I listened last week to the Address in Reply speech of the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday), who confined himself to that Act.

Mr. Ryan: There is nothing wrong in that, is there?

Mr. HEASLIP: No, there is not. The member for Whyalla said that the Bill was rushed through with undue haste. I have been a member for 14 years.

Mr. Ryan: Too long.

Mr. HEASLIP: Probably, but in that time I have never been stopped from speaking for as long as I have wanted or from staying here as late as I have wanted.

Mr. Riches: How long did it take?

Mr. HEASLIP: It does not matter. That is entirely up to members. If they did not want to talk on the Bill or probe into it, that was their business.

Mr. Riches: We made the mistake of accepting the assurance we were given from the other side.

Mr. HEASLIP: How many speeches did members of the Opposition make? The only

members opposite who spoke were the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Frome (Mr. Casey).

Mr. Ryan: How many on your side spoke?

Mr. HEASLIP: There were two, but the Government introduced the Bill.

Mr. Ryan: Who were they?

Mr. HEASLIP: I am not sure, but there were two.

The SPEAKER: Order! This is not a preselection. The honourable member for Rocky River.

Mr. HEASLIP: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition spoke first, and asked why the 4-ton limit was increased to an 8-ton limit under this legislation. He went on to say:

The member for Frome will have further information to put before the House regarding this Bill and that information will reveal a serious challenge to the earning capacity of the Railways Department.

I ask members to note that; the Leader of the Opposition already knew what the member for Frome was going to say, and his real query was why the Government had not introduced a Bill to limit the load capacity to four tons.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: Like Victoria.

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes, like the Eastern States.

Mr. Riches: This has nothing to do with what the member for Whyalla said.

Mr. HEASLIP: I am talking about policy, and I have a real worry about the policy of the Opposition. We are accused of having no policy, and I am trying to find out what the policy of the Opposition is, because I do not know. The member for Frome was the next to speak, and he started by saying:

The Railways Department, which is a public utility, has to be safeguarded.

The Railways Department has to be safeguarded! No matter who pays or how much they pay, the Railways Department must be safeguarded! Last year £3,900,000 was paid from revenue to the Railways Department, yet it still showed a deficit of £211,000. Despite this, the honourable member wanted more safeguards. What about costs now? Who is paying the increasing costs? Every man and woman in South Australia who pays taxation is paying. Members opposite suggest that the Railways Department should be looked after and must not lose money but it does not matter to them who pays.

Mr. Casey: Would you close the railways down altogether?

Mr. HEASLIP: I am not suggesting that at all. Later in his speech the member for Frome continued in the same tone and the member for Gouger interjected, "Do you advocate a 4-ton limit?" The member for Frome replied, "Definitely, because it would conform with Eastern States' conditions and I believe wholeheartedly in Commonwealth uniformity." He believes in Commonwealth uniformity and to him it does not matter whom it hurts; it does not matter who pays and how much it costs as long as there is Commonwealth uniformity.

Mr. Loveday: That is not true. You are not quoting other parts of the speech that show that the member for Frome is concerned about primary producers.

Mr. HEASLIP: I am going to quote more of his speech because the Leader said that the member for Frome would explain the Opposition's views on this matter. The member for Frome continued:

A 4-ton truck can transport 60 bags of wheat. After all, a primary producer does not use the roads extensively. He does not travel hundreds of miles to deliver his wheat to the silo.

I want honourable members to remember that, as I will refer to it again when I am dealing with the remarks of another speaker.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: The member for Frome cannot be a primary producer.

Mr. HEASLIP: He certainly represents a primary-producing area. I believe that what the member for Frome said represents the policy of the Opposition. He said that he definitely believed in the 4-ton load capacity.

Mr. Riches: No one from this side of the House has ever suggested differently.

Mr. HEASLIP: The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) interjected, "You want to slug the carriers a bit more?" and the member for Frome replied, "No. I say that the weight should be reduced to four tons." Again, he said that he preferred the 4-ton to the 8-ton capacity. I want to be sure about this and that is why I am quoting the statements made by members of the Opposition in connection with the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act. The member for Frome continued:

If we permit road transport operators to use vehicles of less than eight tons we will not recoup sufficient to maintain our roads. If the limit were reduced to four tons sufficient revenue would be obtained.

