

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, June 23, 1965.

The SPEAKER (Hon. L. G. Richies) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

WATER CHARGES.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Following the announcement that new charges will be made for rebate water, can the Minister of Works say whether consideration has been given to granting special concessions to new industries establishing in this State, so that they will not suffer unduly as a result of competition from similar industries in other States, where those industries may enjoy lower charges for water used?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I understand the previous Government's practice was to consider applications from such industries and to grant concessions. When the present Government came into office it set up a committee to consider not only the prospects of making services available in a manner that would encourage new industries to establish here but also the practice of searching for such industries, and Mr. Hourigan of the Premier's Department is at present undertaking this work. No special provisions have yet been made, but I assure the House that the Government will do everything possible to encourage industry to come to this State and, if it is necessary to offer concessions to certain industries in regard to water charges, that matter will be seriously considered. I point out that our water charges compare favourably with those applying in the other mainland States, except Victoria. For instance, in Sydney the charge is 3s. for 1,000 gallons of rebate water and 2s. 9d. for excess water; in Brisbane the charge for both rebate water and excess water is 3s. for 1,000 gallons. I assure the Leader that the Government will lose no opportunity in obtaining industries and will grant concessions where they are warranted.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As the Minister has indicated, it was the practice of the previous Government to grant concessions to industry, but so far as my memory serves me those concessions were granted as a result of arrangements made many years ago and were extant to this date. I am not aware that any concessions have been necessary under the previous prices for water; in other words, we have not entered into new agreements with

industry in recent years as our water charges have made such special concessions unnecessary. The Minister has said that the Government will grant concessions where they appear essential to attract new industries to this State. However, the increased charges will apply to existing industries, which are already in very keen competition to maintain their activities. Will the Minister say whether the Government has considered what effect these increased charges will have on existing industries that are big users of water?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I assure the honourable member that this was the subject of much discussion and that after long deliberation we concluded that our charges were still competitive with those in other States.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was (as everyone in South Australia was) interested in the announcement last week by the Minister of Works about the increase in the price of water. This afternoon, I have been interested to listen to the answers to questions on this important topic. Can the Minister assure the House and the public that householders will not have to pay an even higher price for water following a general re-assessment of properties in the metropolitan area and the rest of the State?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: This is a large order, because re-assessments do occur and have to occur periodically. If I answer the question "No"—

Mr. Millhouse: As I hope you will.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS:—I would be saying that this would be the position for all time, and that is something I should not do. I assure the honourable member that the chief purpose in taking this action is to try to save water. The honourable member's guess is as good as mine about what will happen in regard to re-assessments in the future, because every Government finds that they must be made periodically, and no-one knows whether charges will be increased or not when that happens. Beyond that, I cannot say anything at this stage.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Many market gardeners grow, in the main, carrots and cauliflowers in my district; indeed, I believe most of the metropolitan area's carrot requirements are supplied by the growers in the Barossa Valley. Can the Minister of Works say whether the Government has considered what effect the increased water charges may have on this important section of the primary producing community?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Requests have been received from people using water for

gardening purposes. To supply water from a reticulated system for irrigation purposes has, in fact, been discouraged by the department over the years.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: It wasn't during the war years.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I cannot go back as far as that, but it has not been encouraged in recent years, and it creates a problem. If one looks at the percentage of water used in various areas one finds that in the city only 3 per cent of the consumers use excess water; in the metropolitan area the figure is 30 per cent; and in country towns 35 per cent. However, it is 45 per cent in respect of country lands. If it were not for the market gardeners this latter percentage would be substantially reduced. I am currently examining a number of applications from market gardeners, but I think I should be honest and say that I hold out no hope of their getting concessions. Previous Governments (and wisely so) established irrigation areas and market gardeners will have to move to those areas or pay the prices charged other people. I regret the position, but that is how it is.

GLENELG NORTH RATING.

Mr. BROOMHILL: Residents of Glenelg North have informed me that an approach has been made to the Minister of Works with a view to having removed the existing payment of excess rating in sub-area No. 3. Can the Minister say what consideration has been given this matter?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I received correspondence from both the honourable member and the progress association about this area and, after the matter had been considered by the Director and Engineer-in-Chief of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, it was decided that the time had arrived when we could relieve these people of the additional charges. I am sure the honourable member will be pleased to know that they will in future pay only the ordinary rate.

PARLIAMENTARY VISIT TO FAR NORTH.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Has the Premier a reply to a question I asked yesterday about a possible trip to drought-stricken areas in the North and North-East of the State?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: As the Minister of Lands has already notified me that, accompanied by the honourable member for the district and the Chairman of the Pastoral Board, he will be making a comprehensive tour of the Far North-East and Far North-West early

in July, I will await a report from the Minister of Lands on conditions in these areas and notify the honourable member accordingly.

RENA-WARE.

Mr. LAWN: Representations have been made to me on behalf of a widow (this is about the second or third case brought to my attention this year) concerning a firm called Rena-Ware, of Broadway, Sydney, New South Wales, which has an agent going around to persons here, getting them to agree to purchase £90 worth of saucepans, and assuring the purchasers that they have three months in which to cancel the order if they decide not to continue with it. Recently, Mrs. Lodge, the agent for Rena-Ware, called on an elderly widow at Glandore and not only signed her up for £90 worth of saucepans but accepted £19 19s. 6d. deposit, on the understanding that the lady had 90 days in which to cancel the order. Immediately the lady awoke next morning, she realized that she had made a mistake. She telephoned the local people, who said that they had already sent her order to Sydney and she would have to take it up from there. Her first letter to Sydney, dated May 4, stated:

I am writing to explain my position with regard to a deposit of £19 19s. 6d. which was paid by me last night to your representative, Mrs. Lodge, who called to advertise your cooking Rena-Ware. I have recently been widowed and explained to your representative that it would take a considerable time to settle my financial affairs, and I did not think I could possibly afford the articles. However, Mrs. Lodge assured me that a period of three months would be allowed for me to withdraw the tentative order.

After your representative left I considered the matter carefully and telephoned your South Australian district office, Clovelly Park, first thing this morning to cancel the tentative order before it had been dealt with by the office. However, I was informed by your office that your representative was not there at the time but my message would be passed to her. This afternoon Mrs. Lodge called on me and I again definitely informed her that I am unable to confirm the order due to my circumstances.

Mrs. Lodge informed me that the order had already been posted to Sydney and the matter would have to be dealt with by you for refund, but she said she would speak to the manager, Mr. Davies, who might contact you in the matter. However, I also am now placing my position before you and trust that due to the circumstances I have explained you would kindly refund my deposit.

This lady wrote another letter. Acting on her behalf, a prominent city businessman, well-known to several honourable members opposite, wrote a letter to Sydney. In each instance a

letter was received signed by a Miss L. A. Steele (not an officer of the company) and, briefly, one letter from Miss Steele states:

We regret that we are unable to refund Mrs. Bennett's deposit: however, we will explain the legal position for you. Mrs. Bennett's order, which she signed on May 3, was an irrevocable order to purchase and this was clearly stated in the written conditions. The written conditions are in fairly small type, as one can see. I myself had difficulty in reading them, even with glasses, and a person with failing sight would find them extremely difficult to read. Will the Attorney-General have this matter examined to see whether action can be taken to restrain this company from making the misrepresentations that it evidently is making when it tells purchasers that they can cancel their orders within 90 days, at the same time saying that, when signed, such orders are irrevocable and cannot be cancelled?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will have the matter examined. I think this case comes into that class of case where it is difficult to establish objectively in law exactly who said what at the door when a door-to-door salesman came around. I said in the House yesterday that I was examining the Western Australian legislation that gives general protection to householders in respect of contracts made with door-to-door salesmen. I think we already have some legislation but it is restricted to book salesmen. If it is found possible to bring in legislation of the Western Australian kind, that might cover the class of case to which the honourable member refers.

NUCLEAR POWER.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Recently I received from the British Information Service the text of a statement by Mr. F. Lee (the British Minister of Power) on the British nuclear power programme. A section of the statement is headed "Cheap Power From the Atom". In the statement the Minister says that the advanced gas-cooled reactor (A.G.R. system) will be used at the new Dungeness station to start in 1970. Estimates made indicate that the cost of a unit (1 kilowatt hour) appears to be about .56d., or lower than the "break-even" figure, which is roughly .63d. a unit. This new station is now obviously able to undercut modern coal-fired stations coming into service about the same time in 1970. Has the Minister of Works seen this statement and, if not, will he examine it and, if necessary, draw the attention of the Electricity Trust to it to see whether it considers that this type of station would have

any application here in respect of the construction of the new Torrens Island power station?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I have not seen the statement, though probably I should have. The Electricity Trust authorities are ever searching for ways and means of reducing fuel costs in order that the trust may be able not only to retain the low charge for fuel but also, if possible, to reduce in a manner that will encourage industries to come to South Australia. I assure the honourable member that I will examine this article and refer it to the trust in case officers there have not seen it, and I will ask for the trust's report on it.

INDUSTRIAL ACCIDENTS.

Mr. CASEY: I am rather concerned to learn that over the past few months at Gidgealpa one man has been killed, another has had his leg broken, and another has sustained a broken foot, and that these accidents happened whilst the men were on the drilling rig or close to it. Can the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Labour and Industry, say whether the construction company engaged on drilling at Gidgealpa is subject to safety regulations under the appropriate Act and, if it is not, will the Minister take up this matter with his colleague to ensure that the necessary steps are taken to properly protect employees on all drilling rigs against unnecessary risks?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I cannot answer the questions in full, but I am sure that the Minister of Mines and the Leader of the Opposition will agree with me that all precautions are taken by the company to ensure the greatest degree of safety. I should state that because of observations that I have made. However, I shall take up the matter with my colleague and let the honourable member know the outcome.

LOW-DEPOSIT HOUSES.

Mrs. STEELE: I understand that the Minister of Housing has a reply to my question of June 15 concerning the construction cost of £50-deposit houses.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The average building cost (that is all costs other than land and road construction cost) is about £3,300 a house.

LIAISON OFFICER.

Mr. HURST: In the past it has been found that the Public Buildings Department has worked on Education Department buildings without a proper consultation having taken place

between the two departments. Consequently, after some jobs are completed they are found to be most unsatisfactory, and additional expense by the Education Department is involved in doing other work on them. Last year the Seaton Boys Technical High School had an area of about $3\frac{1}{2}$ acres to be beautified. Water had to be reticulated, and the Public Buildings Department put down 1in. and $\frac{3}{4}$ in. pipes with $\frac{1}{2}$ in. taps. However, these were unsatisfactory, and I understand the department intends now to put in a 2in. pipe with 1in. taps in order to reticulate this area. Will the Minister of Works confer with the Minister of Education about the appointment of a liaison officer between the two departments to ensure that work is carried out effectively and efficiently, and to avoid an unnecessary waste of public money?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I notice that the honourable member referred to an incident of some 12 months ago. I inform him that I have spoken to the Minister of Education about proper liaison between my department and the Education Department, and I am pleased to report that the Education Department is happy with the present arrangement. The Minister assures me that the liaison is most satisfactory and he believes that nothing more can be done to improve the already satisfactory position. In the circumstances, I cannot undertake to create additional liaison.

HAIRDRESSING SCHOOL.

Mr. COUMBE: I understand that some time ago a block of land in Barton Terrace, North Adelaide, situated between the Ru Rua Hospital and the Caledonian Hotel, was purchased as a possible site for a hairdressing trade school. Can the Minister of Education say whether that is so? If it is, has his department any plans and can he name the likely date for the erection of the school?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I will get the information for the honourable member.

RENMARK AVENUE.

Mr. CURREN: My question deals with the Sturt Highway in Renmark Avenue from the railway crossing to Salt Creek bridge, which is a particularly narrow and dangerous section of the highway. I mentioned the matter to the Minister of Roads some time ago. Has the Minister of Education a report on the proposition that I put to the Minister?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: My colleague has reported that an amount of £50,000 has been allowed in the Budget for 1965-66 for reconstruction of the Renmark Avenue section

of the Sturt Highway from the railway crossing to the distillery bridge. Plans are well in hand and land acquisition is in progress. The Corporation of Renmark will carry out the construction, commencing in July, 1965. The work will involve the removal of 450 trees. Trees will be planted on each side of the new 24ft. bitumen road in the centre of the reserve at a later date.

PENOLA AND KALANGADOO SEWERAGE.

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Works say what plans his department has for the provision of sewerage services for the important towns of Penola and Kalangadoo?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Consideration has been given to the provision of sewerage services at a number of country towns. An investigating committee, consisting of very worthy people, whose names I cannot recall (but I can supply them in private), and under the chairmanship of Mr. J. W. Murrell makes recommendations on these matters. At this stage I am unable to say whether the towns referred to by the honourable member have been considered, but I will call for a report and get a considered reply.

BLACK FOREST HOUSE.

Mr. LANGLEY: Several of my constituents living in Forest Avenue, Black Forest, have recently complained of vandalism at a house on land owned by the Education Department. As this house has been empty for some time, will the Minister of Education see if something can be done? Could the house be moved or could a fence be provided on the site until the land is required? Further, can the Minister indicate the purpose for which the land is required?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to have that matter investigated and give the honourable member a full answer to his question.

KIMBA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of yesterday concerning the intake of water at Kimba?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: An intake of 600,000 gallons has occurred in the Kimba area.

SERVICE PAY.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Yesterday the Premier, in reply to the Leader of the Opposition on the question of service pay, said *inter alia*:

I know some people are not satisfied with what has been done under this policy and that anomalies will occur. It is Government policy that such persons receiving salaries

should approach the appropriate tribunal to have the matter adjusted. The Government will not make suggestions to salaried officers about service pay, as this matter was never mentioned in our policy. I believe that there are competent people among the salaried officers' group who should know to which tribunal an approach should be made. After these matters have been considered and there are failures somewhere along the line we are prepared to consider what we think will be fair play in this matter.

As I believe, rightly or wrongly, that some tribunals have no jurisdiction to deal with this matter, will the Premier say whether the Government intends to leave it to the people concerned to approach the tribunals, even if they have no power in the matter?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall have to consult my colleague, the Minister of Labour and Industry, and obtain a report on the matter.

EQUAL PAY.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: In the Australian Labor Party policy speech reference was made to the matter of equal pay for equal work. Can the Minister of Education say whether it is Government policy to provide equal pay for men and women teachers in the Education Department?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: This matter will be dealt with in the general context of equal pay for equal work, and I think I am right in saying that the Premier has already made a public statement on the matter.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The mention of public statements has always been a matter of some controversy in this House. I have no objection to Ministers making public statements outside the House on any matters of public concern, but I believe that if questions are asked here the House should be told what the statements are; merely to say that at some place someone has made a statement does not, in my opinion, give an answer to the question. Will the Minister of Education repeat the statement made about equal pay for equal work in the Education Department?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I do not intend to attempt to repeat the statement that has been made, because I have not got a copy of it, and I do not know it from memory. If the Leader wants any more information regarding my department I inform him that it has not yet specifically considered the matter.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Can the Minister say when Cabinet will consider this aspect of declared A.L.P. policy?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I cannot give the honourable member a specific answer to that question, but he must know that this is largely a matter for industrial tribunals. So far as Cabinet is concerned, I cannot inform him when the matter will be discussed.

BALAKLAVA HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. HALL: Over the last few years endeavours have been made by the Balaklava High School Council to initiate the purchase of additional land adjacent to the high school for the future recreational purposes of the school. The acquisition of this land would tie in with the general development of playing fields, and the possible influence on primary school recreational areas, too. Parents and local people actively associated with the school are keen to have this land acquired while it is still available. However, a difficulty has arisen because the land under consideration is held and owned by an estate, the affairs of which are administered from England, and a long time has elapsed since there has been any news about the matter. We have been told in the past that proceedings are going ahead according to schedule, but I would appreciate it if the Minister of Education would obtain a progress report on the present state of affairs. Will he obtain a report?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to get an up-to-date report for the honourable member.

SPEECH AND HEARING THERAPY.

Mrs. STEELE: Can the Minister of Education say whether the Education Department intends to establish a speech and hearing centre at Elizabeth, as many children suffering from hearing losses reside in the area? If that is so, can the Minister inform me when the class is likely to commence? In asking this question, I assure the honourable member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) that I have no designs on his district but merely ask it in the interests of deaf children, many of whom are travelling to the city daily to attend special schools.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to get the information for the honourable member.

WATER SUPPLY COSTS.

Mr. CLARK: Can the Minister of Works give the House the actual cost of water supplied in the major reservoir districts?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The latest report that I have is to the effect that for

the year ended June 30, 1964, whereas the Adelaide water district showed a surplus of about £163,000, the deficit in country water districts totalled £1,967,000. This further information may be of interest to the honourable member. The actual cost to the department of water supplied in the major districts for 1963-64 was:

	Per 1,000 gallons.
	s. d.
Adelaide	2 10.4
Barossa	5 2.2
Beetaloo	8 10.3
Tod River	16 10.4
Warren	9 3.6
Country (average)	6 1.8

PORT LINCOLN SCHOOL CANTEEN.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Last night I was asked by the chairman of the high school council at Port Lincoln to seek information of the Minister of Works. The Parents and Friends Association has raised funds, which have been approved for subsidy by his colleague, the Minister of Education, for the purpose of building a school canteen. The contractor is ready to commence building the canteen. The bricks are on site but so far the council has not been able to obtain a clear instruction as to where the canteen is to be located. As the Minister knows, plans and specifications are being drawn for the new high school at Port Lincoln, but the canteen will be a separate building. The high school council suggested that the canteen should be in a certain position with access to drainage, sewerage and everything necessary. The Public Buildings Department, I think through the Education Department, advised the council that this was not a satisfactory site and suggested two other sites, each of which is occupied by some other building or obstruction. The council, therefore, asked me if I would ask the Minister to investigate this matter. Possibly the misunderstanding (I say "possibly") has arisen because over the years a number of site lay-outs has been proposed for the Port Lincoln High School new building and it is possible that somebody picked up an old plan and suggested a site that may have appeared to be quite satisfactory on an old plan but which is not in accord with the new site plans that have more recently been developed. However, whatever the position, will the Minister, as a matter of some urgency, seek to clarify this position so that the high school council can be informed at the earliest possible date where this canteen will be located?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Let me at the outset express regret for the delay referred to by the honourable member. I am sure that both my colleague and I deeply appreciate the work done by school councils and committees. Accordingly, I shall take steps to have this matter finalized in the shortest possible time.

SHEPHERDS HILL ROAD.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: During the last many months part of Shepherds Hill Road in my district at Blackwood has been under reconstruction. The constructing authority is the Mitcham council but a high proportion of the money is being found by the Highways Department. There has been much delay which has caused great inconvenience and irritation and, on inquiry, I have been informed that one of the main reasons for the delay is that the Highways Department has not yet completed negotiations for the acquisition of land required for the road widening at various points along the part of the road to be widened. Will the Minister of Education seek a report from his colleague, the Minister of Roads, to ascertain whether this is so and, if it is, will he ascertain whether something cannot be done to complete the negotiations on the land soon so that the work can be speedily concluded?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes, I shall be pleased to get that report from my colleague.

ROAD CONSTRUCTION.

Mr. HURST: The Woodville council has informed me that work is being held up on the western side of Sansom Road between Bower Road and Dunstone Road in reconstruction of roads and construction of kerbing, guttering and concrete footpaths. The surface drainage from these areas gravitates to Sansom Road and it is understood that the Housing Trust, when developing the area, will make provision for underground stormwater drainage on Sansom Road. This will take the water from the various streets to the west of Sansom Road. It seems to the council that it is economically unwise for it to proceed to construct the stormwater drain in Sansom Road in view of the plans of the Housing Trust. The council may not work in with the ultimate plans of the Housing Trust and many pounds of the ratepayers' money could be wasted in this work. Can the Minister of Works inform me when the Greater Port Adelaide Scheme within the Corporation of the City of Woodville, being south of Bower Road, Semaphore Park, will be implemented?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The honourable member will appreciate that the whole question of this area has been the subject of consideration by the Public Works Committee and only recently has a report been tabled. Therefore, I should be surprised if any planning had been done to date in regard to this matter. Nevertheless, I will raise the matter with the appropriate authorities and obtain a report for the honourable member.

SAVINGS BANK LOANS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: During the discussion before going into Committee on the Supplementary Estimates, the question of Savings Bank loans for applicants under the Homes Act was debated and I understand that the Treasurer has been good enough to obtain a report for me on this matter. Will he now make it available?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The following schedule compares the number of Homes Act loans from the Savings Bank with the total number of housing loans made year by year:

	Homes Act.	Total.	Percentage Homes Act.
1958-59 . . .	593	1,884	31%
1959-60 . . .	1,359	2,138	64%
1960-61 . . .	1,153	1,858	62%
1961-62 . . .	1,098	2,009	55%
1962-63 . . .	891	2,150	41%
1963-64 . . .	502	2,306	22%
1964-65 . . .	193	2,241	9%

(11 months)

Prior to 1963 the bank as a matter of policy lent only up to 75 per cent of its own valuation, and that valuation was rather conservative. Accordingly in order to lend the required amounts to persons of modest means in about three cases out of five a guarantee under the Homes Act was sought. It had become very clear to the bank by that time that there was really no great necessity for the bank to seek guarantees in considerable volume for in only one case in the whole history of the Homes Act has the guarantee been called upon.

In 1963 the bank decided to raise the proportion of valuation for which it would lend without guarantee from 75 per cent to 85 per cent and since then has taken a rather less conservative approach in making the valuations. I would emphasize that the bank is at present lending more money to more people than ever before, and it is lending more than any other bank or institution in the State. In 1964-65 its loans will be about 2,450 in number and about £8,250,000 in amount. The great majority of those loans are still, as formerly, to persons of modest means. Nearly two years ago the bank was forced, in order

to stop transfer of deposits to other banks, to give some preference in reduced waiting time to customers requiring housing and who had been fairly substantial depositors in the past. However, it has continued without any increase in real income standards its policy of lending in very considerable volume to persons of modest means to encourage them to buy their own homes. At the present time out of 200 loans approved each month at least 125 come from the ordinary waiting list of people of modest means and with only quite small bank deposits.

Whilst the bank now finds it necessary to seek Homes Act guarantees in a relatively small number of cases, it will invariably make the loan under the Homes Act guarantee if to do so will make the applicant eligible for finance to a greater extent than could be provided otherwise. I am assured that no applicant is being refused any benefit of a Homes Act loan by the change in policy. It is worthy of note that in addition to its lending for home purchase the Savings Bank lends directly to the South Australian Housing Trust about £1,000,000 a year for its construction of houses, which likewise are substantially for rental or sale to persons of modest means.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on the motion for adoption.

(Continued from June 22. Page 477.)

The Hon. T. C. STOTT (Ridley): Mr. Acting Speaker, I was trying to recall the number of speeches I have made on the Address in Reply debate, but that has evaded me for the moment. However, I adopt these lines from *Through the Looking Glass*:

The time has come, the Walrus said,
To talk of many things:
Of shoes—and ships—and sealing wax—
Of cabbages—and kings—
And why the sea is boiling hot—
And whether pigs have wings.

Mr. Clark: You are not going through all that?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: You never know where I may get to before I finish!

Mr. Clark: We know that.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I have heard so many speeches in this Chamber that I have wondered what sort of land I was in or what sort of land we were approaching. First, I say that I regret very much the passing of former members of this Chamber and of another place whom we had learned to respect. The late Hon. Mr. Bardolph had an amazing

record of industrial relationships and did a great job. The late Mr. Jim Corcoran was a man whom we learned to respect and admire a great deal and I am sure that it must be pleasing for his son to follow in his footsteps by representing the same district in this Chamber. I believe that is a unique situation, and it is indeed a great achievement for any family to be represented in this Chamber by one of its members and to be followed by that person's son (in this case a very efficient man).

I regret also the passing of Mr. Harold Tapping, a sincere and lovable character with a most efficient manner. I also pay my respects to the late Mr. George Whittle, the member for Prospect from March 19, 1938, until 1944, and then for a later period from March 8, 1947, until 1953. A forceful debater, he also took a great interest in civic life and was a member of the Prospect City Council for a long time. He took a great interest in charitable organizations, too, and throughout his lifetime proved to be a valuable citizen of this State.

I congratulate the new members on their election to this House; they have certainly caused a fresh breeze to blow through this Chamber, and have brought with them fresh ideas. Whether those ideas will be given effect to, however, remains to be seen, for having been a member of this Chamber for 32 years (and having had public experience in many walks of life before that), I soon became disillusioned. I, too, had an enthusiastic approach to many similar problems confronting the new members; I thought that all I had to do was to get Parliament to act, and that a miracle would happen. However, I believe that the proper way to approach these matters is for a member to do his best and always to put his questions to the House. One eventually realizes that the kernel of the whole situation is that finance is government and government is finance. If the necessary finance cannot be raised to give effect to one's theories, one becomes disillusioned and frustrated.

True, I have often been frustrated on projects I have put before the House, for the necessary finance was never available to implement them. Some of the new members, including the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson), may become disillusioned, too. Later, when the member for Glenelg has gathered more maturity and experience in this Chamber, I am sure he will make a valuable contribution as a result of his knowledge of economic affairs, to the benefit of this Parliament, and I look forward to that with interest. However, as a frustrated old campaigner I issue a friendly

warning that plans are seldom realized merely by a man's becoming a member of Parliament.

I believe the main reason for a State Government's inability to raise the necessary finance originated in 1927 when the Bruce-Page Commonwealth Government put into effect the financial agreement (later amended in 1944), which prevents any State Government, a party to that agreement, from raising as much as one penny by way of grant or loan, unless it is approved by the Loan Council. So, when the Premiers assemble at this august body, state their programmes, say what they want and what formula they should follow, and mention the betterment factor and the increase in population, they find that the formula lays down that the States are able to borrow £X million, and so the formula is followed. Notwithstanding that honourable members have come to this place with much enthusiasm and exuberance to get things done on behalf of the people they represent, in the final analysis whether these things can be done is determined around the Loan Council table. We must learn that, and this Parliament will find it out, probably with much disappointment, as it progresses.

I wish first to deal with a matter which I think will have to come to this place and be debated and which has had much publicity in the press recently: the placing of a fountain in the middle of King William Street. As most honourable members know, I have had the honour, privilege and extreme pleasure of visting many capital cities through the world, including Berlin, Stockholm, Rome, San Francisco and New York, where I have seen fountains in play. They are magnificent; they add scenic beauty. Nobody will deny that fountains are lovely things to behold. They are magnificent spectacles, particularly for old people, middle-aged people and children, and even busy people can relax for a moment or two by looking at them. They have even inspired poets and song-writers, and a song entitled *Three Coins in the Fountain* has been written. I do not intend to sing this song to members or to get oratorical.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Lawn): Singing is not allowed in the House.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Thank you, Sir! I realize that. I thought someone would say, "Don't make us go through that." I am perturbed at this proposal. When I visited the cities I mentioned, I noted their traffic problems. It seems to me that, notwithstanding that some matters relating to the fountain have been well thought out, traffic will be

forced around Victoria Square into a bottleneck, because there will be a diagonal strip around the fountain connecting with Wakefield Street on one side and Grote Street on the other. If members go to the western or eastern side of Victoria Square now, they will see that at peak hours traffic has a job to get through. What will happen if we drive the traffic that now flows down King William Street to the two bottlenecks at Wakefield Street and Grote Street? No matter in what direction honourable members travel now—north, south, east or west—in peak-hour traffic they will know that metropolitan traffic (not only that in the square mile of the city) is increasing every month. On the Anzac Highway, which I use each morning and night, traffic is bumper to bumper, and the same applies on main roads all over the metropolitan area.

I ask members to visualize the increase in population that will occur, together with the increasing number of motor registrations. If members will pause and visualize a graph they will realize that we shall have a much more difficult problem in five or 10 years than we have now. So what will happen to our main thoroughfare, King William Street, in five years' time with the increase in motor traffic? It appears that the Adelaide City Council (I say this with the greatest respect to our City Fathers, whom I greatly admire) has not done enough quickly enough to relieve this traffic problem in the city of Adelaide, over which it has jurisdiction. It is certainly doing something about providing car parks to alleviate the problem, but it is nowhere near sufficient when we think of the future increase in road traffic. The council has taken far too long in trying to help the motorists and the city business people who want to attract people to their shops.

In other words, the City Council appears to me to have adopted the reverse policy of driving the motorist out of the city, for parking meters are likely to be placed in Dequetteville Terrace. The present tendency is for the motorist who invests in a motor car costing from £1,000 to £2,000 to get out of his car on the outskirts of the square mile and travel by public transport the rest of the distance into the city. So parking meters will be put in Dequetteville Terrace and farther out in North Adelaide and to the south of Adelaide. In this way we drive the motorist farther out. What will be the position in five or 10 years' time? The average motorist is a fairly well-to-do citizen; often he is also a businessman.

Many of these people have invested in private transport, mainly for the purpose of getting to work but also in order to take their families for a week-end drive through the seaside resorts or the hills, to get out into the fresh air with their families. What happens on Sunday afternoon? We drive down South Road bumper to bumper. This applies also to the roads leading north and, as road traffic increases, so it will become a great hazard to even drive one's family on the roads in the future. So the businessman who looks at economics as a first recipe for his success will think twice whether it is worth while investing £1,500 or £2,000 in a motor car when he is to be forced to use public transport to get to his place of business.

In my view, it will mean a fall in the purchases of motor cars, with a consequent effect on employment in the motor manufacturing industry in South Australia, which has always been regarded as one of our greatest assets. Has the City Council looked at this problem from that point of view? I doubt it very much. This will have a serious economic effect upon the future of South Australia, so I regard this question with much worry and apprehension. I hope that, when this matter is considered in this House, the members and the responsible Minister, who will probably have the final say whether this fountain will go where it is proposed, right in the middle of King William Street, will examine this question again, because I believe the present proposal is premature. I would rather the council spent much less money than £100,000 or £200,000 on one fountain, which would create a bottleneck for traffic, and provided smaller fountains somewhere else and the motorists with adequate parking facilities to enable them to get to their place of business, having regard to the economics of the important motor industry in this State.

There are other problems for the City Council to look at apart from doing something for the motoring public, many of whom pay tremendous rates to the City Council. These problems include the provision of adequate highways to enable motor traffic to travel through to the suburbs. That part of Frome Road which is to go through the southern part of the city is not completed. It should have been completed to South Terrace before the fountain project was proceeded with. Another case is that of the Morphett Street bridge, the planning of which has now reached somewhere close to its final stages. When completed, it will create another north-south highway and allow

an alternative flow of through traffic. As the motor traffic increases it will be found that the thoroughfares of Frome Road, that of King William Street and that over Morphett Street bridge to South Terrace will not be adequate to cope with the present rate of increase of motor cars. I believe that we will have to consider another highway from the Newmarket Hotel corner in West Terrace, over the Torrens River to connect with the northern highways.

These projects will cost a great sum. All these matters depend on the availability of Loan money. However, the Adelaide City Council is prepared to spend up to £100,000 (and I believe the sum will eventually be £200,000) on a project that will only cause a bottleneck to traffic in the long run. Would it not be better for the council to spend this £200,000 in completing the two thoroughfares through the City of Adelaide and so enable a free flow of traffic? I believe that it is better to help the flow of traffic before adding to the aesthetic beauty of the city, as that can be done at some future date. I think that the building of a fountain in this position is premature.

I have been asked to explain the barley stabilization scheme which has been prepared by the Australian Wheatgrowers Federation and which concerns many primary producers in South Australia. The scheme has been placed before the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry (Hon. C. F. Adermann) and he in turn placed it before the Australian Agricultural Council at its last meeting. This body referred it back to the Standing Committee on Agriculture (made up of Directors of Agriculture in each State) for its consideration. It is considering the scheme, which will now be re-submitted and considered at the next meeting of the Agricultural Council, which I understand will be held in Adelaide in July. On January 22 last, this plan was ratified by all the States affiliated with the Australian Wheatgrowers Federation and it was submitted to the Minister at that stage. The plan states:

The Barley Committee of the Wheatgrowers Federation unanimously agrees with the principle of the barley stabilization and that the following points be the basis for the drafting of a barley stabilization plan:

- (1) That an Australian Barley Board should be created to market all barley crops grown on the mainland, Tasmania to be included when it enters the export market.
- (2) (a) A home consumption fair average price for barley will be established each year for the milling grade; and

- (b) the basic price to be related to the guaranteed price for wheat in the respective season. This will vary each season according to changes in the price of wheat under the Wheat Stabilization Plan.

That point needs explanation. It means that for some years past when we were determining the new average price for wheat each year (and as many honourable members know I represent the wheatgrowers on the Wheat Index Costing Committee) it has been related to determining the home price for barley. We take five-sixths of the wheat cost and make it the barley price. It is intended that that should be continued under this proposal of determining the basic price. Every five years the wheat stabilization plan has to be renewed, but before it is, a field survey is undertaken by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics at Canberra. It makes recommendations, and the Wheat Index Committee considers the findings and alters or amends them as it thinks fit. That price then becomes the base price for the next five years of the plan. Every year the committee meets and ascertains the movements from the base price, that is, whether wages and other items—petrol, diesel oil, super-phosphate, bags, interest rate, etc.—have risen or fallen. It obtains the wage figures from the Arbitration Court, and all these items are considered carefully. The price is varied upward or downward according to the annual movement, and consequently that becomes a yearly figure, taking effect on December 1 each year. It is intended that the barley scheme will work in the same way. The plan continues:

- (3) The Commonwealth to guarantee a return equal to the F.A.Q. price for the quantity exported up to 35,000,000 bushels for each season's crop.
- (4) A stabilization fund to be established by a levy of barley exports: (a) the levy to take up to the first shilling a bushel above the home consumption price for milling grade, after adjustment for freight advantage secured by a particular State has been allowed for.

That takes care of Western Australia. It can be justifiably argued that it has an advantage because of its nearness to traditional and other oversea markets. If Western Australian barley growers come in, they would not have a disadvantage that they could turn to an advantage because of sales through their State Barley Board. The plan continues:

- (b) The fund to have a ceiling of £7,000,000 with any excess refunded to the growers in the oldest contributing pool.

(c) Any balance in the fund to be carried on to the following plan.

- (5) Pooling: proceeds of each crop to be pooled; with payments based on the actual return received from the sale of each grade after making allowances for quality. The plan to operate for the same period as the Wheat Stabilization Plan.

Membership: The board to include two grower members from each State; a Malsters' representative, a finance member and a chairman. Grower members to be elected by a poll of growers in their State; the Maltsters to nominate their representative; the finance member and the chairman are to be appointed by the Minister. The term of office to be three years.

Finance: The Commonwealth Minister to arrange for the finances of the board to be done through the Commonwealth Reserve Bank.

Licensed Receivers: The board will have power to appoint licensed receivers in each State. The Australian Barley Marketing Board to have some oversight of the operation of licensed receivers to ensure that barley is properly received and cared for.

The plan is to be submitted to a ballot of growers in each State to be decided by a simple majority in each State of the valid votes cast. In preparing a roll of barley growers the committee is prepared to accept similar principles already in existence for the preparation of wheat growers' rolls.

In the matter of the declaration in connection with home consumption price, November 1 is taken because, as honourable members know, barley is harvested a little earlier than wheat. Deliberately I brought up this question this afternoon, because, naturally, the Minister of Agriculture—

Mrs. STEELE: Mr. Acting Speaker, I draw your attention to the State of the House.

A quorum having been formed,

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I thank the honourable member for Burnside. No doubt she realizes that the matters I am mentioning are so important that honourable members should come and listen to what I am saying. I was about to say that the Minister of Agriculture will have the job of administering this particular proposal in South Australia, if it is approved, and deliberately I raise the matter this afternoon because the Agricultural Council will meet early in July. The Minister will be acquainted with the proposal. He has already been approached about it, but I raise it here this afternoon so that honourable members will be aware of the progress that has been made. I emphasize that the proposal has met with the approval of

the affiliated growers' organizations. It has taken a long time to reach that stage and the matter is now before the Agricultural Council for reconsideration when it meets. If the Minister comes to this House at a later stage on the question of barley stabilization plans, honourable members will know the background and the attitude of growers' organizations. They will not be taken by surprise.

One or two honourable members mentioned to me another matter that is receiving much press publicity at the moment, and that is the reserve minimum price plan for wool. I cannot in the time available go to the extent to which the Chairman of the Australian Wool Board (Sir William Gunn) has gone in dealing with this plan, but I propose to lay down a few principles for the benefit of honourable members, particularly those in rural areas, because they may be asked some questions about it by constituents. There will be a referendum of growers on it, and I assure honourable members of the great interest in the question, not only on the part of the wool-growers who are vitally concerned, but also on the part of the many other businesses involved in the marketing of wool.

Mr. Jennings: It is a very good proposal.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: It is possible only to lay down general objectives for guidance in determining a reserve price, rather than to lay down a precise formula, for no such formula would suit the market conditions that might apply from time to time. However, the general policy for determining the reserve price agreed on by parties to the 1951 Post-Joint Organization plan is commendable in regard to the fixing of the initial reserve price and to the setting of subsequent reserve prices. This policy was briefly as follows:

(a) In a market where prices are high there would be a wide margin between market prices and reserve prices. (b) In a market where wool prices are not unduly high or unduly low in relation to general price levels the margin between market prices and reserve prices would be more moderate, the objective being to stiffen the resistance against a possible fall in the market, whilst leaving adequate flexibility for general market conditions to operate. (c) In a period of low market prices reserve prices would be set at a level close to those prices. In such conditions the objective would be to offer still greater resistance to any downward trend. In determining the reserve price in each of these situations it would be necessary to have regard to the criteria recommended by the Executive of the Wool Industry Conference, plus other additional criteria and guiding principles.

The Wool Industry Conference comprises wool-grower representatives of the Australian

Graziers Council and the Australian meat and wool producers' organization. There are 25 from each side, and those gentlemen are elected by the respective affiliated organizations throughout the Commonwealth. They are all woolgrowers, and consequently they have now appointed an executive, which has just laid down these principles. Today in Sydney it is significant (and probably a coincidence) that the question of whether this reserve price plan, as laid down by the Australian Wool Board and the executive, will now be discussed (perhaps at this very hour) as to whether this plan is approved or not. My information this morning is that it will be carried by a large majority at the Wool Industry Conference. Woolgrowers representing both the large pastoralists' organizations and the organizations of the smaller growers are members of that body. The Chairman, of course, of the Wool Industry Conference is Professor Melville, who is well known in South Australia because of his work at the Waite Research Institute. As Chairman of that conference, he is independent and impartial, and consequently I believe that every honourable member in this Chamber would approve his appointment. He is already doing a great job, and he has the confidence of the representatives at that conference. The executive has set out for consideration and approval the following:

(a) The average reserve price should be set at such a level that, except in exceptional circumstances, it will not be likely to lead to heavy buying-in of wool. (b) On the other hand, it should not be fixed so low that the authority is not required to operate even in periods of depressed prices. Such a reserve price would have no practical value. (c) Once the reserve price is fixed it should not be changed during a season.

Some people disagree with that theory, because they say it has some effects that may not yet be known, and consequently the price should be altered during the selling season, either by raising it or by lowering it. That provision has been included because it has received the approval of the Wool Textile Organization of Manufacturers. The reason for that is obvious. When a textile manufacturer sends his representative wool buyer to the wool auctions he wants to know that he is able to buy wool at a certain figure, without much violent fluctuation in price. If when a manufacturer's buyer or representative was in the market buying the particular category of wool for his mill the price fell below the price paid at a subsequent sale and he had a competitor in the market, the competitor would be able

to undersell him at subsequent textile sales. Because of this, it is thought that that principle should be adopted as far as possible. The International Wool Textile Organization has approved the reserve price plan for that reason. It does not want to see the violent fluctuations that occur in wool prices; it wants to see rather a stabilized price running through all the wool sales.

The reserve price plan does not attempt to set a level of prices; all it does, in effect, is set a minimum price. In other words, we do not alter the present auction system but go on to the floor and bid up to whatever price we like, although we cannot buy wool at below a certain figure. When the authority goes into these wool auction sales nobody except the authority's representative will know the reserve price. I will give an example, but I do not want this to be quoted as what the authority will do. I am just plucking a figure out of the air to illustrate the points I am making. If the reserve average price is 50d. or 51d. for the wool being sold, the auctioneer asks for bids to start the line off and receives bids of 45d., 47d., and 48d. Then there may be a lull and if he cannot drag out a farthing more the authority will bid 48½d. or 49d. with the idea of trying to encourage further bids. Possibly he would get 49d. or even 50d., the minimum reserve price fixed, and if there were no further bids above that the wool would be knocked down to the authority, which would buy it in. In that case the grower would receive 50d. even if the wool were knocked down to the wool authority at 47d., as 50d. would be the reserve price. If wool is knocked down to the authority, it has the right to give a buyer (the last buyer or someone else) 48 hours to purchase it at above 50d. It is not yet finalized (it will be finalized today in Sydney) whether the grower also has the right to say whether he will accept 50d., the last bid of the authority, or whether he wants to withdraw the wool from sale. He is also to be given 48 hours to decide.

Mr. Jennings: That is an improvement on the J.O. scheme.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: In basic principle it is the same, but it is a big improvement on the J.O. scheme. The reserve price factor is the genesis of the matter. Some criticism has been levelled at this, but I am bold enough to say that much of it has come from people who do not understand the plan. It has been said that this will frighten bidders away, but that has nothing to do with it. All we have to do is look at what has happened in this respect

in our sister countries. A plan similar to this has operated in South Africa and New Zealand for many years. I know that, if we took a poll of the woolgrowers in either of those two countries today on whether or not they wanted this plan to continue, it would be supported by over 90 per cent of the growers; they would vote to continue the principle of a minimum price plan.