He again emphasized, as he had done right through his speech, that he was opposed to the 8-ton limit capacity and that he wanted it

reduced, for the sake of uniformity, to four tons.

Mr. Casey: I do not see anything wrong with that.

Mr. HEASLIP: I have had considerable experience as a primary producer and I produced wheat and wool until my sons took over my property. They are still working the property and I am very much interested in the welfare of primary producers. Apart from that, I am the representative of a primary producing district.

Mr. Hughes: I am interested in primary producers, too.

Mr. HEASLIP: The honourable member is?

Mr. Hughes: Yes, I am.

Mr. HEASLIP: Are you the primary producers' friend when you are trying to reduce the load capacity?

Mr. Hughes: I did not say that, and the honourable member was not speaking for me.

Mr. HEASLIP: I have learned from three or four people that the policy of the Labor Party is a 4-ton capacity.

Mr. Casey: It is a wonder that you did not correct me when I made that statement during the debate.

Mr. HEASLIP: The Bill was carried: why worry about it? It was a Government Bill.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The member for Onkaparinga corrected accurately the member for Frome at that time.

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes, the member for Onkaparinga was one who spoke from this side of the House.

Mr. Casey: Did I say anything relating to the protection of primary producers?

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: You did not say how you were going to do it.

Mr. HEASLIP: How can the honourable member say that he was protecting the primary producer by reducing the limit from eight tons to four tons. Practically every farmer would come under the rated capacity and pay road tax on his vehicle. Is that protecting the primary producer? Yet that is what the Labor Party advocates. I have established that, despite the fact that the member for Wallaroo disagrees. I am surprised that on this Bill, where a policy has been laid down, he does not agree with what other members of his Party have said is the Party policy. I have been informed that the policy is for a 4-ton limit. Why did the Leader of the Opposition say that, and why did he say that the member for Frome was going to explain it? The member for Frome seemed to be in favour of protecting the railways, and of reducing the limit

from eight tons to four tons. By doing this he did not seem to care who paid: of course, the primary producers would pay, because it would affect them all.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: No-one on the Opposition side said anything different.

Mr. HEASLIP: No-one at all.

Mr. Loveday: It is a pity you did not give the full quotation from the speech of the member for Frome and what the member for Onkaparinga said.

Mr. HEASLIP: The member for Onkaparinga tried to correct him.

Mr. Loveday: He reassured him, didn't he?

Mr. HEASLIP: It appears that the policy is so different from that of the L.C.L.

Mr. Loveday: Did the member for Onkaparinga reassure him?

Mr. HEASLIP: In his speech the member for Whyalla said that legislation was rushed through with indecent haste. Members would be to blame if that happened and if it were not opposed.

Mr. Riches: How do you excuse the state of affairs on Eyre Peninsula?

Mr. HEASLIP: I am speaking about the indecent haste with which the legislation was supposed to have been rushed through. The Government cannot be blamed for any so-called indecent haste. It has never gagged anyone in this House during my Parliamentary experience, and every member has been allowed to speak as long as he wished. This "indecent haste" is a fallacy. If any member opposite can give me an instance where he has been gagged, I will admit that I am wrong. After the first statement by the member for Whyalla in his speech came a complete reversal of what I thought was the Opposition's policy: that is to protect the railways at the expense of the farmers.

Mr. Hutchens: If our Party had any policy in regard to it, it would have moved an amendment.

Mr. HEASLIP: But it did not move an amendment.

Mr. Hutchens: It would have, had there been any policy on it. We never fail to do it and the honourable member knows it!

Mr. HEASLIP: There is no policy, and I am afraid that at the end of my speech I shall still be seeking a policy from the Opposition. Members opposite vote for one thing one day and against it the next. They do not know their own minds.

Mr. Riches: What is the honourable member's answer to the people of the West Coast?

Mr. Ryan: Ask the member for Eyre.

Mr. HEASLIP: I am astounded to find that the Opposition members now are talking with their tongues in their cheeks; the wind blows one way and they go that way.

Mr. Hutchens: I think the honourable member has the wind up!