It was said at one stage when wool prices fell in South Africa that the authority had to buy in 60,000 bales of wool, so the critics said, "The plan is no good. The authority is landed with this terrible stockpile of wool and is forced to buy in, and the buyers do not want to buy this wool so the plan is a failure." It hit the headlines. I replied in the press that, instead of being a harrowing failure, it was an outstanding success because of that very fact, and the fact is that, if the authority had not been bidding in the market, the wool would have been sold to wool buyers and other speculators at a lower price. That is logical. Then the woolgrowers in those two countries would have had to take a much lower price for their wool.

What happened? This 60,000 bales held by the South African authority had subsequently to be fed back on to the market. It did that, not in one fell swoop to crash the prices but in an orderly fashion. The authority subsequently sold every bale of wool above the reserve minimum price that it bid for it. What was the result of that in pounds, shillings and pence? It was that the growers in South Africa got the benefit of the higher prices because the difference between the reserve price at which the authority bought it in and the subsequent price went into the authority's coffers to build up a fund with which it could go into the market and buy more wool. So the growers indirectly benefited.

Let us look at it from this angle. At that time when wool prices were down and the authority in South Africa was holding 60,000 bales of wool, obviously what happened was that the wool buyers went to other places to buy their wool. Where did they get it? In Australia, of course, at the lower, depressed prices, and the Australian woolgrowers suffered. It was done deliberately, in my view (it is only my view, of course, and honourable members know that I am suspicious of these things) to try to wreck the plan in those two countries by buying wool overseas, but they did not succeed. Had there been no authority operating in South Africa or New Zealand at that time, what would have happened? Obviously

the speculators and wool buyers would have bought the wool at the lower prices and held it, and in the subsequent year (in April, as a matter of fact) wool prices started to rise. That is when the authority started to feed it back on to the market. The speculators and buyers who would have held the wool would then have made that difference in the profit themselves, and the growers would have reaped no benefit. So I dismiss entirely the assertion that, because the authority in South Africa had to buy in 60,000 bales of wool, the scheme was a failure. It was not a dismal failure: it was an outstanding success, because that is exactly what the authority was created to do. So these people who argue against a reserve minimum price plan for wool should look and learn by what has happened to this plan in these two sister countries, New Zealand and South Africa.

It is significant to note the point I made a moment ago, that many people have previously opposed the idea of a reserve minimum price plan for wool, because of this and because of that. One outstanding pastoralist, no less a person than Mr. T. L. Bull, who at one time was the President of the Federal Graziers Council in New South Wales and has been an outstanding figure, a man of great integrity and ability, was opposed to any idea of interference with the auction system; he would not have a bar of it. However, Mr. Bull has now studied this plan. He has taken part in all the negotiations and he is one of the most forthright men in favour of the plan's being adopted in Australia. Mr. Walker is another in favour and so is Mr. Scott, in N.S.W. I say to the critics of this plan that they should study this proposal and become acquainted with it. They should find out what the plan can do and what it has done in our two sister countries. When they have studied the plan and know of the negotiations that took place to bring it to fruition, like Mr. Bull and Mr. Scott they will be convinced that it is right for the wool industry of Australia.

Mr. Jennings: Do you think Mr. Merrifield would think it was right?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: He is not in wool; he is a stud man and he wants to win many ribbons. I doubt whether he has gone into the plan as thoroughly as has Mr. Bull. However, I hope that he will go into it and I invite him to discuss it with Mr. Bull, Mr. Scott or Sir William Gunn. Many people criticize Sir William Gunn as he travels around the world getting better prices for wool. They say that that is all right for him because he is well

paid. I do not need to defend him as he has been defended by more able people than I and people who have a greater knowledge of wool than I have. However, Sir William Gunn has done a magnificent job in putting this plan forward. He is a big woolgrower and cattleman in New South Wales; he has an impressive personality and he can address a meeting well and put over the facts. I defy anyone, no matter how critical he may be, who has a knowledge equal to that of Sir William Gunn, to stand up to him and debate the plan. I am confident that Sir William has the ability, knowledge, know-how and sincerity to sell this plan to the Australian woolgrowers. I hope that he succeeds in the interests of the growers, who are disillusioned now. The criteria with regard to the fixation of the reserve price contained the following:

1. The level of reserve prices fixed by other countries.
2. The average price for wool in the previous season.
3. Economic conditions in the major consuming countries.
4. The relationship between prices of wool and other competitive fibres.
5. The likely capital requirements of the reserve price set in relation to the level of the Government guarantee.
6. Average wool price over several preceding seasons as well as the trend of wool prices in the final stages of the preceding season.
7. The trend in wool consumption and market prospects in wool consuming countries.
8. The level of stocks and the anticipated volume of wool production.
9. The relationship between wool prices and commodity prices generally.
10. The desirability of fixing the reserve at a level so that the volume of stocks held by the marketing authority will not grow to a size or be held for such a long period that wool is prevented from passing into consumption and the confidence of the wool grower is damaged.
11. The need to minimize the risk of having to reduce the reserve price from season to season.

That lays down in brief the fundamentals of this reserve minimum price plan. I add that the Australian Wool Board was convinced that the average price of wool in the past would have been higher had an Australian reserve price scheme operated. That is not my statement—that is from the Australian Wool Board. These men have been elected to the board and are big wool growers who have access to figures from the International Wool Secretariat headed by Mr. W. J. Vines. These facts and figures are collected from all over the world and these men should know more about this than I do.

The Chairman of the board, Sir William Gunn, in his fifth nationwide radio talk, said that in South Africa during March the South African marketing authorities had bid on 41,000 bales or 33 per cent of the offering but had been called on to purchase only 5,000 bales. They forced the price up of 41,000 bales and by being an extra bidder in the market they induced or convinced the other buyers they would not get a lot so the price went up on 41,000 bales, but they were left with only 5,000 bales that they had to buy. Therefore, in South Africa, 36,000 bales were sold by wool marketing authorities at a price higher than it would have brought had there been no reserve price operating. That is obvious. Without having that authority operating the 41,000 bales would have been sold at a lower price and wool growers would have suffered. Sir William Gunn said that a similar situation occurred in New Zealand this year where the marketing authorities only purchased 1,500 of over 20,000 bales it had bid on. In New Zealand they forced the price up on 20,000 bales which were sold at the higher figure because of the high bidding, and were left with only 1,500 bales. This is during a period where prices of wool are falling. If there were no authority in those dominions the wool price would be much lower. I agree with the wool board that the average price in the past year would have been higher if an authority had operated in Australia. Sir William Gunn continued:

Smaller wool growers found fluctuating wool prices difficult to live with particularly if low prices coincided with bad seasons. Substantial falls in wool prices encouraged the smaller growers to move their wool to other types of grade production. This was not in the best interest of the wool industry because wool production must be increased if wool is not to become a luxury fibre and be in short supply. The conservative scheme recommended would not eliminate prices fluctuating. However, experience gained over the years would be directed at a reserve price scheme to achieve the degree of price stability which is necessary and desirable.

Sir William Gunn emphasized that the scheme was not designed to fix the price of wool. All we are doing is to put a minimum reserve price on wool. We would do that in most years and the wool would be selling at prices higher than the average level of the reserve. He said the scheme would have a substantial psychological effect on the market. Experience in South Africa and New Zealand shows that when the market authorities start to bid the trade would buy with confidence, knowing that

the price would fall no further. With manufacturers buying at a local price they could not undersell other manufacturers of wool textiles. Sir William Gunn continued:

Under existing conditions a manufacturer might buy less when prices fell because he feared his competitor could buy wool at cheaper prices and make it fall further.

He would be shut out and go bankrupt because he would have a factory full of textiles which he could not sell at the price. This only emphasizes the price aspect. Sir William Gunn said that it must be acknowledged that some ceiling in the price of wool existed today, but the price is governed by the price of man-made fibres. So, in the months ahead, we shall again find ourselves involved in great controversy regarding the most important industry in Australia, the industry that makes the most important contribution to the national economy. We find people saying, in effect, "We don't want a floor price at wool sales; we don't want to follow New Zealand and South Africa; we don't want to take the advice of wool buyers and of the textile organization. Let us be satisfied with no interference whatever with the wool auction system. What was good enough for grandfather is good enough for us." What a lot of rot and nonsense that is, having regard to the position in which we find ourselves today as a result of pricing ourselves out of world markets and maintaining a world-renowned high standard of living! Despite all this, we are not prepared to do anything that will safeguard this industry which means so much to our national economy and to our balance of payments overseas. In my view, every member of Parliament should go out on the hustings and convince the wool-growers that, in their own interests and in the interests of the economy of this country, they should get behind the plan to establish a floor price.

I now come to an attitude that I always like to nip in the bud. That attitude is that it is of no use being in this plan, because it means Government control. Let us see what is the true position. This proposal was put before the Minister for Primary Industry by, I emphasize, the Wool Industry Conference, which comprises representatives of all woolgrowers and which was unanimous that the Commonwealth Government should provide the money and the authority to buy the wool, if necessary. Cabinet considered the matter and decided that it would provide, by way of guarantee, up to £80,000,000. The growers were to pay a marketing levy of $1\frac{1}{8}$ per cent and the Com-

monwealth Government was prepared to even go above the £80,000,000 if necessary. That is what is termed Government control. As I say, that is a lot of nonsense. The Government would be giving a guarantee but would not be making available one penny of taxpayers' money. Of course, it was natural that the Government should say that it would have to watch the matter closely in view of the possibility of the guarantee being called upon in future. I put it to honourable members that the Government would be watching this plan closely even if it never provided one penny, because of the importance of the industry to the national economy. Should that be called Government control?

Let us look at what happens in the wheat industry. When the Wheat Stabilization Bill was framed, a guaranteed price provision was inserted, of necessity, because the Government goes far beyond guaranteeing the money in that industry—it comes to the party by providing money from revenue if the price overseas is below the guaranteed price worked out under the formula. Last time a contribution was made by the Treasury to the wheat industry the amount made available was £7,500,000, and that is real money. When the Government is asked to make funds available from the Treasury to go into growers' pockets, people say there is Government control. Is it? It is nothing of the sort. Section 13 of the Wheat Stabilization Act provides that the Minister may be empowered to direct the board to make certain sales and to do certain things and, notwithstanding the history of that Act, which was enacted in 1945, that section has never been used. In fact, its use has not even been hinted at. Yet, the Commonwealth Government had to come to the party on one occasion to the extent of £7,500,000. In fact, prior to that, the amount involved was up to £9,000,000. It never invoked section 13 at all. This matter is different, however, because the Commonwealth is asked, not to put in one penny of Government money, but only to guarantee the money. Of course, when the Government went into the market to bid, the necessary funds would be found at the Commonwealth Reserve Bank. That is all we are asking. I have nothing whatever to fear from this so-called "Government control". The Government naturally would be keeping a close eye, through its respective departments, on the progress of this plan. As I said, in the interests of the national economy, it would have to see that this proposal would receive exactly the same treatment.

However, the Government is involved here from another angle for it is to guarantee not only the money: the Minister for Primary Industry only yesterday made a public announcement, when opening this conference in Sydney, that he strongly favoured the adoption of this plan. He ought to know, for he has the assistance of his departmental officers with their training in economics and with all the figures in the world at their disposal. For the Government, of course, it will be beneficial, not only from its own point of view, because if the scheme is successful it will also benefit the national position no matter who is in Government. A higher price for wool puts us in a much better position to maintain our balance of payments overseas; in addition, the woolgrowers will receive a higher income, and so the Treasury, through its taxation resources, will also receive a greater income.

Mr. McKee: Everyone will benefit.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Yes, it will filter down through the whole community. This plan has nothing wrong with it, except that it does not go far enough, in my view. However, I cannot have my own way in everything; nor can anyone in this Chamber. As I said earlier, most of us have become frustrated at times, but, nevertheless, we continue to battle on to the best of our ability, and to put forward these plans.

Mr. McKee: You become disillusioned, but much wiser.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: And much more tolerant, too, although I do not know that I am particularly tolerant.

Mr. Clark: Not quite so optimistic?

Mr. McKee: You could improve!

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I hope I do because, even with most of my public career behind me, I am not satisfied that I have done enough, and I hope that I can lead more people along the right path. Many roads in my district still require attention. I said some weeks ago that I was disappointed to learn that the road from Waikerie to Kingston was being reconstructed because of damage caused by interstate traffic, when, previously the Loxton District Council (which governs the area along which this portion of the road runs) had had money allocated to it by the Highways Department to construct and seal Highway No. 34. However, when the Highways Department heard that the road between Kingston and Waikerie was breaking up, in its wisdom it saw fit to use the money previously allocated for Highway 34 to repair this road, which is a main thoroughfare to Sydney. That is a rank and unwar-

ranted injustice, for the money for this work should have come from the appropriate Commonwealth source.

Interstate hauliers travelling between Sydney, Melbourne, Albury, etc., and Adelaide, cart their goods along this road, and those people do not benefit Upper Murray districts at all. Indeed, residents in those districts are left with a road in bad repair which has to be reconstructed, and for which local district councils should not be penalized. Highway 34 runs from Loxton to Swan Reach; it is a shorter road to Adelaide for many residents than is the main highway, and the Highways Department should seriously consider improving it as soon as possible. Another road requiring urgent attention (and I am not advocating that it be sealed, but only that it be put into good condition) runs from Pinnaroo to Bordertown. Although it is outside my district it connects with the road from Pinnaroo to Loxton and carries much traffic. Many farmers in these areas are finding a ready market for cattle, lambs, etc., in the South-East, especially at Bordertown, Mount Gambier, and Portland (Victoria). Consequently, the sooner this road is able adequately to cope with this traffic, and the sooner the people concerned can use it, the better it will be for both commerce and trade generally in these districts, as well as in the South-East. The connecting roadway from Lameroo to Keith is also used by many people, but, as people wishing to go to Keith have to travel almost down to Moorlands (not far from Tailem Bend) and then travel back to Keith, this through road should be constructed as soon as possible.

Yesterday I raised the matter of a bridge across the upper reaches of the Murray River. I see no reason for the delay in the Public Works Committee's receiving the terms of reference on this project. At the moment I am not prepared to say exactly where this bridge should be erected. As honourable members may know, the wording in the terms of reference to the committee, of necessity must be to the effect that the committee make an inquiry into the erection and establishment of a bridge at some particular site. The Upper Murray Local Government Association favours Kingston-on-Murray as the site for the bridge.

If this precise location were included in the terms of reference the Public Works Committee would take evidence from local government bodies and anybody at all interested in the project (particularly from Upper Murray

districts), and those witnesses might well advocate that the bridge be located somewhere else, for instance, at Berri, so that it would link that town with Loxton, where much trade exists today. If the committee were convinced by the evidence given that the bridge should be so located, naturally it would say so in its report. The Public Works Committee Act provides that the committee is not bound to recommend a site named in the terms of reference. I know the Highways Department has been considering designs and specifications for this bridge, but I am at a loss to understand why the delay has occurred. I understand that the type of bridge—that may be recommended for Kingston or the Upper Murray area is one similar to the type that has been constructed at Blanchetown, which is an excellent bridge. Why the delay? Obviously the Highways Department has the specifications and drawings of the Blanchetown bridge, so why is such a delay necessary if the same type of specifications will be used for a bridge at Kingston? I cannot see the logic behind the delay. There may be differences in the approaches to the bridge because of the different contours of the land on each side of the river, but there are no differences in the design of the bridge. Perhaps some extra length or one extra span is necessary, but what is that? It means only an extension of 30ft., 50ft. or 90ft. in another span, so why the hold-up? I am a little suspicious about this matter, and I should like the Highways Department to know that it will not sell me this idea. I cannot see any reason for the delay.

Mr. Corcoran: It may be a matter of economics.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Perhaps it is, but we have not been told about that. This is one of the things about which I have become frustrated and disillusioned. As I have not been told that it is a matter of economics, I am still plugging away.

I hammered for a long time to get a daily rail passenger service to Loxton, and I appreciated the last Government's approval of this service, which has proved a wonderful boon to people in Loxton and nearby areas. I hope that the new Government, under its proposals for co-ordinated transport that have been spoken about, will not interfere in any way with this daily service. I do not know what the new Government's proposals are, but the Premier has said that they will be made known to the House in due course. If under these proposals any attempt is made to interfere with this service, the Government cannot expect any

help from me. I will resist any change with all the oratory at my command. The district waited for a long time and fought for this service, so why should it be penalized in comparison with any other part of the State? Most other parts now have daily passenger services; this applies to Yorke Peninsula, Victor Harbour and other places. Why should a very important district that makes a big contribution to the revenue and the economy have to put up with something that is not good enough in these days?

I come now to a matter that I and the honourable member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) have raised before. The honourable member from his experience as Minister of Lands, his rural knowledge and down-to-earth approach would be able to speak with much authority on the very real problems of the Loxton soldier settlers. This is nowhere near answered, and it will take a long while for these people to get out of the present difficult situation. They came back with the great hope that they would stake out for themselves a place in the community at Loxton. They went into the scheme with much enthusiasm and the hope of establishing their families there and getting some land they could call their own. Some were experienced fruitgrowers, and some had to pass the qualifying test to become applicants, but they were given blocks. The Commonwealth Department of Primary Industry provided the necessary capital, and the scheme was administered by the State Lands Department on behalf of the Commonwealth Government. The blocks were completed, and the settlers were given some sustenance money to enable them to carry on until they got their blocks into production. As these boys went along, they obtained advice from officers of the Agriculture Department and the local district officer, and they planted so many acres of citrus, wine grapes, sultanas, peaches and other deciduous trees. They were looking forward with much hope to the time when those blocks would come into full production. Unfortunately, in many cases their hopes have not been realized. True, there are some cases of square pegs in round holes, but I do not think there are any in this category left; most of the unfortunate boys who could not manage or had other reasons for leaving have now left. However, even the best and most efficient settlers have had problems because they have been given citrus trees from the wrong bud stock to plant on their holdings. As it takes nearly eight years for a navel orange tree to come into full production, these settlers have found

to their frustration and consternation that at the end of that time they are growing oranges as big as a child's football and with thick skins. This is due to wrong bud stock, and it is no fault of the settlers. What could they do about that problem?

Mr. Quirke: They are doing much about it through their own efforts.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: That is so. The soil at Loxton was not ideal for planting oranges. Some of it had Winkie sand. It was all surveyed by the soil experts of the Waite Agricultural Research Institute and the department; some was found to be ideal, although unfortunately some was not. Because of the contour of the land at Waikerie, that area is an ideal place for oranges, and it has proved itself over the years. Waikerie has no basic drainage problems because, as honourable members who have passed through there will realize, it is on slopes, and those slopes drain the water back into the river. Because of this, growers there do not have a water table problem. In addition, 60ft. or 70ft. below the surface at Waikerie is a coral rock formation through which the water percolates and gets away.

In irrigation there is fundamental principle that if water is applied to land by spray or furrow irrigation something must be done to take it away from beneath the surface or there will be a failure. That is not happening at Waikerie, Kingston or Moorook because of the contour slopes that enable the underground water to flow away. At Loxton, however, because the clay subsoil was too close to the surface the water applied by irrigation went down until it reached hard clay. Consequently, the water table started to rise. When this happened the orange trees, which have root systems close to the surface, fed on this water table, which as it rose collected many minerals and salt from the soil and consequently became saline. As a result the growers, instead of having navel orange trees in full production, were affected by the water table. How disappointing and frustrating!

Apart from this, after eight or nine years the growers, under a contract or arrangement entered into with the department, have to pay a certain sum for water rates and a certain sum in actual commitments to the department. This was all worked out by the Commonwealth department with the Lands Department on the basis that the settler should be able to produce so many cases of oranges, peaches, grapes, and other fruit, his return should be £X, so he should be able to pay £Y in commitments.

In addition to these bad types of orange tree and the small crop because of the water table, last year they had to contend with the most confounded thing of all—low prices for all citrus, good or bad. How can the soldier settlers meet their commitments? It is absolutely impossible. So it is necessary for our new Minister of Repatriation (who will be sincere in his approach; although he has not yet much knowledge, at least he is trying to understand this problem, and it is my purpose this afternoon to drive this home so that he may get an approach to this problem and lend a helping hand to the soldier settlers for the period they have to survive) to take this matter to Canberra and convince the authorities there that these men must have help. When the honourable member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) was the Minister, he realized the problem and had many fights with Canberra on it. I want to enlist the aid of the new Minister to do something about this problem at Loxton.

It is not without solution. If these men are handled carefully and given more time to meet their commitments, I am confident they will pull through. In the meantime, we have to do something about the budded stock. As the honourable member for Burra said, they are already doing something themselves by individual effort. With the co-operation of the department they can regraft and get a better type of budded stock for their navel oranges; but that takes time. Let us not put the pressure on those men or we shall drive them out and break their hearts, and that would be a tragedy for Loxton and for them, men to whom we are indebted for what they did for us in the war. They are not asking for generous treatment because they fought for us overseas; all they want is a fair go. They work; they are prepared to get their heads down and their tails up and get stuck into their properties. They will do it if they are given a helping hand over this difficult period.

So I appeal to the Minister to take this matter to Canberra as forcibly as he can and ask the authorities there to grant the soldier settlers a temporary stay of proceedings on their annual commitments to enable them to pull through this difficult period.