Mr. HEASLIP: I might have, but I am still here and still going. The member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) qualified his statement when he said:

I believe the Prices Commissioner sets the formula for the Wheat Board whereby the actual cost is passed on through the differential to the farmer at the silo, so that even if the farmer in the short haul to the silo delivers his wheat himself he is still caught by the carrier with the heavy vehicle carting his grain. That is all right; the member for Whyalla thought that was so but it is not correct. As you will know, Mr. Speaker, the Wheat Board has a Wheat Index Committee of which I know you are a member, and the Prices Commissioner does not come into the fixing of prices at all.

Mr. Loveday: Would the honourable member be interested to know that his opinion is different from that of the Wheat Board on the subject?

Mr. HEASLIP: I happen to know what I am talking about and that the price of wheat is fixed by the Wheat Index Committee.

Mr. Loveday: I suggest that the honourable member telephone the board to find out.

Mr. HEASLIP: I believe that what I am saying is correct. I think five or seven members are on the committee and they arrive at the cost of production of wheat according to other costs that occur. If costs rise, so does the price of wheat; if costs fall, the price of wheat also falls.

Mr. Loveday: I suggest the honourable member contact the responsible officer of the Wheat Board and ask him about the information he gave me on the subject before he makes further statements.

Mr. HEASLIP: I happen to know what I am talking about. I know that the Wheat Index Committee last year reduced the price of wheat by 1s. 5d. a bushel. That may be of some interest to members opposite. The wheat farmer, however, took less for his wheat last year than in the previous year. Costs were reduced from 15s. 10d. to 14s. 5d., but we did not buy our loaf of bread any more cheaply, for it was all taken up in wages costs. However, wheat was supplied to the miller more cheaply last year than in the previous year and the Prices Commissioner had not one word

to say about it. It was the Wheat Index Committee that fixed that price, in conjunction with the Commonwealth Government. I am not taking exception to what the honourable member said but merely trying to set right what I suggest was an inaccuracy.

Mr. Loveday: Are you suggesting that I misinformed the House?

Mr. HEASLIP: No, I do not think it was intentional. However, I do not think it matters very much.

Mr. Loveday: Why are you raising it if it does not matter?

Mr. HEASLIP: I think the record should be put straight.

Mr. Loveday: Will you go and ask the Wheat Board about what I was informed on the subject?

Mr. HEASLIP: I am not that interested. I am just trying to tell the House the facts. If the member for Whyalla makes mistakes, I am not going to chase them up with the Wheat Board and put them right. The honourable member then went on to say:

One farmer in the Cowell area, for example, produces 3,060 bags of grain for delivery to Port Lincoln at least 100 miles distant.

The member for Frome said a few moments ago that farmers do not cart wheat far, and that 60 miles is a long way for them, yet the member for Whyalla quoted an example of a farmer who had to cart wheat 100 miles.

Mr. Casey: Why didn't you point it out to me when the legislation was before the House?

Mr. HEASLIP: The member for Whyalla went on to say:

Supposing that his goods are carted by a Tumby Bay carrier who has four large trucks, two of which have a tare weight of about 11 tons with a load capacity of 15 tons.

Mr. Shannon: That is a very poor ratio.

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes, it astounds me.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I think that would be correct.

Mr. HEASLIP: It could be correct, but are the majority of farmers' trucks of that ratio?

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: No; that particular one is a very heavy and expensive carrier's truck.

Mr. HEASLIP: Exactly, and I maintain that the honourable member picked on this particular truck to point out—

Mr. Loveday: It is not pointed out as a farmer's truck at all.

Mr. HEASLIP: No, it is a carrier's truck.

Mr. Loveday: It happens to be an actual case.

Mr. HEASLIP: All the figures the member for Whyalla put forward are based on the weight of this truck, and I would say there would not be one truck in ten with that ratio. I have lived all my life in the country and I know a little bit about it. The honourable member picked (I am afraid, deliberately) the highest ratio of tare weight compared with weight-carrying capacity to put the cost to the farmers in the worst possible light. The ratio today is more like about one to two—tare weight one ton, carrying capacity two tons.

Mr. Shannon: That is correct.