There are scientific problems with which I am not fully conversant—for instance whether overhead sprays are the correct type or whether they are spaced correctly in the wind to get sufficient water to the orchards. That is a scientific question that I am not prepared to answer here today, but I know the men are complaining about it. Some

of the well-informed people in that area are beginning to believe that the spray system in some places is not right for what they want. That matter should be looked at by the departmental officers. Then the question arises whether they are using sufficient quantities of fertilizers or the right types of organic or artificial manure to bring their trees to top productivity. In some cases they have been doing the wrong thing at the wrong time. My knowledge of that is based on an inspection I made of Mr. Voullaire's place at Mildura. He has been there for many years. He is a scientific and efficient farmer who told me what he did to bring his trees to complete fertility. It is interesting to note that the produce from his trees, on the other side of Mildura, was nearly double what the settlers were getting from their good trees at Loxton. To my lay mind it appears that he is probably doing something that has been proved correct. Let us find out from him what it is and ascertain from trial and experiment in the Loxton experimental orchard whether it is correct. While this is taking place, these settlers need help. I hope the Minister will consider this problem and give all the help he can.

I now come to something with which I am more conversant—wheat. Recently, the editor of a journal in another State wrote to me asking for information about my feelings on wheat in marginal areas. He intends to run a series of articles on this subject. I shall read this letter that I sent to him in reply. It is dated June 21 and, as today is only June 23, it is up to date:

Before answering the questions which you have listed, I should like to take the opportunity of stating that the overall picture of the wheat industry in Australia is one which presents a particularly healthy and vigorous outlook. This is especially so when it is realized that the 1964-65 harvest, which involved a record delivery of 345,250,000 bushels to the Australian Wheat Board, has resulted in a complete clearance and, additionally, had the board been able to offer a further 50,000,000 bushels, this too could have been sold. The law of supply and demand for foodstuffs, which from Australia's point of view as a primary producing country should always be inherent in our outlook and the versatility and resourcefulness of the Australian farmer, must not be overlooked. The mixed farmer (wheat and sheep) has adequately demonstrated over the years his ability to meet situations as they occur, and which I have no doubt he will continue to do in the future. In the meantime I would suggest that the wheatgrowing industry is in a sound and healthy position overall, and does not warrant gloomy or pessimistic utterances which some

well-meaning, but very ill-informed, persons have made about the industry during the past few months.

One of those to whom I refer, with great respect to my friend from Glenelg (Mr. Hudson), was a so-called economist whom I term an armchair expert, who was advocating, above all things, in articles in the Eastern States a restriction of wheat acreage. The member for Glenelg may know to whom I am referring.

Mr. Hudson: Who was it?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: A man called Donath. I do not know whether or not the honourable member knows him. The letter continues:

In my opinion, what we have seen today is the natural course of events, brought about by the evolution and progress of an important and vigorous industry. It is interesting to note that, during 1964-65, world wheat production of 8,000,000,000 bushels was grown to feed a world population of 3,000,000,000 people. Based on the Australian wheat consumption of five bushels per capita for all purposes, we would have to increase world production to 15,000,000,000 bushels.

And here are some ill-informed armchair experts saying, "We want wheat restriction." The letter continues:

Turning to your questions concerning marginal areas, Question: Are we pushing our wheat crop beyond the limit? Answer: There are two parts to this question. Firstly, there is no doubt that the increase of wheat production in marginal areas has had a considerable influence on the amount of wheat produced. This can be attributed to (a) the tremendous development taking place in all States, which is bringing thousands of acres of new land under production.

That is taking place on our West Coast; even land west of Buckleboo is coming into production. The letter continues:

(b) increased soil fertility through the use of legumes, resulting in better farm practices; (c) the control of wind and water soil erosion; (d) the improved and better types of wheat available.

The second point I should like to make involves the decline in barley acreage. Generally speaking in the marginal areas grain growing is done in conjunction with wool and meat production. Many of the marginal areas in the past have grown a greater percentage of barley than they are growing today. Admittedly, soil fertility has improved, which has allowed and encouraged the growing of more wheat. However, if similar rotations are used in growing wheat as with barley, obviously in the long run, soil fertility will not keep pace with the draw made upon it.

I do not want to go into that matter. I believe honourable members are well versed in the fact that if we draw soil out we must put

fertility back. We could learn a valuable lesson from the Scandinavian countries. The letter continues:

"While new land is being developed at its present rate, crop rotations are not as important until such time as this land has been consolidated. As most people know, two or three successive crops are needed to sweeten the land and rid it of stumps and sticks, etc. But it is after this new land has become consolidated in the manner mentioned, that serious attention must be given to crop rotations, and accordingly the growing of barley must eventually enter into the picture. Of necessity the cereal grower must expect a cash return from cropping on any given paddock every so often, and should this cash return be alternated between crops of wheat and barley, not only will his land be kept in good heart and condition, but he can implement closer rotations with safety. It should be remembered too, that excellent markets are available for Australian barley, of which we grow the best in the world.

Question: Is the practice likely to be injurious to the long term agricultural productivity of certain areas?

Answer: If barley or other crops, such as oats, do not become recognized in marginal country as a necessary part of the cropping programme there is no doubt that the continual cultivation of wheat could be injurious in the long term productivity of these areas, unless wider wheat rotations are employed. (That is, instead of a wheat crop in every four years, the rotation be increased to six years, with a barley crop in between. Therefore over a 12-year period this would allow for two crops of wheat and two crops of barley in lieu of three wheat crops.) Even by striking a balance between wheat and barley rotations, the use of low rainfall medics (particularly Barrel clover), must be utilized to its fullest extent. Credit must be given to the marginal farmer for the way in which he has adopted and accepted the principle of cover crops, which apart from markedly improving his soil structure has tended to encourage the carrying of extra livestock. Successful wheat farming and grain growing must, in the main, be carried out in conjunction with wool and meat production, as one complements the other and each has proved remunerative both from the monetary and soil fertility aspects.

We find in some of the mallee country that with crops being planted now and again the land becomes wheat sick. For this reason it was necessary to consider the introduction of barley and oats. After nine or ten years some of the farmers who were growing barley are now able to grow wheat crops again, which proves the importance of rotation and soil fertility. It shows that on these lighter, marginal soils we cannot keep to one particular crop all the time. The letter continues:

Question: If we are facing a dry succession of seasons, can you recommend practices that may obviate the danger?

Of course, a quick answer to that question would be "more rain"; but that is not the answer that was wanted. The letter continues:

Answer: This without doubt is the 64 dollar question, and Mr. Pluvius has the only complete answer. Should the previous points be adhered to, this would be the only way in which a grower can obviate dangers which are always lurking in the background, through drought. I would suggest that any farmer should very sparingly graze his previous year's wheat stubble which would help in regard to any likelihood of soil drift. By the same token it is essential that the cultivation of the soil be such, so that the surface soil is kept rough. In marginal areas it is pointless these days for growers to attempt to cultivate too often to get rid of weeds. This practice tends to fine down the soil unnecessarily, particularly when hormone weed sprays will take care of most of the weeds which may germinate after the crops have been sown. Unfortunately, I doubt whether we will ever be able to completely overcome the heart-breaking ravages of a real drought, brought about through a succession of dry seasons.

Question: To what extent have we extended the reasonable limits of wheatgrowing?

Answer: Five years ago it was commonly stated that the average harvest of approximately 170,000,000 bushels was the maximum amount of wheat we could grow and successfully market. Additionally it was suggested this was the limit which the recognized wheat-growing areas could produce. However, during this period we have seen our production double, and there seems to be no limit to the possible production of wheat in this country, through improved varieties of wheat strains. With the possible introduction of the Mexican type of "dwarf" wheats which are being developed at the present time, we could very well see our present production doubled without any increase in acreage at all. It should be borne in mind that if we can do this without increasing costs, it automatically follows that our costs of production would be halved.

Mr. Quirke: The nitrogen soil content would be the limiting factor.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Yes. The letter continues:

To illustrate this point, at the present time it is costing 14s. 7d. per bushel to grow wheat at an Australian average return per acre of 17 bushels. Should it be possible to grow 34 bushels of wheat per acre without incurring any additional expense, we should be able to produce that wheat for 7s. 4d. a bushel. To be able to compete on world markets at this figure would be a "salesman's dream", particularly as we are producing some of the world's cheapest wheat at the present time. Even in view of this exciting possibility, however, it would still necessitate a strict observance between rotations, with due consideration being given to barley and other crops.

Question: Has improved technology and practice lessened the danger of creating a "dust bowl"?

Answer: It would be true to say that improved technology has lessened the possibility of "dust bowls" appearing in our grain-growing marginal areas. However, it would be essential that the previous points I have made, in relation to rotations and other cash crops, be kept always to the fore in regard to farm management. There will always be a risk of drought conditions which could cause almost unlimited damage should they be spread over any period. It must be realized that there are two ways of looking at this matter. For instance, there is a valid reason for land drifting following a series of poor and dry seasons—but there is no excuse for soil to drift in an average or near-average season. When the latter occurs, obviously farm management is suspect and the necessary action should be taken along the lines I have discussed.

Now I come to the question of sales. An article states:

Dramatic changes in the exports of Australian wheat have occurred during the past decade. China's orders for £A286,000,000 (which is 572,000,000 Australian dollars) worth of Australian wheat in the short time since it has been a customer focus attention on the potential of Asia generally as a market for the Australian farmer. In the 10-year period 1954-55 to 1963-64 Japan, too, has increased its purchases of wheat in a spectacular fashion. The Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics figures for the decade show that, although there has been some fluctuation, the tendency for these two Asian giants is to import increasing quantities of Australian wheat. There has been an up and down pattern in the export of Australian wheat to other Asian countries—notably India and Pakistan—but the overall trend is again one of encouragement to the Australian farmer. For instance, in 1954-55 neither North nor South Korea imported any Australian wheat. In 1963-64 North Korea imported 42,957 tons and South Korea 41,240 tons. The overall exports to all countries in the 10-year period have shown a dramatic upturn from the 1,691,064 tons to 6,796,194 tons. Russia has been a substantial contributor to this increase, her imports rising from nothing in the base year to 1,367,290 tons in 1963-64. In April, Russia ordered a further 600,000 tons, an order that caused the Chairman of the Australian Wheat Board (Mr. J. V. Moroney) to comment that sales to Russia could become a regular feature of the Australian export market. It was thought that the recovery of the Russian wheat crop in 1964 would mean the country's import requirements would be lower. However, it now appears that the new Soviet policy on agriculture enunciated in March is beginning to affect world trade. The new policy freezes the compulsory deliveries from farms at 54,000,000 tons a year over the next five years compared with a series of planned increases which were scheduled to have brought the target to 90,000,000 tons by 1970. Russia is apparently resigned to the fact that it will produce less wheat at home and will have to purchase more from overseas countries. This will have to be done to build up domestic stocks and provide for export commitments.

Mr. Corcoran: I suppose they lopped off the head of their Minister for Agriculture.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I have limited information that the previous Russian Premier got into trouble because farmers did not live up to the targets he set in his policy. He was a failure and was dismissed. I am pleased that honourable members on the Government side keep themselves up to date on this important problem. The article continues:

It is fairly clear that Russia is planning for a grain deficiency, but it is difficult to estimate its extent and duration. There are also encouraging prospects among some Red satellites. Albania took no wheat in 1954-55, but in 1963-64 it imported nearly 38,000 tons. A number of Asian countries outside the Bamboo and Iron Curtain countries present a picture of considerable variation in importing Australian wheat. In 1954-55, India took 466,508 tons and in one succeeding 10-year period the figure was as low as 11,000 tons. In 1963-64 it was built up to 202,811 tons. In 1955-56 Pakistan imported two tons but the peak was in 1956-57, when it took 165,930 tons: in 1963-64 it imported 54,737 tons.

In terms of tonnage Singapore is not a large importer of Australian wheat, but her imports rose by 23.8 per cent, from 513 tons in 1954-55 to 1,811 tons in 1963-64. Malaya imported 19,276 tons in 1959-60, but only 3,962 tons in 1963-64. In the period under review Japan, among the eastern countries, has been responsible for one of the most striking lifts in the intake of Australian wheat. There was a rise from 55,624 tons to 503,562 tons. The figures for Red China are more impressive, rising from nothing over the 10-year period to 2,502,847 tons. Various reasons have been advanced for these enormous shots in the arm to the Australian farmers, injections that have sent coursing through their economic veins increased prosperity and a strong hope for a long-term market stability. A country the size of China is vulnerable to the vicissitudes of the elements and the seasons to the extent where partial crop failures are more common than in other countries. She is on the razor's edge between sufficiency and grave shortage of food for her people, especially now that she is trying to raise her living standards by, among other things, giving her people more to eat in an endeavour to improve the manufacturing output.

Mr. Quirke: Added to that is the fact that up to the present no Communist country has succeeded in feeding itself.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Yes. Continuing:

Failures in either her rice or wheat crops mean increases in the importation of wheat. That is a trend that will strengthen as she becomes more industrialized. China is faced with a population explosion. She now has 700,000,000 mouths to feed, and the number is rising to such an extent that the increase is 15,000,000 a year. In addition, China has commitments to members of her bloc by way of trade agreements that call for the importation of other goods into China. It is thought she

may be paying for some goods with Australian wheat. In Japan the momentum of western civilization has gathered pace and that country is developing a high standard of living as one of the great industrial powers of the world. More people there are getting a taste for bread, which means importing wheat. Less and less land is becoming available for agriculture, as more factories and houses for workers are being built. These are ingredients in adding to her dependence on Australian wheat. These factors, some permanent and some periodic, tend to give the Australian wheat farmer a firm ground for optimism about his future. The International Wheat Agreement operates in nearly all sales of world wheat, and that agreement is under review: it depends on what happens in regard to the common market countries whether the International Wheat Council should not use the same formula as the common market countries are using in regard to world wheat trade. That is, the world wheat trade should be set at a floor and ceiling level, and there is negotiation between the two prices.

True, China has been paying a little more for wheat than have other countries. The Australian Wheat Board was criticized because we were giving a better deal to China than to other customers and because we were not charging China interest on the credit that we were giving to her. The answer is that a couple of years ago in New South Wales they had bad storms that affected a large quantity of the wheat grown in that State. It became second grade and it is difficult to dispose of such wheat. A mission went to China to try to sell a large quantity of Australian wheat, and at the same time to try to pass off this second or undergrade wheat. China was prepared to take the wheat under a contract, including the good f.a.q. at a certain price, and consequently the overall price was affected. We do not disclose the amount of interest on the credit terms, but generally the terms are 10 per cent deposit, 40 per cent in six months and the balance in 12 months. On the credit side, China has met all her commitments before they were due. Some were paid in March, whereas they were not due until the following September. I cannot disclose information in regard to the rate of interest. One reason for that is that we do not want to cause embarrassment and do not want other countries buying our wheat to say, "You have given China a good deal. What about us?" However, if any honourable member has any doubts about the interest charged he need not worry at all because I can go to the extent of saying that China is paying a higher interest rate than we are paying.

Mr. Quirke: What are you paying? One and a half per cent?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: No, we are paying more than that. Another matter to which I wish to refer (and this relates to a question asked by the honourable member for Gouger) is the necessity to alert wheatgrowers to the fact that oversea countries, China particularly and Russia to some extent, are becoming fussy about wheat samples. Because of this, farmers' organizations have undertaken a campaign to encourage farmers to keep up the quality of their wheat and to keep the product clean and free from weevil. The Australian Wheat Board last year laid down a policy allowing no more than 5 per cent of unmillable material in the wheat.

Mr. Quirke: What about stones and ploughshares?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: The honourable member for Burra raises the question of stones and that reminds me of what happened in relation to a charter shipment from a South Australian port to Russia. Not long ago a big parcel turned up at the Wheat Board office and the man delivering it said, "I want somebody to give me a hand with this, because it is too heavy." We found that it was a parcel of stones, and in it there was a note quoting the name of the ship and the words, "We buy wheat, not stones." I do not know how stones of that size got through the elevators and, then, why they were not noticed on the endless belt by which the wheat is loaded into the ship. A Government inspector supervises the loading and is in a position to stop the belt if he sees anything like that. When everybody was worried about it, I said, "Don't be worried. It is only Russia throwing a few stones at the Australian Wheat Board." The Russians said that the shipments should be "docked" to a certain extent. Our oversea buyers do not want to buy stones; they want to buy wheat. A sample that was sent to Japan was passed as f.a.q. but the Japanese complained about the presence of a few grains of barley in it. I appeal to wheatgrowers to make every effort to keep the quality up and to keep the wheat as clean as possible.

A matter that concerns the Minister of Agriculture is the serious problem that arose in the marginal areas, particularly my own, last year because of the saffron thistle infestation. Many crops became badly infested and the pest got into the sample of wheat. Generally speaking, farmers had never been greatly concerned, because when they harvested the wheat with headers and combines they harvested above the level of the infestation and, therefore, the saffron thistle was kept out. However, the late

rains in early October and November caused a vigorous growth of the thistle and it was then that it got into the sample. Local and overseas flour millers will not have a bar of wheat with this thistle in it, and the Agriculture Department is being asked to do all it possibly can to eradicate it, by either cultivation or spraying methods. It can probably be eradicated in the lighter soil areas but when rains such as we got last season occur the soil drifts and, consequently, farmers in these areas are hesitant about cultivating to eradicate it. More scientists are needed in our Agriculture Department and I was pleased with the Minister's answer to a question I asked, wherein he said that the department was encouraging more persons to take apprenticeships in agricultural science. I strongly advocate as much as possible being done to advance this matter. I am not condemning spraying with a view to eradication, but perhaps agricultural scientists from the C.S.I.R.O. or some other recognized institution could provide a spray that could be more cheaply manufactured, thus reducing the cost of eradication.

I come now to the grape prices problem, a matter that greatly concerns my district. I personally doubt whether we in South Australia or grapegrowers in other parts of Australia have reached the limit of the acreage that should be sown to wine grapes, but in the last two years a problem has arisen because wine makers have been obliged to take certain wine-producing grapes at prices laid down by the Prices Commissioner (Mr. Murphy). The Playford Government approached Mr. Murphy about this matter and he prescribed certain categories of prices. Some wine makers were prepared to pay the prices laid down but others were not, and this created a storm in the industry at that time, with the wine makers being called all sorts of names by the wine grape growers. Most wine makers were prepared to honour the prices prescribed by the Commissioner, but, when one or two were not, certain embarrassment was caused to others because of the price factor, and so the question became a difficult one. The problem came up again this year. The distilleries were not prepared to handle a quantity of 5,000 tons of surplus grapes, and consequently representations were made to the new Government to try to solve this problem. The Government, in its wisdom, decided to set aside £67,500 of State Bank funds, as a first advance of £5 plus cost of cartage for these surplus grapes. I had hoped that I could tell the House this afternoon the details of the contract, but I do

not yet know the ultimate price the grower will receive for the surplus. Emu Wines at Morphett Vale has taken about 1,000 tons, and the balance has been taken by Penfolds in the Barossa Valley.

I believe that about 13,000 tons of sultanas has been received by certain distilleries. Sultanas are a dual purpose grape that can be used for dried fruit purposes. They can be readily sold overseas by the Australian Dried Fruits Association. If the wineries concerned had not taken those sultanas for processing into wine they could have taken other varieties, such as pedros. While the wineries can buy sultanas they will not buy other varieties, and we have reached the stage where drastic action should be taken to help this industry. If wineries can establish beyond doubt that they require certain quantities of sultanas to produce, say, a light wine, all well and good, but this will exclude growers of, say, gordos and pedros, and the problem is nowhere near solved. It has been alleviated this year, under an arrangement with the Government, in that an extra 500 tons is to be processed, but that has left 290 tons at Loxton not included in the deal at all, and this has meant that Loxton wine grapegrowers have had to do the best they could to barter their grapes around the countryside and sell them to another firm when and where they could. The firm concerned was not prepared to take the whole quantity at once, but took it in bits and pieces, and the growers are now gradually disposing of that surplus.

While this takes place, Emu Wines is exporting 1,000 tons of grapes; at Penfold's another great quantity of spirit is building up, which means, in effect, that next year, because of a surplus, the co-operatives and other organizations will not have a market. How do we overcome this problem? I have already had a conference with the Wine Grape Growers Association on this matter and I have suggested that it is necessary, in such an emergency as this, to set up a tribunal with statutory authority to help the industry over this difficult period. I suggest that a winemaker, representatives of a co-operative and distillery, and two grapegrowers be nominated by the council to this tribunal, and that the Minister appoint a chairman.

It would be necessary to clothe this board with power to direct a particular type of grape to a distillery and, if necessary, to direct that sultanas be dried and not processed into wine, unless a special case warranted it. This would

restrict the intake of sultanas into wineries and thus increase the intake of real wine grapes. If winemakers had not taken in 13,000 tons of sultanas, we would never have had the problem of a surplus this year. Obviously, the Premier was on the right track the other day when he said that it would be undesirable to frame legislation to force people to take a product they did not want and pay a price they could not afford. However, winemakers have been taking these sultanas at the expense of wine grapegrowers, so let us stop that for the time being. Emergency legislation may be necessary for only two or three years, and I, with others, intend to wait on the Minister of Agriculture at the appropriate time on this matter.