Mr. HEASLIP: Exactly, but the one the member for Whyalla quoted had a ratio of almost one to one, and this gives an entirely different and misleading picture. I know that there are trucks such as the one he quoted; I think a Mercedes has a similar ratio. There would be very few such trucks carrying wheat, yet the member for Whyalla in his speech bases his cost to the farmer on the use of such a truck, and that is neither fair nor right. The honourable member went on to say:

I have been informed that a firm at Port Lincoln has been advised by the Adelaide Steamship Company that an increase of 12s. a ton will be imposed because of the road tax on those vehicles using the roll-on-roll-off *Troubridge*.

Mr. Loveday: The Adelaide Steamship Company said that.

Mr. HEASLIP: Does the honourable member believe what everyone tells him? If he does, he should not quote it.

Mr. Loveday: Read what I said.

Mr. HEASLIP: The member for Port Adelaide (Mr. Ryan) interjected and said, "That has already been done."

Mr. Ryan: That has been done, and you can't deny it. Representations have been made to the Premier to have it abolished. You can ask the Premier that.

Mr. HEASLIP: Well, that is quite different! The Minister informs me that this is an overall charge not on the carting of the vehicle across the gulf but on the delivering of goods inland over Eyre Peninsula.

Mr. Ryan: In accordance with the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act.

Mr. HEASLIP: That would apply to any.

Mr. Ryan: Isn't that what the member for Whyalla said?

Mr. HEASLIP: When it is looked at in that light, it is a truck travelling over the road, I agree.

Mr. Loveday: Did they suggest that part of the cost could be for other reasons?

Mr. HEASLIP: I think it is qualified later, but it did not mention that. No, I do not think the speech does qualify it. In any case, that has been explained. That is the road tax after the vehicle arrives at the West Coast, travelling over the roads.

Mr. Bywaters: I suggest that the honourable member look at the speech again.

Mr. HEASLIP: The honourable member for Whyalla said:

Practically the whole of this district's superphosphate requirements, amounting to some thousands of tons annually, has to be delivered by carriers to the farmers. The ton-mile tax is going to add 5s. a ton to the cost of this.

Unfortunately, that is only a half truth. The facts of the case are that there is no ton-mile tax for the vehicle going back irrespective of what one puts on it. The policy of primary producers, as asked for by the superphosphate companies, is to take back superphosphate when they have delivered their wheat. If they do that, there is no cost whatsoever. Their trucks have to run so, if they take the superphosphate back, it does not cost them anything.

Mr. Loveday: It is back-loading?

Mr. HEASLIP: It is, on which there is no tax.

Mr. Loveday: But it is all back-loading?

Mr. HEASLIP: It is done to a large extent now. In fact, one gets a concession on one's superphosphate if one does it. The farmers are taking advantage of it and they get the superphosphate more cheaply. That extra 5s. that has been pointed out by the member for Whyalla as an extra cost to the farmer is not real. So, in this debate on the Address in Reply, on the one hand we have the champion of the primary producer who is trying to run the Bill down, who is trying to get more exemptions for it (and we have more exemptions here than they have in the Eastern States); and, on the other hand, when the Bill was introduced, we had the champion of the farmer, the member for Frome (Mr. Casey), who was trying to reduce the carrying capacity exemption from eight tons to four tons. My idea of assistance to primary producers is entirely different from that.

Mr. Casey: But surely there is a difference between the term "farmer" and the term "primary producer"?

Mr. HEASLIP: I do not think there are any doubts left on the part of anybody. Later, the member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee) spoke

and he had a few words to say about Aborigines. Later still, the member for Stuart (Mr. Riches) spoke. I congratulate him on the way he dealt with the difficulties that we can have, are having, and have had regarding Aborigines. He knows a little about how to deal with them. Few people do, but evidently the member for Port Pirie does because he has made this statement, when speaking about the Aborigines at Point Pearce and in the sandhills in Port Augusta:

The way in which these people have been retarded, pushed aside and forced through economic circumstances and lack of education and understanding to live in filth and squalor in this jet age is a complete disgrace.

I cannot allow that statement to pass without comment, as it is not correct. Although I have not lived with the Aborigines, I have had a fair amount to do with them, and I know some of the difficulties we have had and will have in trying to assimilate them into our way of life. The member for Stuart spoke well on this matter, and he is an understanding man on the subject.

I recently travelled in another member's district, and I wholeheartedly agree with that practice. One thing I do not agree with, however, is a member going into another member's district and then asking questions and making complaints about things that are not his concern at all. However, I believe every member should be conversant with what is going on in South Australia. I once lived for five years on the western side of this district in the pastoral areas, but recently I went to the corner from which one can overlook Western Australia and the Northern Territory. On that trip I passed through the Ernabella mission station, which is run by the Presbyterian Church and is subsidized by this Government. Fregon, an outstation there, has been subsidized in the last three years to the extent of £27,000. This is where the Aborigines are taught how to become useful citizens. These Aborigines are more advanced than others. They have passed through one stage, are passing through another, and are performing a useful service.

We also passed through Musgrave Park mission station, which was built and is being run by the Government. At that station there were 150 Aborigines. There should have been more, but most had gone to Ernabella for a medical examination. I agree with the member for Stuart that the Aborigines come to the mission stations because they want to be there. They do not get anything for nothing, however; there are no hand-outs. They must do something before they get their rations. It is

wrong for any member to say that this Government is not doing something for the Aborigines, and I could not let this matter pass without saying something about it. I support the motion as moved.

Mr. RYAN (Port Adelaide): I support the motion as amended by the Leader of the Opposition. I have heard many statements tonight that Opposition members have not put forward a case in support of the amendment. However, I think it can be said truthfully that we have heard no opposition whatever from any Government members to this amendment. I read with keen interest the remarks made by the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) about this amendment, and the only occasion on which he criticized it was when he quoted the base figure in 1953. The only other occasion he mentioned the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition was when he quoted the price index figure of 1.3 per cent. It amazes me that it is necessary for the Opposition to substantiate its amendment when Government members, including those on the front benches, are greatly concerned with the issues confronting this State. A report appearing in the *Advertiser* on Saturday, August 1, states:

Prices Rises Watched. The S.A. Government is known to be perturbed at the extent of price increases of some items following the £1-a-week increase in the basic wage.

According to Government members, however, no such price rise has taken place in this State; it just does not exist, but I think it can be proved that it does exist. The report continues:

Although the goods concerned have been freed from price control for some years, the Prices Department has continued to watch those which make most impression on the household budget. In some instances, goods were decontrolled on the understanding that any price rises contemplated would be referred to the Prices Department for review. It is understood that in the past few weeks the department has received a flood of applications for increased prices.

Does not the member for Mitcham read the press? This is the Liberal and Country League's propaganda sheet: it is not the *Herald*—published by the Labor Party. The report further states:

The Prices Commissioner (Mr. E. A. Murphy) would not comment yesterday. He said such matters were confidential until a decision was made. In the case of a commodity not subject to price control, any announcement of price increases was a matter for the company itself. Our political roundsman says there is a distinct possibility that some lines will be recommended to the Government for reconrol. One of the

applications now before the Prices Department is for an increase of 1d. a bottle for soft drinks.

If there is no price rise, why is it that the recommendation is going to the Government for some price recontrol? The *Advertiser* of August 4, states *inter alia*:

Soft drink price increase. The cost of the contents of small bottles of soft drink went up 1d., and most larger sizes 2d. yesterday . . . "Inevitable". The president of the South Australian Retail Storekeepers' Association (Mr. M. W. Thomas) yesterday predicted that price increases for grocery items were "inevitable."

The chairman of the Metropolitan Milk Board (Mr. S. A. Gale) said a report on the price of milk was being submitted to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Brookman) . . .

The president of the Cake Manufacturers' Association of South Australia (Mr. G. R. Romain) said last night that some cake manufacturers had increased prices to cover the additional cost of the basic wage increase. Butchers in the city and metropolitan area said short supplies of beef and lamb had forced prices up. Varying demand from customers also affected prices.

How, in the light of the above comments can the member for Mitcham say that the Opposition has not submitted a case showing a variation of prices in South Australia? The honourable member must read Braille: he certainly is not conversant with what has been said by the *Advertiser* in the editions I have quoted.

Mr. Bywaters: I believe it is also written in Braille now.

Mr. RYAN: If that is so, the honourable member, when he has had time to study it, may come back and admit his mistake. A report in the *News* (only yesterday) states:

Protest to Premier.