Mr. Quirke: Don't forget the winemakers took pedros, too, but on the cartnote they were classed as sultanas, and the difference was £5 a ton.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Yes, that is the point I am making. How can we solve this problem without the necessary statutory authority? This is not the type of legislation I should normally advocate, but it is necessary in an emergency such as this one. Obviously, without this legislation, the Treasury could well be told next year that a surplus of 5,000 or 6,000 tons of grapes exists, without any legislation to provide that winemakers take wine grapes and not sultanas. The Treasury would then have to put up another £70,000 to cope with the problem. Parliament should be alerted to this. Have we not reached the stage where we should introduce this legislation to give a board power to authorize the winemakers to take only wine grapes, so that 13,000 tons of sultanas will not be taken in, to the exclusion of 5,000 tons of real wine grapes that are not suitable for drying? As I have said, sultanas can be dried and sold overseas by the Australian Dried Fruits Association.

Mr. Corcoran: Is that a sound market?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Yes, quite sound at the moment.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: What if the sultanas themselves are unsound?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: That comes under the Dried Fruits Association's jurisdiction. We should consider not only the surplus grape problem, with which I have just dealt, but the fact that we have not got sufficient co-operation among the co-operatives. Everyone in this House knows that I have been classed as a mad co-operationist, and I accept the title; I like it. What is a real co-operative? It is not a

concern that can shut out the grower who wants to come into it and get the benefit of it. I am sorry to say that in the Upper Murray districts we have co-operatives cutting one another's throats, and that is wrong. They should get together, without losing their autonomy, and sell wine overseas under one label.

Mr. Quirke: I put that to them 16 years ago!

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Yes, but unfortunately they would not learn the lesson. However, we have reached the stage where they must learn the lesson, not only in the interests of the grower members but in the interests of Australian trade as well.

Egg marketing has been mentioned in this House often since this session started. Fundamentally, there is not much wrong with the egg marketing plan; where it has gone wrong is in a way similar to that in the matter with which I have just been dealing. Each State has boards operating under their own statutory authority and marketing within their State, and they will not give way at all to another State. They are fighting one another and they will not agree to have an overall Commonwealth board to take them under its wing and to have federal powers to regulate and control the flow of eggs between States. That is where I think it will fail. I have no time for the big Mount Gambier producer who wants to run many fowls and who says he will have nothing to do with paying a levy because he wants to sell his eggs over the border.

Mr. Corcoran: This is consistent with that man's attitude towards any type of organization.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Then he is not a friend of mine. I suspected that that was the case.

Mr. Burdon: He has an industry in my area and another at Millicent.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: That type of grower wants it both ways. We have had this sort of grower in the wheat industry, the barley industry and the banana industry. What these fellows want is to get under the umbrella of an orderly marketing scheme but at the same time exploit open marketing principles for their own benefit. I will not have a bar of it. That is not a marketing scheme at all. In a marketing scheme all must be in it for the benefit of all. Under such a scheme a producer in South Australia cannot be free of his obligation so as to sell eggs at Portland when the price there is higher than in this

State. I come now to section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution. What are we going to do about it?

Mr. Ryan: Tear it up!

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I do not favour tearing it up, but I strongly favour amending it. I have been requested by the National Farmers Union of Australia to prepare legislation for the Commonwealth for a referendum of the people, to be held at the same time as the referendum in relation to the Senate, to ask whether they will favour an amendment to section 92 to provide that, where a marketing board has been established within a State and approved by a poll of growers and the necessary legislation has been passed by the State, that marketing board shall be free from the effects of section 92.

Mr. Ryan: That would be more important than the Senate referendum, would it?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: It would to me. It would have the effect that a marketing board exercising its powers under a State Act would be free from the effects of section 92. It would have nothing to do with transport, and it would have nothing to do with wool, because under the wool marketing scheme there is power to transport wool anywhere one likes on any auction floor. That does not come into effect until the wool reaches the auction floor in Sydney, London, or anywhere else. The suggested change would have no effect on that, or on general trade or commerce across the border; its effect would be that, when a group of producers agreed that they wanted to have a marketing board, the board would be free from the effects of section 92. This brings into the net our friend from Mount Gambier, and he is the fellow I am after. We have had the same experience in the barley industry. Notwithstanding the powers contained in the Barley Marketing Act, which covers Victoria and South Australia, at Penola, Lameroo, and even as far down as Peake, Bordertown and Naracoorte some of the maltsters from other States come across the border and buy barley.

Mr. Nankivell: Mr. Doyle is one.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Yes, that is his name. What he does, in effect, is offer a cash price for barley. He over-rides the legislative power of the Australian Barley Board because he says, "You cannot touch me; I am taking it across the border."

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The Barley Marketing Act expressly cites section 92.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Quite so. In any of this type of legislation where there is a possibility of interstate trade, to make it water-

tight it must contain what is known as a construction clause. This clause states that notwithstanding the Commonwealth Constitution the Act shall not over-ride the powers of the Commonwealth Constitution. This clause must go into all this type of legislation. This man comes across the border and buys barley, which he sells at a profit. It has been proved in the years this has been going on that the foolish growers who have sold barley to him would have been better off financially if they had been patient and had taken the first advance of the Barley Board; the subsequent price has proved this. Notwithstanding that the overall majority of growers want this type of legislation, a small minority breaks down the principle of marketing legislation by invoking section 92. That is entirely wrong. We have a Parliament in each State and a Commonwealth Parliament, and they have been pressurized by farmers and primary producers to bring in a plan to market their produce. Because of our oversea competition, we shall have to see more of this as time goes on. We find that because of section 92 neither the Commonwealth nor any State Parliament can legislate to do anything about it, and surely that is wrong. We have a Constitution that denies the right of Parliament to legislate to do something about it. What are we elected for? Surely it is to legislate for the good government of the country. Parliament should also be prepared to listen to what the growers and the general taxpayers want to say, but here is the ridiculous situation that no Parliament, State or Commonwealth, has the power to do anything about it.

Mr. Shannon: The Parliaments of the State and the Commonwealth have dealt with the wheat problem.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Yes but, notwithstanding the outstanding success of the Australian Wheat Board and the complementary legislation passed by all States and the Commonwealth, that legislation cannot over-ride section 92.

Mr. Shannon: Does it need to?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: No. A litigious individual may want to start an action in the High Court. If a flour miller came across from Victoria and wanted to buy wheat from the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) and take it back across the border, we could do nothing about it because section 92 prevails. But, as a result of what we would do, that flour miller would not be in the race because he could not live today unless he got a quota of the export flour trade. That is governed by

the Commonwealth department that issues export licences. The flour millers all agree on this. If we found a flour miller who wanted to play monkey tricks with our legislation and the board and he tried to break down the board and buy wheat and invoke the aid of section 92, we would say, "All right, but you will not get a quota for export." That is how we would stop him.

But we cannot do that with barley, grapes, citrus, bananas or tobacco, whence came the request for this amendment to the Commonwealth Constitution. It was strongly supported by the Banana Growers Council in Queensland, the farmers' organizations in New South Wales and Victoria, our own organization in South Australia and that in Western Australia appealing to the Commonwealth Government to take this amendment to the people. I recommend it to this Parliament. It does not wipe out section 92; it is a qualifying clause to the Constitution that, where a marketing board has been established by State legislation and a subsequent poll of growers has agreed to it, that marketing board should not be subject to the effects of section 92. What is wrong with that? I cannot see anything wrong with it. It interferes with nobody else's commodity. If anyone wanted to transport other commodities across the border, section 92 would still prevail. This is confined to positions only where a marketing board is established by the will of the producers and the Parliament of the State. I can see nothing wrong with that and strongly recommend it to this House. I now return to China, for the benefit of the honourable member who interjected a short time ago.

Mr. Ryan: You want to go back to China?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Yes.

Mr. Ryan: That is a one-way ticket.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: It could be with me. The population of China is increasing by 15,000,000 a year. The national product per capita in China is £30; in Japan, as a comparison, it is £300. Production per annum of steel is 12,000,000 tons in China and 28,000,000 tons in Japan; for cement it is 9,000,000 tons in China and 29,000,000 tons in Japan. The figures for capital assets are: tankers—26,000 tons in China and 3,634,000 tons in Japan; trucks—185,000 in China and 2,100,000 in Japan; cars—33,000 in China and 800,000 in Japan; telephones—500,000 in China and 6,500,000 in Japan. That gives a few facts about what is happening in those countries today. We have reached a stage where our wheat research

institutes and the scientists are telling us that they can double our wheat yield per acre within the next 10 years. That is a fascinating thought. Where shall we get to if we double our wheat production with the help of our scientists in the next 10 years? Can we handle it?

I have already given the figures this afternoon of how China is increasing its imports of Australian wheat, and all the indications from China are that they will continue to do so for many years ahead. If their population explosion continues at the rate indicated by the figures I have given, it can be reasonably expected that we shall send more wheat to China. Yet this economist in Melbourne, Mr. Donath, is advocating a restriction of the wheat acreage! We can see how ridiculous that suggestion is, and how important wheat acreage is.

Mr. Ryan: China has been a good payer, too.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Yes. It has paid three or four months before the due date; it has always paid on the knocker. Before the Australian Wheat Board got into credit, inquiries were made in London and Switzerland, and of the clearing bank and the International Monetary Fund, and the answer came back, "No worries". That has been proved correct.

Another problem, which has reached the press headlines recently but which, fortunately, has become less prominent because of the copious rains of a day or two ago, is drought. It is a problem that has always been and always will be a nightmare to the Australian farmer. The ravages of the drought in New South Wales and parts of Queensland today are horrifying to witness. It has been said previously that we should deal with our drought problem. How do we go about it? It is not much good praying to Jupiter Pluvius to send down rain from the heavens: what we must do is set up an authority similar to the wartime commission and give it the money it needs to take action. It will have to be sponsored by the Commonwealth because drought is not confined to one particular State: it reigns all over the country. This authority should undertake a campaign of encouraging fodder conservation by various means so that, instead of the growers in Queensland having to pay £60 a ton for baled hay today to keep their stock alive, pockets or depots of fodder would be available in case of emergency, under the control of this authority.

This is not the first time that this type of thing has been thought of. It may be original

as far as I am concerned but it is not the first time in the world that something along these lines has had to be done. I have in mind President Roosevelt, who had to do something about the dust bowl of America many years ago. He set up a drought authority and also a water resources authority, from which was created the Tennessee Valley Authority, which turned that dust bowl into a wonderfully productive area. Instead of its maintaining only a few people, it now maintains some millions of people in the United States.

I ask honourable members to consider again the wonderful trip that we had to the Snowy Mountains. All honourable members must have been impressed by the magnitude and fascination of the Snowy Mountains scheme. This scheme has about seven years to run before it is completed. A scheme of this magnitude necessarily has to have some men working in the early stages on specifications, drilling, tunnelling and so on, and as it reaches completion these men are no longer necessary and their services are dispensed with. The Snowy Mountains scheme has not reached this stage yet, but that time is not far away. The Commonwealth Government and this Government should give attention to this fact before the scheme is completed. It could be discussed at the Premiers' Conference or elsewhere. We should use these men to work out a project of water conservation in conjunction with the Water Conservation Board and the drought authority. Some scheme should be worked out whereby we could use at least the brain power of these excellent men now employed by the Snowy Mountains Hydro-Electric Authority, otherwise they will go to some other country and their brain power and know-how will be lost. We should keep them in Australia and use their ability on some other scheme, not necessarily of the magnitude of the Snowy Mountains scheme.

Surely there is somewhere in Australia where such a scheme could be carried out. The rivers of Queensland that drain into the Pacific Ocean could be turned back to water the inland of Australia. This is the type of scheme that these men could undertake. This would be similar to what happened in respect of the Tennessee Valley Authority. The question of the conservation of fodder, grown possibly under irrigation, could be considered and this fodder could be conserved to become the property of the authority in an emergency during drought periods and be used to feed the starving stock, such as we have now. Members should look at the loss of national income as

a result of the loss of millions of sheep and cattle in these arid areas of Central Australia. We should do something along these lines. If we had the statutory authority given and the necessary finance provided, then this work could be undertaken. I believe that it would be a crying shame if we lost these men of the Snowy Mountains scheme and if we let them disperse without using them to harness the water resources of Australia.

Australia is the driest continent in the world and South Australia is the driest State of the Commonwealth. What do we need more than anything else? We need water. We have the Chowilla dam at present and, according to the previous Premier (Sir Thomas Playford) and the advice of his department, this dam will safeguard South Australia in the case of drought emergency until 1970. But what will this driest State in the driest country in the world do then? We are increasing our population and have a bigger migration drive than any other State per head of population. We should do something about water because this is our main problem. Chowilla dam will not meet the position entirely in the years ahead. Therefore, I advise the younger members in this Chamber to heed my words and to get busy at the Commonwealth Government level and in Premiers' Conferences to set up an authority to find out what we can do about this lack of water. It could make the necessary reports and make a valuable contribution to Australia's future. There is nothing more important to Australia's future than water, and the worst thing that could happen to the country is a drought. If we can overcome the two major problems of drought and water conservation, we will go a long way towards helping this great nation to be even greater in the future. I hope that these words will not fall on deaf ears. I have given much time to this question, and that is my job. I hope that my contribution will be helpful.

I wish to deal with the question of the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited. The history of the company has been discussed previously in this House, as has the question of where silos should be built. The latter question is very topical at the moment. However, I shall give a few details about the company. It came into existence in 1955 when it got its charter through this Parliament and since then its growth has been both fantastic and dramatic. It has built silos in over 100 places and, if the extensions at Wallaroo, Ardrossan and other places are taken into account, the total

is 140. The following is a list of the silos erected last year and their capacity:

	Bushels.	
Mangalo . . .	240,000	(No Railway)
Buckleboo . . .	240,000	(In addition)
Kyancutta . .	330,000	
Witera . . .	330,000	(No Railway)
Copeville . . .	110,000	
Wanbi . . .	110,000	
Apamurra . . .	110,000	(In addition)
Cambrai . . .	110,000	(In addition)
Wallaroo . . .	1,000,000	(Extension)
Ardrossan . . .	1,000,000	(Extension)
Coonalpyn . .	370,000	(New)
Gladstone . . .	240,000	(Extension)
Orroroo . . .	110,000	(Extension)
Paringa . . .	110,000	(New)

Tenders in the building programme this year will be called to build silos in various country areas. Obviously honourable members will not ask me where these silos are to be erected and I could not tell them if they did. However, silos will be erected in various country areas to accommodate another 4,000,000 bushels during 1966.

Mr. Shannon: What will the total capacity be then?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: It will be 48,750,000 bushels. The building of silos to take 4,000,000 bushels extra will depend on the toll income received this year, and the chances of a good toll have been improved by the recent rain. However, if a dry period should eventuate the toll income might fall and consequently the programme might have to be reduced. It is significant that when this company started it had an income in its first year of only £200,000, whereas last year its total income was over £2,000,000. I am referring not to tolls alone but to the capital facilities allowance from the Australian Wheat Board.

If the rain continues to fall and the toll income is satisfactory, then the total income of the company could be over £2,000,000 again this year. The total storage is made up of 40,000,000 bushels of wheat (with 3,000,000 emergency storage), 6,750,000 bushels of barley, and 1,000,000 bushels of oats. The question has been raised in this House as to whether the Government has power under the Act to decide where silos will go, and the answer to that is "No". Under section 14 of the Act the Government does not decide on sites. The Act provides that the Minister must approve the design and materials. There was a completely harmonious relationship between the board of the co-operative and the previous Government. In the past the board has said to the Minister, "Here is the silo, with the specifications and drawings, for a

particular place. Will you kindly approve?" Naturally, the approval came back. The questioning of the site never occurred, and since 1955 it has been a sort of understanding that when the company asked the Minister to approve designs and materials for a particular silo at, say, Mangalo, Witera or Streaky Bay where there was no railway siding, the question of whether it could be erected at a place without a railway siding never arose. I emphasize that I believe (and I have no authority) that I am speaking on behalf of the members of the board who would like to continue the same harmonious relationship with the new Government regarding the design of the silos as has existed in the past. We have a new Government, and whether we like it or not we must co-operate with the Government because it is on the Treasury benches, and I am sure most people want to co-operate with it. At the declaration of the poll at Ridley I said that the Labor Party had been elected to govern, and it was entitled to try to put its policy into effect.

If I can co-operate in any way with the Minister I shall be happy to do so, but if the Government introduces legislation which I think is contrary to my beliefs, I reserve the right to attack and criticize it. I hope I can do that in a constructive way. I have never been a carping critic in this place during the time I have been here, and I hope I never will be. The Government can rest assured that when I can co-operate I will, but if it introduces any measure detrimental to the District of Ridley or to the rural community in South Australia generally, it can expect some criticism of policy and will not receive my support. My criticism will not be personal. I have never believed in going to a Minister cap in hand for something and with a stiletto behind my back. I do not agree with that, but I reserve the right, with all the power at my command, if I disagree with the Government's policy, to say so in a constructive way. I understand that the Government is not prepared to say what it intends to do about the re-institution of the Transport Control Board. I will criticize any move in this direction when it is made. I will not have a bar of it.

Mr. Corcoran: If the legislation is brought down.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I understand it will be introduced, but I hope it is not. If any action has annoyed country people more than any other, it has been the restrictive action of the Transport Control Board. We do not want the board. When the previous Government

introduced the road tax legislation it stated that one of the reasons was to bring hauliers from other States into the net. That was fair enough. However, if the board is re-instituted not only will there be a road tax but there will be the embarrassing and harassing restrictions of the board. These two ideas cannot marry.

Mr. Corcoran: What about other States? When you say the two ideas will not marry, are you referring to the ton-mile tax?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Yes. The community has accepted the idea of paying road tax. People who use vehicles on the road are willing to contribute to the maintenance of those roads, and that was the reason for the legislation. Now there will be restrictions on travel and a permit will be necessary. The Government cannot marry these ideas.

Mr. Corcoran: They are married in other States.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: We don't want to marry them here, as they should be kept single.

Mr. Corcoran: You said you did not want them married. They are married in other States.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: The honourable member for Rocky River says he would not like the children of this marriage, and neither would I. The idea of re-instituting the Transport Control Board is ill-conceived and wrong. The Government may need additional revenue, and I think the Premier said, in effect, that the railways could earn an extra £1,000,000 revenue. An extra £1,000,000 in net railway revenue means over £2,000,000 gross. Who is going to pay? The man in the country, of course. In the country we cannot put up with that type of thing. We cannot have road transport at so much a ton as well as restrictions on road travel and increases in rail freights. I warn the Government that I shall oppose any road transport control legislation with all the command I have. I support the motion.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River): In supporting the motion, I assure the House that what I have to say will be to the point, and it will not take me two hours to say it. I congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion, not on what they said but on how they said it. I do not necessarily agree with what they said, but I agree that they said it well. I am not as critical as the honourable member for Burra, who said that members should not read their speeches. Whether they should or should not I do not know, but as members we represent

our people, and if we wish to put our point of view before Parliament and can do it well by reading it, we should read it. Our main object in Parliament is to represent those who sent us here. How one does it does not matter; the main thing is to present one's point of view.

I congratulate the members for West Torrens and Victoria. I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on having attained your high office, an office which you will uphold with dignity and from which you will control the House as it should be controlled. The member for Port Adelaide said, in his somewhat rambling speech, that he thought your predecessor biased because he always voted with the Government. I would not say that you, Mr. Speaker, would be biased if you always voted with the Government, either. You are here to represent the people who elected you and to help implement the policy of the Party to which you belong.

Mr. Ryan: Apparently, you agree with my remarks?

Mr. HEASLIP: No, I do not agree about bias. The previous Speaker always supported the Government because he believed it was doing the best thing for the people.

Mr. Hall: In one important instance he did not.

Mr. HEASLIP: He did in most instances, because he believed he was putting the wishes of his people before Parliament, as they desired him to do, and I think that, as a Speaker, he should have done that. However, when it comes to giving opinions on Standing Orders, I would not have expected him, and would not expect you, Mr. Speaker, to be biased. I am sure that while you are Speaker of this House, there will be no bias in your decisions. I also congratulate the Chairman of Committees. He has occupied the Chair on a number of occasions this session as Acting Speaker, and I think he will continue to do a good job. I offer my condolences to the relatives of the members who departed this life during the last year or so. We all know we are going to die, but that knowledge does not make it any easier for those left behind, because the loss of a loved one always hits hard.

The Governor's Speech was again delivered as we would expect Sir Edric to deliver a speech. I have never known an occasion when the Governor has not delivered a good address. However, whereas he has always written his own speeches and has always given us something worth listening to, I believe that on this occasion he missed out and that there is

much in his Opening Speech that is not productive. Certainly, many reforms are necessary.

Mr. Ryan: Will you support the reforms that will be brought down by the Government?

Mr. HEASLIP: I support some, but there are some that I do not support. However, I may touch on that matter later. I think the member for Port Adelaide explained the position clearly. The Government was only in office for 68 days when the Speech was delivered, and that so many projects were initiated by the previous Government that it would have been stupid for members of the incoming Government to say, "That is not what we were going to do. We will drop that, even though it has been started." That would have involved an absolute waste of taxpayers' money, so the incoming Government must continue what has been started. We shall not find good reading in the Governor's Speech until next year, or the following year. I was rather disappointed to notice that the present Government is making political capital out of projects initiated by the previous Government. Because they were commenced, the Government is taking the credit.