Students will petition on fare rises.

Adelaide University students are planning a petition to the Premier, Sir Thomas Playford, against the increases in scholars' monthly concession bus tickets. An article in the university's student newspaper, *On Dit*, says the rise in some bus fares will hit students "pretty hard".

If the Premier is of the same opinion as the member for Mitcham he will refuse to receive the petition lodged by these people and say that as there is no price rise, it is no good their coming to him. The end of this article is rather amusing and I am sorry that the member for Mitcham is not here to hear it.

Mr. Bywaters: It is not difficult to hear you!

Mr. RYAN: I have always believed that a member is elected to this Parliament to be the voice of his constituents and as such should be heard. There are some dumb members of the Liberal Party who, if they were heard

by their constituents, would not be here after the next election. Later the article states:

The paper says the M.T.T.'s general manager Mr. Keynes, said it was the Government, not the M.T.T., which granted concessions.

In other words, the Government is not opposed to concessions, yet it has approved these increases and according to this article, will not reduce them. The article concluded:

Mr. Millhouse, M.P., felt concessions were unnecessary, but said he was open to correction, and suggested students ride bikes to university, according to the article.

I hope the member for Mitcham rides his bike from Mitcham to Parliament House and gives us a laugh. The recent decision of the Arbitration Commission was not given on account of what might happen in the future, but on what has happened in the past and was based on the productivity of industry and its ability to pay the rise. This important aspect has been overlooked by Government members. The commission knew that it did not have any control over the passing on of any rise by the manufacturers. Realizing what would be done by unscrupulous manufacturers (and this has happened) the Arbitration Commission amended the procedure whereby the representatives of the Australian Council of Trade Unions could make further application to it. Prior to the last rise it was laid down that an application could only be resubmitted for a further amendment to the basic wage after a period of two years had expired. However, realizing what was involved and realizing that the worker and others were going to be fleeced because of the increase granted by it, the commission decided to amend that particular section dealing with applications and the A.C.T.U. (or any other organization) can now immediately go back to the commission when it feels that some further approach is justified.

The commission would not have altered the set-up on this occasion if it had known that prices were going to be stabilized in accordance with productivity and the ability of industry to pay. It can honestly be said that this State has not made much effort in the last 12 months or so to retard the increase in prices. This State had the machinery, without the necessity of the approval of the Parliament, to recontrol the various items that were considered absolutely necessary to stabilize prices, but nothing has been done. Apparently the political roundsman has inside information that an approach will be made to the Government to re-control prices. However, legislation is not necessary as it could be

done without reference to Parliament, but that is not so in other States. The amazing part is that in this State where we have price control, the price rise, prior to the increase in the basic wage, was the highest in the Commonwealth. No Government member can deny that. If an upward movement in prices takes place it is the Government's duty, because of its economic policy—

Mr. Loveday: That is, a responsible Government.

Mr. RYAN: We have an irresponsible Government in this State. I think it was the member for Mitcham who said that the majority decision of the Arbitration Commission was not good enough. We have been governed in this State by a minority; if it wants a majority necessary to be a responsible Government then it should do something about it. It is necessary that the Government should take steps to keep prices down in accordance with the wages fixed by the Arbitration Commission. This would assist Government expenditure: apparently the Government is not interested, and this is a typical attitude. To the ordinary person this is a matter of the gravest importance. In the last three or four months I have not been in a shop without hearing a discontented customer, and more so since the £1 a week basic wage increase. The most common comment to be heard in a retail shop today is, "There's nothing much left out of a quid."

Mr. McKee: Many workers have not received the £1 a week rise.

Mr. RYAN: That is true, and many people who are not working have not received the increase. Pensioners have not received it and they are entitled to it. The increase was justified by the Arbitration Commission but what assistance has this Government offered to people on fixed incomes?

Mr. McKee: This Government tried to reduce the basic wage in one instance!