Mr. Corcoran: Where has this Government taken the credit?

Mr. HEASLIP: The Government has announced that it is going ahead with the works.

Mr. Corcoran: That is not taking credit.

Mr. HEASLIP: I am afraid that the Government is taking the credit, and I will read something that I think will convince members. What I propose to read concerns you, Mr. Speaker, but I believe that I should read it. The following article appeared in the *Northern Review*, the local paper circulating in the Jamestown, Laura, Wilmington and Booleroo area:

A 9,000-acre wild life reserve. The South Australian Government has purchased four sections of land in the hundred of Winninowie containing 9,465 acres as the first stage to dedicating the area as a wild life reserve. The land has been purchased from Mr. M. G. Frick, of Wilmington. This was announced at the weekend by the Speaker of the House of Assembly and member for Stuart, Mr. L. G. Riches. Mr. Riches said the land was a portion of the area in the Flinders Ranges in the vicinity of Mount Remarkable and Black Ranges, Alligator Gorge and Mambray Creek basins. He said action was now being taken for dedication of the area as a wild life reserve under the National Park and Wild Life Reserves. Mr. Riches said negotiations were also in hand for the purchase of further property at Mambray Creek.

I have no complaint about the latter part of that article dealing with the purchase of

further land at Mambray Creek, but 9,000 acres was purchased by the previous Government, and the person from whom the land was purchased told me 10 months ago that he had sold it.

Mr. Corcoran: Is that report inaccurate? It says that the South Australian Government purchased 9,000 acres of land.

Mr. HEASLIP: Wouldn't anyone reading it think that "the Government" was this Government?

Mr. Corcoran: I do not think it is misleading.

Mr. HEASLIP: I cannot see any other interpretation.

Mr. Corcoran: The article said that the South Australian Government purchased the land. That could have been the previous Government.

Mr. HEASLIP: "The Government" is the Government of the day.

Mr. Corcoran: It was the South Australian Government that purchased it, surely.

Mr. HEASLIP: I would say that 99 per cent of the people would interpret it as I have done.

Mr. Ryan: It did not say when it was purchased.

Mr. HEASLIP: I was told by the owner of the property 10 months ago that the land had been purchased. He was satisfied with the price he received and used the money to purchase another property, which he considers is much better.

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

Mr. HEASLIP: In reading the Governor's Speech I was surprised to find what I should call the "relegation of importance" of primary production. That is evident from the contents of paragraph 10. This aspect has not only received less priority than it has in previous years but, unfortunately, only one Minister is to be in charge of all primary production. I should have thought that its importance would definitely warrant the attention of two Ministers, as was the case with the previous Government. I am not casting aspersions on the present Minister of Agriculture and Lands (Hon. G. A. Bywaters), but I do not think it is physically possible for one man adequately to handle those two portfolios. On reading the whole of the Speech I found that only three lines were devoted to primary production, as follows:

My Government will pursue policies designed to make full use of the productive potential

of the State in agriculture, mining, land settlement, forestry and other fields. Research facilities will be provided and investigations conducted.

Then tacked on to that were the words:

Private industry will be encouraged to the greatest possible extent.

Being like my colleague, the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney), and perhaps a little ignorant—

Mr. Lawn: You have a few more colleagues like that.

Mr. HEASLIP: I am at least trying to get the true facts of the situation. I looked up both the Collins and Oxford dictionaries for the meaning of the word "encourage", which, on the face of it, seems a simple word that we should all understand.

Mr. Lawn: You have never been "encouraged" at all; you have always been dominated by the master.

Mr. HEASLIP: I found that "encourage" means "to promote, to assist, to countenance", and not being satisfied with that I looked up the meaning of the word "countenance".

Mr. Ryan: What a pity you didn't look in the mirror!

Mr. HEASLIP: I am searching for the truth, and trying to impart it to members opposite. I found that "countenance" meant "to favour" or "to encourage". I am pleased that the Government, despite the fact that primary production warranted only three lines in the Governor's Speech, will promote and favour private industry, for I think that is all-important. One of the private industries connected with primary production is the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited, which had at June 30, 1964, 22,000 members. Those members (and there are probably 25,000 today) had contributed over £4,500,000 to June 30, 1964, to make the company workable. They contributed this sum free of interest, because they thought the undertaking was so important. This is one of the things that the Government told us in the Governor's Opening Speech that it would assist and encourage. I am pleased that the Government is to encourage private industry. In his policy speech, delivered on February 19 at the Westbourne Park Memorial Hall, the Premier, when speaking of the public works programme, said:

The point I am more concerned to make known to the people of this State is that any public works recommended by the Government which are estimated to cost £100,000 or more must be referred to the Public Works Standing Committee. Any that are already recommended will be proceeded with under the Administration, and we have the assurance of

the industrial organizations that, wherever it is possible to speed up the completion of these works and any others that may be recommended, they will do their utmost to assist.

The Government, which intends to encourage and assist primary production, has deferred for at least 12 months—and this may mean for ever—a loading terminal at Giles Point, although the Public Works Committee has investigated the matter.

Mr. Ryan: Did it say 12 months?

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes, but I think that may mean that it will be deferred for all time. The Public Works Committee investigated this project and recommended it. In his policy speech the Premier said that his Government would proceed with any projects already recommended, but it has since been deferred. Is that assisting primary production? I cannot see that it is. Apart from that, a report appeared in the *Advertiser* that a silo for Appila had been refused.

Mr. Ryan: We thought you would miss mentioning that.

Mr. HEASLIP: No, I will not, as I am interested in the primary producers of this State and, more than that, in the State's economy. Secondary industry cannot carry on without primary production, as we need primary production to provide funds for oversea credits to help our secondary industry. When listening to the Governor's Speech I thought we were going to get that assistance, but since then the Giles Point project has been deferred and the Appila silo has been turned down. As a result of this, I doubt the sincerity of the Government, particularly as on March 24 the Premier was reported in the *Advertiser* as follows:

The Premier forecast a bright future for the railways of South Australia. The Premier was opening the biennial conference of the South Australian Division of the Australian Federated Union of Locomotive Enginemen at the Trades Hall.

The member for Barossa (Mrs. Byrne), whose husband is South Australian Divisional Manager of the Union, was present. The Premier said how all-important it was that the railways should go on earning. He said that the Government intended that the railways should earn at least another £1,000,000 a year.

Mr. Ryan: Do you agree with that?

Mr. HEASLIP: I am all for it, so long as the primary producers do not have to pay for it. Immediately after dealing with the railways, it being a railways conference, the Premier brought in the Appila silo. He said that State Cabinet had turned down a proposal

for a silo at Appila because Appila was nowhere near a railway. Why should he introduce that into a railways conference? There must have been some reason.

Mr. Clark: He gave the reason, and so did you.

Mr. HEASLIP: What is the reason?

Mr. Clark: Because it was not near a railway line.

Mr. HEASLIP: I will deal with that in a few minutes' time, because it is no reason at all. If we are to help the primary producers, who have to cart their wheat miles to the nearest railway station, the first thing to do is to put a silo near where they produce their wheat, so that they do not have to cart it far during the harvest.

Mr. Ryan: Why didn't your Government do something about it?

Mr. HEASLIP: This project came before us just before the election.

Mr. Ryan: Others have been refused.

Mr. HEASLIP: No they haven't. That is why I cannot understand the present Government.

Mr. McKee: How far is Appila from a railway line?

Mr. HEASLIP: Nine miles, and part of the Flinders Ranges is between the two places.

Mr. Hurst: What is the nearest silo to Appila?

Mr. HEASLIP: Booleroo Centre, which is 14 miles away. I will deal with that in a moment; honourable members are jumping in too soon. Because I doubted the sincerity of the Government, I started asking questions in the House as soon as the session began. My first question was:

Under what Act has the present Government—or any Government, for that matter—the right to turn down a proposal to build a country silo merely because the site is not near a railway system?

I did not get an answer to that question that day. The Premier promised me one, and the next day he gave me this answer:

I wish to advise you that Government policy is not to approve of silos on sites not served by rail. In accordance with this policy, the Government is not prepared to approve of the erection of a silo at Appila. Section 14 of the Bulk Handling of Grain Act requires the approval of the Minister of Agriculture before any silo can be erected. Further, I understand that the previous Government's policy was similar to our stand on this matter. Thenceforward I kept on asking questions but never got a proper answer. The final answer I got was from the Minister of Agriculture, because the Premier referred me to him. I

thought that the Premier would be responsible for answering my question as it involved policy, but he referred me to the Minister of Agriculture, saying that he could answer policy matters as well as the Premier himself could. The Minister said:

It would be difficult for me to satisfy the honourable member, but I said yesterday that this action was entirely in line with the way in which the former Government would have acted and in which I believe it intended to act.

Then I interjected:

That does not answer the question.

The Minister continued:

If this statement is not correct then the Opposition can contradict it. I believe that I covered the question fully yesterday and that constitutionally I was working under the same principle as laid down by past precedent.

That is the only answer I have received and it was not an answer to the original question: "Under what Act did the Government prohibit this silo?" I intend to take this opportunity to accept the Minister's challenge to contradict the Government, and I shall endeavour to do that by showing, first, that the policy of the present Government is different from the policy of the previous Government. I shall also show that the previous Government acted constitutionally and the present Government is acting unconstitutionally. I have tried to get an answer to questions about this matter, but have not been able to do so. During a question asked by the honourable member for Flinders (Hon. G. G. Pearson) there was an interjection. In reply to the question the Premier said:

I shall request the bulk handling co-operative to give me a complete and detailed report about the time the applications have been lodged.

The Minister of Agriculture, at this stage, interjected:

And the voting, and whether they wanted a silo at Appila.

The Premier then said:

I accept the interjection from my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture.

This made me more suspicious than ever. How could the Minister of Agriculture know what was the voting of the directors of the co-operative? He knew that the co-operative wanted a silo because it had made an application, but how did he get the information about the voting, when the meetings of the board are confidential? My brother is a member of the board but I would not think of asking him about what happened at a meeting or about decisions of the board, and if I did he would not tell me. These meetings are

confidential and information should not be released from the board room. However, the Minister of Agriculture knew what was going on.

Mr. Hughes: He is not the only one who knows.

Mr. HEASLIP: Well, that is the point. If more than one person knows about these matters, who is talking?

Mr. Casey: You had better ask your brother.

Mr. HEASLIP: I am sure that he was not the one. However, I should ask him because it is wrong that this confidential information should be released.

Mr. McKee: Is the honourable member blaming the Government for that?

Mr. HEASLIP: No, but there must be a leakage somewhere and it should not happen. The next answer I received from the Premier was:

An examination of the official dockets has revealed that on February 13, 1956, the Board of Directors of the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited sought the approval of the then Minister of Agriculture for the building of a 500,000-bushel capacity bulk grain storage at Balaklava, Snowtown, Brinkworth and Kybunga. A perusal of the docket has shown that this proposal based on a zonal plan was then investigated by the Railways Commissioner and also by Messrs. Rosevear and Dean, the two Government nominees on the Board of Directors of the co-operative. Both the reports of the Commissioner and of the two directors mentioned expressed opposition to the erection of a silo at Kybunga on the grounds that the zonal plan would be detrimental to railway revenues, involve higher road maintenance costs, and had unsatisfactory features as far as growers were concerned. The report of Messrs. Rosevear and Dean recommended a principle of bulk storages at alternate rail sidings.

I was in Parliament when the Bulk Handling of Grain Act was passed, and anyone who studied it would know that this report was made nine years ago. That was at the beginning of bulk handling when the Government had guaranteed money to it. There was no guarantee—in fact, anything but one—because one member of Parliament said, when the Bill was passed, that although it had gone through it did not matter because the company would go broke and have to come back to the Government.

Mr. McKee: Was that the member for Onkaparinga?

Mr. HEASLIP: No, but that was the position then. No-one knew it would be the success it has been, and the Government then

appointed two directors to the board who have been most helpful.

Mr. Ryan: Who were the two Government appointees?

Mr. HEASLIP: Mr. Dean and Mr. Rosevear, and they have done much towards helping the company. Section 7 of the Act states:

Where the two directors appointed by the Governor dissent from any proposal which is agreed to by a majority of the directors, or is intended to be carried out by the company, and the proposal relates to or affects the order of priority of the construction of the bulk handling facilities at terminal ports, or would, if carried into effect, increase the risk of the Treasurer having to pay money under the guarantee given by him in respect of money lent to the company, the said two directors may, by notice to the secretary of the company, record their dissent from the proposal.

It is also their duty to report back to the Government. At that stage there was some doubt about the financial position of the company and whether it would be successful or not, and they reported back to the Government. Even then the Government did not refuse the silo, and it never said that Kybunga could not have a silo. The matter was referred back to the company and it decided not to erect a silo there. It was erected at another siding on that line. That is the reason why the silo at Kybunga was not built: it was not prohibited by the Government. Kybunga was on a railway line and there was no suggestion that the previous Government rejected the silo because it was not on a railway line. On the contrary, that Government approved several silos.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: The Government did not have the authority to reject the silo.

Mr. HEASLIP: Definitely not. However, the present Government states that it is following the same policy as that adopted by the previous Government: that Government's policy was never to reject a silo on the ground that it was not at a railway siding. Mangalo, Arno Bay, Cowell, Streaky Bay and Witera are not on railway lines.

Mr. Hudson: How far are they from a railway line?

Mr. HEASLIP: Varying distances, but they are not on a railway line.

Mr. Hughes: They are not further than nine miles.

Mr. HEASLIP: Some may be, but one may as well be 50 miles away if one cannot get to a railway siding. Distance is not everything.

Mr. McKee: They are entitled to a silo if they are that far from a railway line.

Mr. HEASLIP: Because it is physically impossible to get to a railway line by direct route, they are not entitled to a silo. Is that what you say? Is that your reasoning? Evidently it is. I know that if the goods are produced, the people must have somewhere to deliver them. That proves definitely that the policy of the previous Government was not the same as that of this Government. It never rejected a silo, particularly on the ground that it was not on a railway siding, but this Government has. Later, I asked another question, to which I received quite a long reply but it still was not an answer. This reply was as follows:

The application for Appila was sent to the Railways Commissioner for report and his reply received on March 3, 1965, reads:

I am disturbed by the request of the S.A. Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited that a silo be constructed at Appila to meet the request of growers who are within distances of 8 to 15 miles from the silos in the railway yards at Booleroo Centre and Wirrabara to which stations they have been carting grain for at least 65 years.

The Railways Commissioner says that the farmers of that area at Appila have been carting their grain to Wirrabara and Booleroo Centre for the last 65 years. I say that that is an absolute misrepresentation.

Mr. Ryan: By the Railways Commissioner?

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes.

Mr. Ryan: Do you say he was not telling the truth?

Mr. HEASLIP: It is not the truth. I have lived at Appila for 50 years and every year I have carted wheat to the railway, so I know a little about it. I never carted wheat to Booleroo Centre or to Wirrabara and yet the Minister of Railways says that farmers have been carting their wheat there for 65 years.

Mr. Ryan: You do not know what is going on in your own district!

Mr. HEASLIP: I do know. During the period of bagged wheat, no-one carted wheat from Appila to Booleroo Centre or Wirrabara.

Mr. Casey: Was wheat ever carted to Appila?

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes.

Mr. Casey: How much?

Mr. HEASLIP: Thousands and thousands of bags, and it was carted from Appila to Port Pirie by road.

Mr. Casey: Were there any wheat stacks at Appila?

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes, there were big wheat stacks there. I did not cart there, but my father did.

Mr. Casey: How far back are you going?

Mr. HEASLIP: I know that that is the position and I also know that it was carted to Port Pirie from Appila.

Mr. Ryan: Wasn't this report sent back to the previous Government?

Mr. HEASLIP: This was in 1965.

Mr. Ryan: Wasn't it sent back by the Railways Commissioner to the previous Government?

Mr. HEASLIP: That does not matter.

Mr. Ryan: It did not dispute the truth of it, did it? Your Government approved it after the election.

Mr. HEASLIP: This was sent on March 3, 1965, and there was an election on March 6. Do you think that any Government would commit another Government three days before an election? Some Governments might, but I am sure an L.C.L. Government would not.

Mr. Ryan: This matter was considered by Cabinet after the election and before this Government took over. Recommendations were made after the election.

Mr. HEASLIP: This was written on March 3 and the election was on March 6. It would take at least a day to get to Cabinet.

Mr. Ryan: Cabinet made recommendations after the election and before this Government took over.

Mr. HEASLIP: It may have made some.

Mr. Ryan: This was in the Government's hands at the time.

Mr. HEASLIP: My point is that the Commissioner's report was not correct.

Mr. Ryan: Your Government didn't dispute it.

Mr. HEASLIP: It didn't have time.

Mr. Ryan: Rubbish!

Mr. HEASLIP: In any case, it handed it on to the present Government, which has taken notice of it and rejected the silo. I lived in the area for 50 years, during which time I never carted wheat to Wirrabara or Booleroo Centre; nor did people cart it from Appila. During that period of bagged wheat it went to Yandiah, about seven miles north-west of Appila, involving an up-hill climb and higher freight charges. Wirrabara never received a bag, but producers south or west of Appila carted all their wheat in bags to Stone Hut.

Mr. Ryan: How far is that?

Mr. HEASLIP: About nine or 10 miles from Appila. Neither of those places has a silo. The only alternative available to people at Appila is to send the wheat to Booleroo Centre, Wirrabara or Gladstone. It is not practical to cart wheat to Wirrabara because of the up-hill grade, and this applies also to Booleroo Centre, where the freight charge is

about 6d. a bushel higher. No-one in his right senses would do that. The only place to send wheat is Gladstone, a distance of 20 to 25 miles, and yet this Government has refused to provide a silo 25 miles away from there.

Mr. Casey: There was never any bagged wheat at Appila over the least 25 or 30 years.

Mr. HEASLIP: Is the honourable member asking whether wheat was stacked at Appila?

Mr. Clark: He said in the last 20-odd years.

Mr. HEASLIP: He did not say that originally.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: What did you say about "encouragement" for primary producers?

Mr. HEASLIP: This is the assistance and encouragement that we hear about in the Governor's Speech, but we are receiving no such assistance. Contrary to the Constitution, the Government is denying the people concerned the right to have a silo; although it has no power to do this it can force those people to cart wheat to a railway station.

Mr. Casey: They used to cart it there before.

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes, because no alternative existed before the introduction of bulk handling. People carted wheat nine miles to Stone Hut and Yandiah. Now they cart it 25 miles to Gladstone, where they wait half a day to have it unloaded; yet the member for Frome says that is good enough for primary producers.

Mr. Casey: I did not say that. I am saying there was no need for a silo at Appila, because there was never any bagged wheat there to my knowledge over the last 20 years. It never was a site for bulk handling.

Mr. HEASLIP: The member for Frome's Party says it will encourage private industry and primary production, and yet he himself says that we do not deserve it, and that we are not entitled to it.

Mr. Casey: I did not say that. I have never heard anything so ridiculous in my life.

Mr. McKee: The member for Rocky River needs a hearing aid.

Mr. HEASLIP: The honourable member is not a primary producer and has not had to lump wheat in the hot sun. He may have done so on the stacks, but not on the farm. The member for Frome is a primary producer, so he should understand the difficulties of producers. However, evidently he does not, or he does not want to. I would not like to be in his position—sitting behind a Government whose policy is not to encourage but to discourage primary producers.

Mr. Quirke: He does not care, because he gets the wheat in any case.

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes, he gets it. The Minister also said:

I submit again, Mr. Speaker, that this Government, in refusing approval for Appila, is continuing to adopt the same policy as the former Government.

It was not the policy of the former Government. What is more, every time I have asked under what power the Government has acted, section 14 of the Act has been quoted. There is nothing in that section that deals with country bins: the only thing dealt with in it is the approval of materials and design. Therefore, there is no power under the Act that allows the Government to prohibit the building of a country bin merely because it is not on a railway.

Mr. Hughes: Why not test the Government? That is the answer to the whole thing.

Mr. HEASLIP: I have been trying to get an answer for the whole session.

Mr. Hughes: I did not say an answer: I said, "Why not test the Government out?"

Mr. HEASLIP: In what way?

Mr. Hughes: There is only one way.

Mr. Hall: You suggest through the courts?

Mr. Hughes: Why don't the farmers test the case?

Mr. HEASLIP: That is a great encouragement for primary producers—and that comes from a member representing a country area!

Mr. Hughes: We are happy with the position at Wallaroo, but apparently the honourable member is not.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much interjection. The honourable member for Rocky River.

Mr. HEASLIP: I am surprised that most of the interjections came from two members who represent primary-producing areas.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: They are a bit sensitive about it.

Mr. Hughes: If I were as worried as the member for Rocky River is about farmers in my area I would suggest that they test out the Government.

Mr. HEASLIP: And involve them in more expense? Do you say you are supporting a Government that is forcing the primary producers to go to the courts to find this out?