Mr. RYAN: That is true. It tried to put a case before the commission for a reduction of the basic wage. Prices were increasing but the Government wanted the basic wage reduced. It is apparent that action must be taken and the Opposition has submitted the necessary machinery. It seems that Government members are saying that they have no confidence in the personnel of the committee suggested by the Opposition. Government members do not think they would be competent. What would they do? Are not the personnel of the committee that we suggested competent people, as well as being

top executives in this State? Have Government members no trust in these people? It is a sad state of affairs if that is the case. At least we say, without trying to obtain political kudos, that this is absolutely necessary, and if Government members do not face up to their obligations we can say what the answer will be next March, namely, that the people in South Australia will once again record their vote for a particular Party that is prepared to act on behalf of the whole State. They did it last time and they will do it more overwhelmingly on the next occasion, because they realize that if action is necessary, action will be forthcoming from the Opposition, which is the Government of the future. This is the last session of this Parliament; when this session is over we then enter the ring with boxing gloves for the State election in March, 1965.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: I thought the honourable member was going to take them off.

Mr. RYAN: We always fight with the gloves on, and let me say, Mr. Minister, we are never afraid to punch. If Government members want to punch us let them have a go.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: I shall have a try.

Mr. RYAN: The Minister can try whenever he likes. As a matter of fact, I should like to be allowed to have a go at his seat at a by-election tomorrow, and if he wants to bet on T.A.B. he can have that too. If Government members want to hear a case put forward they will certainly be here for many a long day because the Opposition can really put its case on behalf of the amendment as submitted. If we had to sit and listen to the opposition put up by members opposite to our amendment we would have gone home before tea tonight, because what have they said in opposition to it? Absolutely nothing, for they realize they have no case to submit in opposition to it! But ask the public whether it thinks a committee should be set up to investigate increased prices, and I know what the answer would be. Let the public decide and we would soon have the answer.

Mr. Lawn: We ought to have had price control ever since the Premier's promise when he said, "The Government can and will control prices."

Mr. RYAN: Members of the Government opposed a referendum to grant price control to the Commonwealth Government because they said they could do it without any assistance from the Commonwealth. It is satisfying to throw back some of the ridiculous statements that they have made on occasions. According to them the only ridiculous statements are

those from this side of the House but that, of course, is not the case.

This Parliament was elected in 1962. It will dissolve probably towards the end of this year and we will be going out, irrespective of Party, to solicit support and votes and, of course, the Government will be telling everybody what it has done during the life of this Parliament. It is interesting to look back to try to find out what it has done. As a matter of fact, if we cared to find out we might as well adjourn the debate and go home because there could be no further discussion.

Mr. Jennings: It has done much on ADS7.

Mr. RYAN: Yes, it is Wednesday; I wonder what is on television tonight. When we look at tonight's *News* we see the headline, "TV Licence Fee may be £8 soon." If it is going to cost £8 to look at ADS7 at 6.55 p.m. on Wednesdays, I can see a lot of people returning their sets and saying, "It is not worth it." If that is the type of programme we are going to get, people will say that they cannot afford £8 for such rubbish.

Somebody said that the Opposition sets out to play the game of politics. Can anybody say that the Premier does not set out to be political and to play the game of politics on ADS7 every Wednesday night? What is put over then is the greatest rubbish—and I have told the Premier so—that anybody could listen to or watch. The amazing thing is that a couple of weeks ago the Premier took over both commercial television stations in order to make an announcement. I know that Station NWS9 really resented that action. Incidentally, a member of another place is a director of ADS7 and contributes to the station's funds. On that night the Premier also took over all radio stations, and a rumour went around Adelaide that the Premier was going to announce the resignation of the Government and the date of the elections; I heard that rumour three or four times during that afternoon. I asked the Premier whether that was true, but he would not comment. However, he made some nation-rocking statement about a project at Whyalla that was practically completed; the people at Whyalla and in the surrounding districts knew all about the matter for some months previously, and the project was well on the way, yet the Premier took over all wireless stations and both commercial television channels to make this nation-rocking announcement.

Mr. Lawn: Somebody had just told him about it.

Mr. RYAN: How ridiculous, and how political can one get? Yet we are accused of playing

politics! I can tell the Government now that I am elected and paid to play politics, and I am going to earn my remuneration; I make no bones about it.