Mr. Hughes: They are not being forced at all.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Rocky River to address the Chair and members to refrain from interjecting.

Mr. HEASLIP: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I have proved my point—that the policy of this Government is not the same as that of the previous Government.

Mr. Ryan: But you are not sure.

Mr. HEASLIP: If I am not, I do not know how anyone can be sure. I have already proved that this Government is not acting constitutionally. If I had been given a simple reply in the first place that it was legal or illegal I would have been satisfied, but I did not get an answer.

Mr. Quirke: The Railways Commissioner told the Government what to do.

Mr. HEASLIP: Exactly. Is the Government supporting or encouraging the Railways Commissioner or primary producers? I go back now to the Governor's Speech. In paragraph 8 of the Governor's Speech I find the words "It is my Government's policy to encourage the use of public transport." I think "promote" is a good word but I do not think the Railways Department should be assisted at the expense of the primary producers. Coming from a primary producing area, I take exception to it and do not think it is right. I fully support paragraph 4 of the Governor's Speech, which deals with the promotion of the tourist trade.

Mr. Ryan: You do agree with Government policy on that?

Mr. HEASLIP: I do. By not encouraging tourists South Australia is losing much money from overseas and other States. We have only to go to Queensland to see the amount of money coming in from tourists. Many houses in the cities there are built with no industries nearby, and everything is kept going by tourists. We have in the Flinders Ranges and the Barossa Valley wonderful opportunities to promote this trade.

Mr. Ryan: Didn't your Government have 32 years in which to do this very thing?

Mr. HEASLIP: It was doing it but I say now that I support the present Government in extending it.

Mr. Ryan: It was not promoted very much, prior to this.

Mr. HEASLIP: It has been promoted to a great extent and much money has been spent on it. I still believe it is a good thing to continue to spend money in that direction because we have in the Flinders Ranges, within reasonable distance of Adelaide, Port Germein Gorge, Alligator Creek (which was mentioned earlier), Horrocks Pass, Pichirichi Pass and a new one that has been opened up—the television bluff at Wirrabara. A road has been

built to the top of the bluff, the highest part of the Flinders Ranges in that area, where the television station has been established.

Mr. Quirke: Can you get up that road now?

Mr. HEASLIP: I am coming to that. The Commonwealth Government spent more than £50,000 on that road and, before it was completed, 200 local cars of a weekend would go up there to get the view from the top. It was difficult to park there because no parking space had been cleared, but it would be easy to make a parking area there and hundreds of people would visit that place and look from the top of the bluff right over Port Pirie, Port Augusta, Jamestown, Peterborough and so on.

Mr. Ryan: Don't they still do that?

Mr. HEASLIP: I am coming to that. A recent edition of the *Northern Review* states:

No visitors at the Bluff. The Director of Posts and Telegraphs (Mr. J. R. O'Sullivan) said last week that since the television transmitter station at the bluff near Port Pirie had been opened, many people had driven their motor vehicles to the locked gate across the access road about three miles from the station, not knowing that they could not be permitted to continue along the road, which is private, and visit the station. Mr. O'Sullivan said there were several factors which made it impracticable to permit visitors to the station, not the least of which was the inability of the staff on duty to perform their essential work and look after visitors at the same time.

I am not asking for any attention by the staff at the bluff: all I am asking is that the Government has that road opened and permit visitors to go up and spend a few hours in the clearing at the top, where they can park their cars. There is no need for people to go into the television station. It has a high fence around it and visitors would not interfere with it at all, but if they were allowed to use this road they would be able to view from the top of the bluff a huge expanse of the northern area of South Australia. The land over which the road has been built was originally owned by the South Australian Government. The Commonwealth Government got the right to put the road through the forest. I asked a question on this matter and I found that the Commonwealth Government wanted £50,000 from the South Australian Government to open the road to the public. I believe that is most unreasonable. After all, this is the taxpayers' money and surely they should be allowed to use a road for which their money has paid. I hope that the Government will examine this question and see what can be done.

In his speech, the honourable member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee) said:

The beef industry is very important to South Australia, and it should be considered. Valuable time should not be wasted talking about the cost, from where the cash is coming, and who is going to pay for it. The Commonwealth Treasurer has warned that several million pounds will have to be found to enable conscripted, voteless boys to fight a foreign war. I am sure people of this country would prefer to see the money spent on the country's development rather than in having these boys fight this foreign war.

I believe this is not a foreign war, but a war very close to us. It may be fought on foreign land, but it is all-important to Australia. If we spend millions of pounds on beef roads for the development of Australia only to lose Australia later on to the people north of us, what is the use of that? This is a wonderful country and we have been developing it, but it is not fully developed or populated. Surely it is our duty to see that we hold on to this country so that those who come after us may enjoy a democratic and peaceful way of life.

Mr. McKee: Do you agree with voteless boys being conscripted to fight a foreign war?

Mr. HEASLIP: I think that anyone who lives in a country has a responsibility towards that country, whether he is a voteless boy or not. The armed forces will not take old men; they have to be young men to do the job. Therefore, it is useless to spend money on development and then hand the country over to the people from the north. The member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes), who made a good speech and appeared as the champion of the wheatgrowers, said:

The need for decentralization of industry is just as great today as in previous years and already this Government, in the short period it has been in office, has taken the initial steps to assist in this direction. One of its first acts was to establish the Premier's Department, which has been set up to encourage new industries to come to South Australia and to assist established industries to expand.

I do not know what is the honourable member's conception of the Premier's Department. First, industries must be encouraged to come and cause development so that other industries will come. Many things done by this Government, however, will make it almost impossible to get them here. But if they do get here, and the honourable member thinks that they can be directed to country areas, he does not know much about secondary industry. It is impossible to direct them. If they come we are lucky, but they will decide whether they will come, and they will not be going into the country. In his speech the honourable member

appeared as a champion of the primary producer but tonight, while I have been speaking, he is doing everything against primary production, and I do not know where he stands.

The honourable member for Frome criticized the honourable member for Mitcham for touring the Far North in a Land Rover at the Government's expense and posing as an authority on beef roads. Having said that, the honourable member for Frome then told us that he had been to America, and it seems that after one trip he now knows all about nuclear power and is an authority on it. I say that people who live in glass houses should not throw stones, but that is what the honourable member for Frome is doing. We have experts on power and electricity and I leave it to them, because I am not an expert.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: We have experts on railways. Do you leave that to them?

Mr. HEASLIP: I would not think of trying to run a railway myself because I know nothing about it.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: You were critical of the Railways Commissioner tonight.

Mr. HEASLIP: I said that he did not tell the truth, but I was not being critical. I made a statement, and I am prepared to say that to him outside the House. I was not being critical at all. North of Orroroo is a huge artesian basin where, originally, 40 families carried on dairying successfully while the Pekina dam could supply them with water. However, the dam, now silted up, is useless. Bores have been sunk to about 350ft. and good water flows for a while but is then blocked by the sand. In the last 12 months a Mr. Bright put down a bore to 760ft. and finished on rock, and that bore has been flowing continuously with no sand problems. I hope that the Government will make money available to the Mines Department to enable further exploration of this basin to see how much water it contains. If that were done, it would actively assist decentralization, and would be more than just talking about it. To get 40 families back in that area, where there are now half a dozen, would be decentralizing the population and increasing production at the same time. I support the motion.

Mr. CORCORAN (Millicent): I support the motion, which was moved so ably by the new honourable member for Barossa. She has the great distinction of being the first Labor woman member of Parliament in this House. I offer her my humble welcome. All my colleagues and, no doubt, members on the other side of the House are pleased that she is

with us. She has already demonstrated her ability and we look forward to her further contributions and advice on matters that we, possibly, are not as familiar with as we should be. She had a wonderful victory on March 6. I believe it was all the more meritorious because of the opponent she defeated, Mr. Condor Laucke, one of nature's gentlemen who applied himself assiduously to his duties as member for the district. However, I am confident that the new member for Barossa will perform her duties equally as well as, if not better than, Mr. Laucke did, and that she will retain this seat for the Australian Labor Party for many years to come; in fact, for as long as she desires.

She was ably assisted by the seconder of the motion, the honourable member for Glenelg who, strangely enough, drew much comment from the Opposition for a new member. This is a good sign and shows that his speech was perhaps provocative for a maiden speech and that he gave food for thought. I think somebody referred to him as the economist or the economic adviser to the Government. That was a tribute to him and I am sure that we will receive good, sound advice from the honourable member on economic matters. I am not at all afraid of the advice he will give us, because the position he held prior to his coming to this House will stand him in good stead and I know he will represent the electors of Glenelg admirably.

I now refer briefly to some things said by speakers on the other side of the House, particularly by those speakers who immediately preceded me. I was pleased that the honourable member for Rocky River, who has just resumed his seat, did support some of the policy of the Government. He, together with other members on that side of the House, expressed alarm and concern that this Government appeared to be relegating primary production to a "bottom shelf". However, I am confident that the Government will not do that. Criticism has been levelled at us because the portfolios connected with primary production are under one Minister, but this situation will be rectified as soon as we can possibly rectify it. We give full importance to primary production in this State and in Australia. Our record as a Party bears this out, particularly in the Commonwealth sphere, in our achievements in the field of organized marketing, a subject that was ably dealt with this afternoon by the honourable member for Ridley. I know that the Government will

consider matters affecting primary production in this State.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: It has already done so tonight.

Mr. CORCORAN: Yes. I will have a little more to say about that matter later. There is one thing for which I admire the honourable member for Rocky River: his tenacity in seeking replies to the series of questions he addressed to the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Quirke: And his ferocity!

Mr. CORCORAN: No, I should say "tenacity", because he pursued the subject vigorously, and although he believed he did not get far I think he got his answer. He may have been dissatisfied with it, and that is perhaps one of the reasons for his pursuing the matter as he did in this debate, for which I do not blame him. He has a district to represent, and no doubt he has his own reasons for forming his opinion. However, I believe that the Government did what it could in this matter, and that it was guided to some extent by the actions of the previous Government. I was interested in the remarks of the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke), when he said that new members would be well advised to speak without notes.

Mr. Quirke: I did not say to speak without notes.

Mr. CORCORAN: The member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) was of the opinion that a more logical sequence would occur if a member read from notes. The member for Burra told us that one of the faults in reading a speech was that it did not make for good listening, and that one often got the impression that the speaker was mumbling in his beard. However, I could not help thinking tonight that the member for Rocky River was doing just this, because he was extremely difficult to hear, and it was not because of the chatter going on around me at the time. I listened as attentively as I could, but I just could not catch everything he said.

Mr. Jennings: You didn't miss much.

Mr. CORCORAN: I shouldn't say that, but I do think he took a long time to get over his views on the replies he got about a silo at Appila. Perhaps the member for Burra has a point. It is not easy for a new member to think when he is on his feet, or to make himself clearly understood. I think we had a perfect example of what can be done from the member for Ridley (Hon. T. C. Stott) this afternoon, who spoke for nearly three hours. Perhaps the reason for this was that, having spent three years in the Speaker's Chair,

he thought he would make up for lost time. I listened to practically the whole of his address, and he was interesting to the end. One could say that there is no substitute for knowledge, and on the subjects to which he referred I suppose his background would be as good as anybody's in South Australia. He referred to the wine grape situation, and although that interested me as a citizen of this State it does not directly affect my district.

He gave his version of the cause of the problem, and I think I should inform honourable members, who may not have heard the news tonight, that the Premier has honoured another Government promise and has appointed a Royal Commission into this industry, which, I hope, will be instrumental in solving the problems facing the wine grapegrowers today. I listened to Channel 2, and from the remarks made by Mr. Nelson (who, I believe, is the Senior Vice-President of the Wine and Brandy Producers' Association), I think he was satisfied with the decision to appoint a Royal Commission and with the terms of reference, as also was Mr. Lucas, the Secretary of the Wine Grapegrowers' Association. The other feature of this Royal Commission is that its finding is expected to be made by September 30. This is important because, if the problems that have arisen in the last three or four harvests are to be overcome, it may be necessary to introduce legislation as a result of the recommendations of the Commission, and the Government will have time to do it. I wish this Commission well, and I hope the problems associated with the industry will be overcome.

Mr. Quirke: This would not affect Coonawarra.

Mr. CORCORAN: That is so, but that district is represented by the member for Victoria, and I do not think it has many problems in disposing of its grapes. A very good product, Coonawarra claret, comes from this area. I was impressed with the speech made by the member for Ridley (Hon. T. C. Stott). This was the first time I had heard him speak in this House, and there is no doubt that a young member like myself can learn much from listening to him. I give him credit for his effort. We were all agreeably surprised last night by the effort of the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney). He surprised not only us but probably himself, too.

Mr. Lawn: What about his Communist girl friend?

Mr. CORCORAN: I shall have something to say about that later. Because of all the fatherly advice he gave to the

younger members, I am a little reluctant to criticize anything he said. At one stage, after listening to all the experiences he had had and the fatherly advice he was giving, I was sure he was trying to usurp some of the powers of the father of the House, the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon). However, I do not think he could tell us all that the member for Onkaparinga could.

Mr. Clark: I'll bet he couldn't!

Mr. CORCORAN: Probably not. I enjoyed the speech. He started off with a reasonable approach; he said he was aware that the Labor Party was a reform Party and that no doubt certain reforms would be introduced during the present session that he might or might not support. At least he was prepared to say that possibly some of these things were desirable and that he would consider them when they came up. I hope he is given the opportunity later in the session to show that he will do this, and that he will remain, in his own words, "invincibly himself". I think they were the words he used in his maiden speech. I can remember one occasion when he was not invincible—when he tried to uphold the integrity of the South Australian Parliamentary cricket team against the Western Australian team. He was the last man in. I do not know how many runs we needed, but it needed only one decent hit. He swung his bat, missed, and the ball hit the wicket. He was not invincible on that occasion, but he did his best for the team.

When speaking about the new members, he stated that the member for Barossa (Mrs. Byrne) had made a sweeping statement about the building industry in this State. She had referred to it at some length in her maiden speech and had expressed her concern about it. The member for Stirling said that he had discussed this matter with a bank manager who resided in Queensland and, I think, visited this State recently. I forget exactly what the bank manager is supposed to have said but I think the honourable member indicated that the bank manager thought that we were fortunate in this State with the standard of our houses and buildings. I think that is something like what was said, that the standard and cost of housing would compare favourably with Queensland's. I do not think I would be prepared to accept a statement from a visitor, no matter who he was, who possibly had not had the opportunity to examine closely the faults that the member for Barossa drew to the attention of the House. A person can look at a house from the outside and it appears to

be of solid structure but, if he is buying it, naturally he examines it more closely. This is when one discovers the shortcomings of the people who build houses of this type at the moment. They are not all bad, but some are, and possibly far more than there should be.

I know from experience, as I have said here previously, of the jerry-building of trust houses in Millicent. In some cases they had been built for only two years, but baths were sinking, back verandahs were cracking and sinking and huge cracks were appearing in the walls, all as a result of bad workmanship. This has been rectified in Millicent and, fortunately, I have heard of no similar recurrence. A sweeping statement implies that something has been just brushed over and not dealt with in detail, but I thought that the member for Barossa went into great detail about these matters and made her point very well. She also came up with what she believed to be the correct solution of the problem.

I thought the member for Stirling made a sweeping statement last night about the rash promises made by this Government. He said that we had made rash promises. When challenged to name one, he did not. He said he had a whole list of them but did not feel disposed to divulge them at that stage. I do not think he was able to. It was, therefore, a sweeping statement and I was surprised, as a result, that he challenged the member for Barossa in the way he did. He mentioned, too, long-term loans in relation to land and plant for primary production. I could not agree with him more on that but he must recognize that it is because of the shortcomings of the private banks in this country that this situation has arisen. Were it not for the State banking instrumentalities, these long-term loans would not be available. The previous Government recognized this when it introduced the Rural Advances Guarantee Act, which in my opinion is operating very well. I notice that the member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) has a question on notice about that Act, which I think will elicit some interesting information. Having had some dealings with this Act since I have had the honour of being a member of the Land Settlement Committee, I am convinced that it is a good Act and that we should apply it where possible.

Mr. McAnaney: Does the policy of the Reserve Bank allow the trading banks to make long-term loans?

Mr. CORCORAN: I think it would. I believe that the Commonwealth Bank or the Reserve Bank should give a lead in this matter and

do it so well that the private banks would have to follow. I believe that this was the main reason behind the previous Government's introducing the Rural Advances Guarantee Act. I believe the Leader of the Opposition will bear me out in that. The honourable member also compared farming methods in South Australia with those in Queensland. He said that better farming methods were used in South Australia. I do not dispute this, but he seemed to base it on the fact that the land tenure was different in Queensland where short-term leases applied. In South Australia there are freehold, perpetual or miscellaneous leases. He said that in Queensland, because of the short-term lease, they do not take an interest in the land and develop it to its full potential. He is probably right in saying that. When he said this the Leader of the Opposition interjected. "They are doing away with freeholds in this State." I think that the member for Stirling would realize that this is not so and that the freehold that exists at the moment will survive.

Soldier settlers with perpetual leases have the right under contractual agreement between the Commonwealth and the State to freehold their properties. Every application made prior to March 3 to have a perpetual lease freeholded was honoured by the Minister. However, the Minister of Agriculture then said that no more perpetual leases would be freeholded, and there is a good reason for this. It may not close all the loopholes that exist, but it will go part of the way in preventing the aggregation of small holdings into large holdings. In the past, under provisions of the Crown Lands Act, any individual holding land with an unimproved value to the total of £12,000 could not take over a perpetual lease. However, land-owners were overcoming this provision in certain instances by freeholding the land and selling it to the big landholders. Admittedly, people were able to get a better deal, but it kept the small man out, and it is important from the point of view of decentralization or anything else that we put as many people as possible on the land.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: What is the average cost of freeholding leasehold land when it is permitted?

Mr. CORCORAN: I do not know that, but I think it would have been about £5 an acre.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: That places an embargo on the movement of land. A cost of £5 an acre over the value of the land would prevent what the honourable member suggested.

Mr. CORCORAN: In relation to the embargo, I should say that it was not nearly sufficient. The inflated value of land today and the prices people are prepared to pay mean that this £5 will be disregarded. This figure may have seemed a lot at one time but, today, it is not a sum that worries those who want this land to build up their properties. I believe that the honourable member for Alexandra (Hon. D. N. Brookman) mentioned during his speech his interest in improving farming methods. He has expert knowledge and experience in this field, and he referred to the potential of the South-East. We know that this is God's own country: there is no question about that, for there is an assured rainfall and everything one wants. This is one reason why I am keen to see the small man get on and to see more people on land in this area. I quote from an article that appeared in the *South-Eastern Times*, headed "Farming in the Future: Eight Sheep to the Acre is Possible." This is for interested members, and is reasonably feasible because it is working at present. The article states:

Small, pocket handkerchief size paddocks carrying up to eight dry sheep per acre are the likely agricultural developments in this district in the next few years.

That is the Millicent district. The article continues:

In that scene, yet to come, the graziers of this part of the State will become sheep farmers. Soil utilization will be intense, an economical necessity, and because more food and clothing will be wanted in the world. Recently, a party of New Zealand farmers visited this district. They were told it comprised the best land in South Australia. What surprised them was the "absence" of fences. A New Zealander, who has taken up residence in Millicent, agreed on Friday that an average of eight sheep per acre, from the use of 5-acre paddocks, was more than likely. Besides his experience in New Zealand he has the trends of some local tests to back his view. The emigrant is Mr. Bruce Campbell, B.Ag.Sc., Farm Management Consultant to the Millicent and District Advisory Service, who was discussing some tests being made at Tantanoola. Mr. T. G. Altschwager is using five-acre plots and fodder rolls. Outlining the advantages of fodder roll feeding, Mr. Campbell said that fodder was turned into round bales each weighing between 200 to 250 lb., and left in the paddock for use in the following autumn. Paddocks would be subdivided into areas of approximately five acres, which would mean temporary fences would have to be erected. This means of baling and usage would be economical as there would be no cost for cartage, twine or storage. This method is allied to deferred grazing. It is necessary to run at least 200 sheep to the acre for it to be a success. Each subdivision is eaten out separately and

becomes available for pasture renovation. If this high stocking rate and deferred grazing were carried out at the critical time of the year, it would be possible to run eight dry sheep to the acre, and this might become the natural thing, stated Mr. Campbell.

This is an interesting article, and points to the future of this district.

Mr. Nankivell: What is the drought frequency?

Mr. CORCORAN: Not very great. The district has an assured rainfall, as the honourable member knows. We have had some dry years, the driest being 19in. in 1957, but we usually have about 25in. of rain. One reason why we are so interested in the area is the need to drain it because the rain that falls there cannot get away and must be taken by the drains.

Mr. Quirke: You have screamers about the drainage?

Mr. CORCORAN: That is an interesting subject, and one that may have caused the previous Minister of Lands some headaches. Even if it did not, it took much of his time.

Mr. Quirke: It never caused me any headaches.

Mr. Ferguson: Would 19in. of rain be considered a dry year at Millicent?