I now wish to deal with the Governor's Speech in 1962, which was the first Speech after the election in which the Labor Party had been returned with a majority in this State. One would have expected some startling announcements in the Speech that year, because, with all due respect to the Governor, the Speech is only a blueprint of what the Government intends to do. It is about time the public knew some of these things. The Governor does not prepare his own Speech: it is prepared by the Government and handed to the Governor, who becomes the Government's mouthpiece when he reads it on the opening of Parliament in another place. As I say, one would have expected some startling announcements on that occasion, as the Government was a minority one and was trying to play politics in order to retain power instead of handing over to the majority Party at that time. But what do we find? Paragraph 7 of the Speech states:

It is the policy of my Government to develop an expanding, strong and varied economy to ensure full employment, to establish a higher standard of living and improved educational, hospital and other social services. There is nothing wrong with that, but has the Government achieved it? The only thing that has happened over the three years is that the cost of this higher standard of living, and of the education and other social services, has outstripped the standard of living. The Government has reduced the standard of living but the costs have spiralled. Instead of achieving what was promised in 1962, it has reduced the standard of living. Is not the very reason for the amendment submitted by the Opposition that the standard of living has been reduced for the worker and that the proposed committee should meet and report back on the price increases? Paragraph 10 of the Governor's Speech delivered early in 1962 reads:

In pursuance of its policy of developing new industries in various parts of the State and thus providing a measure of decentralization, my Government proposes to create a new department charged with the function of securing new industries and assisting them in their initial stages and generally promoting production within the State of commodities which are now imported.

If this was so important, why was this department introduced in 1963, after nearly two years of the life of the Parliament had elapsed?

Mr. Jennings: Should not this have been introduced within the last 25 years?

Mr. RYAN: Absolutely. This is after the Labor Party had received the majority vote in this State, yet it was not necessary to proceed with it until nearly two years after the announcement was made. We know what happened. Has this had any bearing on the introduction of new industry into this State? The answer is definitely "No". In paragraph 12 of the Speech it was announced:

In the metropolitan area my Government will continue the widening of roads and proposes to construct an additional main road between Adelaide and Glenelg.

That was in 1962; it is now 1964, and it will not be long before it is 1965. There will be an election in 1965. Is not this what happens in this State all the time: promises are made and never fulfilled, and the Premier and his Party hope to goodness that the public will forget that they were ever made? I am going to make a bet—and the member for Angas (Hon. B. H. Teusner) can be in on it if he wants to be.

Mr. Lawn: He is not a betting man.

Mr. RYAN: I shall take a bet that this same proposition will be another promise by the Government in 1965. That is one reason why I am bringing it forward now and predicting that this will be another promise in 1965.

Mr. Jennings: You cannot be too sure about that. Do you mean that it will be part of the present Government's policy?

Mr. RYAN: For the purpose of trying to catch votes, especially in the Glenelg District where they will be absolutely vital. The honourable member knows as well as I do that this will be an election promise again in 1965, in the hope that the Minister of Education will save at least some of the votes that he will otherwise lose next March. Not a thing has been done from 1962 to 1965, yet we are told that this Government carries out its obligations!

Mr. Jennings: How many atomic power stations or deep sea ports have we had?

Mr. RYAN: I think the Premier is creating a deep sea port at Gidgealpa now.

Mr. Lawn: The people at Gidgealpa say they can be given an ocean as good as that at Glenelg if the Premier can suck as well as he can blow!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Port Adelaide.

Mr. RYAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. These matters will be mentioned in 1965, do not worry, because if the Government thinks it can hoodwink the public again it will resurrect them. In paragraph 22 of his 1962 Speech, His Excellency said:

There has been a very rapid growth in population in some areas. One did not need to be a magician to know that. His Excellency continued:

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.

When was Her Majesty's Opposition consulted? The Premier introduced the Bill. Did he consult Her Majesty's Opposition? He could not care less. What was the result of this conference and the consultation with Her Majesty's Opposition? It got the answer it should have got; it got the axe! We know that this will once again be one of the major planks of the Government in 1965. I imagine it will also be mentioned by the Opposition. In common Australian language, our attitude will be fair dinkum, not something rigged by the Government.

Mr. Casey: Public opinion is very strong on this matter.

Mr. RYAN: We are always eager to take up the gauntlet when it is thrown down.

Mr. Casey: But nobody threw it down!

Mr. RYAN: No. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.29 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 6, at 2 p.m.