Mr. CORCORAN: Yes, if the following year was not up to standard 19in. would be well below average.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The last successful drainage programme you had was the draining of Lake Bonney.

Mr. CORCORAN: Perhaps, but they never drained it. An outlet made to the sea lowered the level of the lake and allowed a soldier settlement scheme at Canunda to be established. However, the causeway filled up and has not been opened since. The level of the water in the lake does not seem to have risen and it serves a good purpose by enabling effluent from the paper mills to be disposed of.

I wish to refer to the Communist girl friend of the honourable member for Stirling. I am envious of all those much-travelled members of this House who have been to London, New York, Rome, Paris and such places, and I hope that one of these days I may see all the fascinating sights in those countries. However, I cannot think of anything funnier than the honourable member's meeting that Communist girl in New York. I wonder whether it was a blind date the honourable member was on, but, surely, after spending from 7.30 p.m. or 8 p.m. until 5.30 in the morning with her, some of her philosophy must have rubbed off on the honourable member. However, he

was obviously immune to anything she could have suggested. The honourable member must have been extremely interested, or he could not possibly have sat there until 5.30 in the morning. I will not accuse the honourable member for Stirling of being narrow-minded. On the contrary, I think he is a fair and broad-minded man and I am not saying this to be unkind to him. However, I do take the opportunity of having something to say about matters raised by honourable members opposite.

Some members on the other side mentioned the co-ordination of transport, a matter that is causing much concern in my district at present. I know that it is causing anxiety in the districts of the honourable members for Victoria and Mount Gambier, but we are all concerned about this. A well-attended and orderly meeting, under a good chairman, was held in my district. I had the pleasure of addressing that meeting. I stated that I did not know on what those present were basing their case or their argument, because at that stage we had not introduced any legislation on the matter. Whilst there may be an intention to do so, we do not know the form it will take. However, if honourable members care to study the position obtaining in other States in respect of the co-ordination of transport, they will find that this is the only State without some form of control, although I understand that some licences granted under the Road and Railway Transport Act still operate and will continue until 1968. I have no doubt that the Minister of Transport has investigated the various forms of control operating in the other States and that from them all he may be able to devise a system that will not interfere with the freedom and choice of the people, particularly the graziers and farmers. However, I am not in a position to know any more than any other honourable member about what will happen. I do think that as a Government we have a responsibility to this State to protect the public investment in our railways of about £60,000,000. I suppose every honourable member would agree that railways are necessary, but it is not good if they are continually running at a loss. Some people say, "We can overcome this by improving the efficiency of the railways." This is extremely difficult, because of its shortcomings. It is not practical, for instance, to run a railway to every farm, and, therefore, road transport has this advantage over the railways. On the other hand, however, the railways have many advantages over road transport. I believe the two systems

can be harmoniously combined to the best interests of everybody in this State, and I think this Government will be sadly lacking if it does not give effect to the policy it enunciated on the co-ordination of transport. I look forward with much interest to the legislation that will be introduced on this matter.

Mr. Nankivell: So do we!

Mr. CORCORAN: I have no doubt about that. Although it may be introduced only in stages, I hope the final result will be satisfactory to everyone.

Mr. Hall: Will you, as a backbencher, have any influence on it?

Mr. CORCORAN: The honourable member knows that I shall exert all the influence I can. If I am not in agreement with certain provisions in the legislation, he knows that I will wield what influence I have (and I am being very humble about it, Mr. Speaker). The member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) spoke about trade apprentices, and he said he thought they should train themselves, or that possibly industry should be responsible for part of the cost of their training. He said he was an accountant, who had to pay for his own training, but I wonder if that is entirely correct. I think if we closely examined the situation we should find that he did not have to pay for all of his training, for he would have been helped in some way. The honourable member was possibly clever enough to obtain scholarships, but even without them he would have received some Government assistance towards his training. An accountant offers his services to the public of his own volition, for which he gains due reward.

Mr. Coumbe: He is a public servant.

Mr. CORCORAN: Some tradesmen also obtain that reward, but in the main they offer their services to an employer who is able to make a profit from them. I think it is not unusual to find in industry that an employer charges adult rates for a third-year apprentice, and he makes a profit from it.

Mr. Hurst: They do it in the case of a first-year apprentice.

Mr. CORCORAN: I was giving them the benefit of the doubt. They make their profits, and I believe they should contribute something towards an apprentice's training. This is the only State in which apprentices must attend a trade school in their own time. In other States, I believe, they attend such schools in their employers' time.

Mr. Quirke: That is not universal in this State.

Mr. CORCORAN: I suppose it depends on the individual employer.

Mr. Quirke: They attend night school, but they also attend school in the employers' time.

Mr. CORCORAN: In part of it, but they do attend trade school in their own time.

Mr. Hurst: It is four hours a week.

Mr. CORCORAN: This position should be examined, and no doubt the Government will do something about it. Like the people of Millicent and district, I am pleased at the development taking place at Apcel. The construction of the new building to house the converting plant and a new machine is well advanced. The members who were in the last Parliament will recall that last session an Indenture Act was passed in connection with the expansion of this industry, and it is pleasing to note that this expansion is progressing at such a good rate. As a result it should not be long before more people will be moving into the district. I have been told that the neighbouring factory, Cellulose Australia Ltd., will be going on to a four-shift roster soon, which will create employment for an additional 50 people. Those who come to Millicent as a result of the expansion will bring others into the town as well, and this concerns me because the housing situation there is not as good as it could be.

I believe one of the first requirements for industry to obtain employees is to have suitable housing available. The Housing Trust has made some provision to cater for any expansion. I asked the Premier a question not long ago and in reply he gave me a report from the trust indicating that it recognized the need and was planning to cater for any influx of people to the district. However, I hope there will be a more positive approach because, although 35 houses are now being erected, they will be allocated mainly to Apcel under the Act passed last year. To my knowledge, 17 people employed by Cellulose Australia Ltd. are awaiting rental accommodation, and in addition there are people who have come to the town privately and are on what is known as the general list. I think the waiting time is far too long.

It has been said that houses are sometimes for sale, but I do not think it is reasonable to expect a man and his family coming into the district to make a decision immediately about purchasing a house. I think he requires rental accommodation initially so that he can settle down. Then he, and his wife in particular, can decide whether they want to remain in the district. That is why I think more attention should be given to building rental

accommodation. This would overcome the problem I have mentioned, and people could purchase houses later if they decided to stay in the district.

I have found the officers of the trust extremely helpful. I have often approached them as a result of many requests to me from people awaiting rental accommodation. These requests come in continually. At all times I have been received courteously by these officers who, where possible, have helped me. I appreciate this because I know their problems are not easy. No doubt, the metropolitan members similarly appreciate the assistance they are given. There will be a need in Millicent to build more houses, particularly within the next 12 months. We shall require over 100 more houses by June of next year. I have here some housing figures for Millicent. At the moment there are 327 trust houses in Millicent, and I anticipate that in the next 12 months there will be at least a further 100.

This leads me to the matter of sewerage. I directed a question to the Minister of Works on this and expressed the view that the priority that had been given to Bordertown should be reviewed with a view to transferring it to Millicent. The member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) was not irate but was concerned about this: he thought I was trying to do a "pinch"—but I was not. I should be happy if Bordertown could be serviced and at the same time Millicent could be considered. I am pleased that the Minister of Works and the Chairman of the advisory committee (Mr. Murrell) advised me today that this was exactly what they intended to do. I make it clear to the member for Albert that at no stage did I intend to do this "pinch". I am happy, on his behalf and on behalf of the people of Bordertown, that the planning for this work at Bordertown has reached an advanced stage and that it will not be long before the work is started. It will be possible in the next 12 months to have the plans for the sewerage of Millicent completed so that that work can be placed on the Estimates next year. As a result of this, many citizens of Millicent will be curious about what sewerage will cost them. I mention it now because I hope that the remarks we make in the debate on the Address in Reply are examined by the various Ministers. I ask the Minister of Works whether he can make available to me an average example of what the costs are likely to be at Millicent for the connection and operation of sewerage.

Mr. Quirke: What is the cost at Naracoorte?

Mr. CORCORAN: I think it is about 2s. 3d. in the pound. I want the information from the Minister so that I can be accurate in what I pass on to the people of Millicent. They should be fully informed of what is involved, particularly the matter of paying this amount by instalments and how it may affect pensioners with dwellings who may not be in a position to pay the full costs. I know that some provision is made for this. This is the type of information I hope the Minister of Works will be good enough to provide for me.

The Hon. C. D. Hutehens: I will do that for all honourable members.

Mr. CORCORAN: I am pleased to hear the Minister say that.

Mr. Quirke: Councils sometimes undertake a financing scheme for pensioners.

Mr. CORCORAN: I thought the honourable member was going to say that councils sometimes act as spokesmen for their rate-payers. I am pleased with that information and I hope that sewerage for Millicent will be undertaken. It is badly needed because of the low-lying ground in which the development of Millicent is taking place. The land is totally unsuitable for septic systems: the water table rises so that septic systems are ineffective. The sooner this scheme can be carried out the happier will be the Housing Trust and the citizens of Millicent.

I wish to talk about an important industry in my district—fishing. I have the honour to represent the majority of fishermen in the South-East, if not in the State, but I do not know whether the member for Flinders would accept that. In my district are the ports of Kingston, Cape Jaffa, Robe, Beachport, South End, Carpenter Rocks and Port Macdonnell, and at each of these places is based a fishing fleet, the total number of boats being about 170. It is an inhospitable coast, but the boat haven established at Robe and opened last year is of great help to the industry, though it does not serve all the coast. If fishermen get into trouble in rough water they can make a run for this haven and have excellent protection. I know that the people at Robe, in particular, are happy with this excellent facility. People in this industry are expressing concern about its future. I have heard talk about the need for conservation of crayfish and about control of those engaged in the industry. This concerns all the people involved in the industry because they are not certain where they are going. They must lay out a fair amount of capital in investment in their boats.

This is a hazardous occupation, but it is fairly lucrative in a good season. However, seasons vary. Fishermen are concerned at the moment that there are too many people becoming established in the industry, and the areas in which they fish and the number of fish or crayfish in these areas are not increasing.

Mr. Quirke: You need another Royal Commission.

Mr. CORCORAN: I should not suggest a Royal Commission, but I should be grateful if the Minister would consider having a fairly extensive inquiry made into the industry. This has been done in Western Australia, which I think is the main producer of crayfish in Australia, and it has fairly rigid controls compared with those in South Australia. I am not one who wishes to see controls for the sake of controls, but I believe that there may be something in the argument of the fishermen in this area. The *Australian Fisheries Newsletter* states that there was an economic survey carried out on Western Australian crayfish. The article states in part:

The findings of the survey, the first of its type conducted in the Australian Fishing Industry, are contained in a report just published. The Western Australian crayfish industry, based on the marine crayfish or spiny lobster (*Panulirus cygnus*), is the most valuable commercial fishing enterprise in Australia, but for some years it has been apparent that the increasing number of men and vessels entering the fishery has not been matched by a proportionate increase in production.

This is the point I make in respect of the industry in the South-East. The report continues:

In the light of this trend and other information of a biological nature it appeared that additional vessels would not yield any increase in overall production and could lead to a serious depletion of the resources.

That is why fishermen are worrying about it. The article continues:

This led to an agreement in 1963 by Commonwealth and State fishery authorities that limitations should be placed on the issue of new boat licences.

It would be in the interests of the industry, of the State, and particularly of those towns to which I referred, because to a certain extent the towns rely on the fishermen.

Mr. Nankivell: How do you get into the industry? Buy your way in?

Mr. CORCORAN: I hope we do not have to do that. I have no details of how it should be controlled, but it should be in the hands of the Minister, and if the honourable member can buy him he is better than I am.

Mr. Nankivell: When they are restricted, you have some means of obtaining a licence, so you buy it from someone else.

Mr. CORCORAN: I have not considered how this should be done. I suggest there is a need to do this on the South-East coast, and it may be necessary at other ports in South Australia. There are other measures: a restriction on the number of pots used by the fishermen. The type of licence issued could be altered—a professional or an amateur licence, as in other States. This would not interfere with the rights of individuals to go where they want to. The fishermen's tackle could be restricted. There would be certain qualifications required by a person who held himself out to be a professional fisherman, and this would be reasonable. I am not saying what should be done. I believe there should be an inquiry into every aspect of the industry to see whether these things are desirable, and if they are, to see what can be done to give effect to them. Next month, I hope the Minister of Agriculture, on his visit to the South-East, will meet representatives of the fishing industry and I hope that something will eventuate. It is necessary to consider facilities provided in the various ports for these people. I referred to the Robe boathaven. This is an expensive structure costing £175,000 but it will serve its purpose well. Most facilities required by these people cost much money with little return to the Government, but if we are going to give this industry a future and the consideration it deserves, these matters must be considered.

The value of crayfish production to 1964 was £835,506, and most came from the South-East. Over £7,000,000 worth of fish was exported by this country; in the main this was cray tails to America. These are an attractive item there and the Americans pay well for them. We still import £11,000,000 worth of fish into this country each year, according to the *Australian Facts and Figures No. 84*. Salmon is one type of fish imported. When the Public Works Committee investigated this project at Robe, fishermen gave evidence to the committee that they had seen the sea "boiling with fish" out from Robe and that these were either tuna or salmon. I think that some incentive should be given by the Government to enable the development of this type of fishing in conjunction with crayfishing in the area. Perhaps the Commonwealth authorities could send people there to give a lead to the fishermen concerning the quantity of tuna or salmon present, the type of equipment that would be needed to catch

them, how to use this equipment and to advise on whether it would be desirable to proceed with the venture. There is now an all-weather boat haven at Robe and I think it is possible to take advantage of the situation if the fish are there in the quantity stated.

Mr. Nankivell: It is a wonder the New South Wales tuna boats have not been there.

Mr. CORCORAN: They may go there. When the Public Works Committee visited Robe, I said to one of the people present, "You people will have to accept the fact that when the facility is established, there will be more boats at Robe." That did not worry them then, but on the day of the opening of the boat haven, one of first things they said to the Minister was that they were concerned that more boats would be there, as they did not want that. I do not know whether the tuna boats from New South Wales have been there but I hope we can exploit the fish there before they arrive.

Mr. Quirke: The fish could be delivered to Port Lincoln, couldn't they?

Mr. CORCORAN: A cannery could be provided at Robe if the quantity of fish warranted it. I do not want these people to be put to the expense of buying equipment if the potential is not there and I do not think it is for the fishermen themselves to prove the potential. Therefore, I hope the Government will give what help it can to the people concerned.

Mr. Hall: It would be a big programme of research, wouldn't it?

Mr. CORCORAN: I agree, but the Commonwealth Government has the facilities and the State could assist. After all, development of the industry would be in the interests of the Commonwealth as well as our own interests. I turn now to the Kangaroo Inn Area School, which is in my district. Perhaps honourable members have heard my father mention this school in the House. I think that at one stage he was called the Kangaroo Kid by the *Hansard* staff. I do not know whether that is correct, but I have heard whispers to that effect. This school is unique in its setting, and it is novel for people travelling along the Penola Road to suddenly come on this school situated more or less in the wilderness, 20 miles or more from any centre or town.

Mr. Quirke: It is one of the best situated schools in the State.

Mr. CORCORAN: Exactly, and there was much controversy about it when it was established.

Mr. Quirke: The only thing wrong is that the gum trees have been pushed over.

Mr. GORCORAN: That could be so, but it is still in a pleasant setting. An excellent oval has been developed and all the people in the district now agree that it is situated in the correct place. School buses travel to it from either direction. The school committee is one of the most vigorous I have ever known. The previous Minister of Education would be well aware of this, because I have had much correspondence with him, and have introduced deputations to him on this matter. I suppose it will not be long before the present Minister of Education becomes aware of this school committee, which, I must admit, has been fairly easy on me lately. However, it has drawn my attention to the need to provide craft facilities at this school, a matter to which I know the Minister will give due consideration.

On December 4 last I was notified by the previous Minister of Education that it was likely that boys' craft facilities (including an art room and a normal classroom) would be provided during the 1965 school year, and that the extension of the girls' craft facilities would be carried out following this work. Subsequently, I made inquiries about the type of construction, whether it would be similar to the existing structure or in the form of temporary classrooms. I also inquired when the work would commence, and the present Minister of Education replied that it was not possible at present to say when the construction of craft facilities was likely to commence, as the recommendations had to be considered in relation to the needs of other schools when the 1965-66 building programme was being prepared. I could not agree more with the Minister on this point, for it is apparent that there is a tremendous commitment in relation to school buildings. I am not so parochial as to insist that work in my district should come first, but an obvious need exists for these additional buildings at the school; otherwise the school committee would not be applying for them.

I think it is recognized that, in principle, they are necessary, and on behalf of the committee I ask the Minister to do everything possible to see that the buildings are included in the works programme for the coming financial year. I know it was not the previous Government's policy to provide assembly rooms at such schools as this one but, because of its unique location, and because I think it has a special case for one, I do not think a request along these lines would be considered ridicu-

lous. Such an addition could be used as a multi-purpose room, and it would serve the school admirably, because it has really become a community centre, serving the district not only as a school but as a gathering place for various functions. At present the end-of-the-year school concert has to be held in a hall some distance away, and no doubt other occasions arise during the year when the provision of an assembly room would be greatly appreciated by the committee, parents and children.

In conclusion, I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your appointment to your high office. I have no doubt about your ability to handle your duties efficiently and impartially. I have much admiration for you and for your judgment and wisdom. This has been built up since my first association with you in this House. I wish you well, Sir, in your office, and hope that you will occupy it for a long time.

I congratulate the Chairman of Committees, the inimitable member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn), on his appointment. I do not think there is any doubt that he will apply himself well to his job, because anything he does, if he is keen on it, he does well. He puts his heart and soul into everything he does, and I am certain that he will be impartial.

I congratulate the new members of this House. I have already mentioned the member for Barossa (Mrs. Byrne) and the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson). Much has been said about the previous member for West Torrens (Mr. Fred Walsh), and I endorse those remarks wholeheartedly. I am sure the new member for West Torrens (Mr. Broomhill) will capably fill his shoes. He has the ability to give much good advice, particularly regarding industrial matters. The other day a member opposite said something about the number of trade unionists on this side of the House. The people that they serve, and serve well, must be looked after as well as every other section of the community, and we are proud to have them here. That applies to the member for Semaphore (Mr. Hurst). One member opposite said he stood up flat-footed and let it go, and that is what happened. I congratulate the member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda) on his maiden speech. I think it can be said without fear of contradiction that he is a "regular guy". I am sure that my association with him will be on the same level as my association with the previous member for Victoria (Les Harding) for whom I had much respect. I hope Mr. Harding is enjoying

his retirement. He is overseas now, and I hope he will get much benefit from his trip and that on his return he will renew his association with us.

I congratulate every member of the Ministry. I shall not eulogise the job they are doing, as I think that speaks for itself. They are a fine bunch of fellows who take their job in their stride, and they have a big responsibility. They have never faltered, and I am sure they never will. I know that they will prove to the people that this Party has the quality to govern the State effectively. I wish the Ministers well in their high offices.

I endorse the remarks of previous speakers who have extended condolences to those who have suffered the loss of loved ones recently. I most sincerely thank every member of this House and another place for the remarks they made about the passing of my father. The only thing I can do is try to live up to the reputation that he built up not only in this House but in the district in which he lived. This will be a big task indeed. My brothers and sisters and I were moved by the expressions of sympathy and the remarks made about my late father. I want all honourable members to know that the remarks were appreciated by all of us. I support the motion.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): At this stage of the debate there are only bits and pieces left, for most of the material in the Governor's Speech has been well covered. However, I join in the general congratulations and condolences that have been offered. In particular, I congratulate the new members on their election to Parliament and the manner in which they have moved, seconded or spoken in the debate on the Address in Reply. I congratulate the member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda) on his maiden speech. I am glad he is on our side: I should not care to be on the opposite side to him, because he will be a formidable political force in the future.

I apologize for daring to interrupt the member for Semaphore (Mr. Hurst) during his maiden speech. The only genuine excuse I can offer is that he was going so well and seemed so used to it that I forgot it was his maiden speech, so was tempted to make some small interruption. For that I sincerely apologize and assure him that it was in no way premeditated.

I believe that so far only one member has expressed sorrow at the passing of Mr. Whittle, who used to be a member of this House. I join in expressing regret at his death. Although I did not know him in this House, I was

associated with him in the Institutes' Council of South Australia, of which he spent a term as President. I was much impressed by his good sense and his excellent service to the community. I extend my sympathy to his family.

Much has been said about recent political events in the State, the one most spoken of being, obviously, the recent election. Mention has been made of the time that this Government has been in office and the number of days in which it has had an opportunity to implement its programmes. But, in spite of the great claims made that the Government is here with a sweeping mandate for changes within the State, I say that the greatest force in the election, which has now put us all on different sides of the House, was the fact that the Liberal and Country Party was in power as a Government for 32 years. This is amply demonstrated by the result of the New South Wales election, where the Labor Party found itself in a position similar to that of the Liberal and Country League Party in this State: there was a reversal of fortunes, the main reason being the people's desire for a change after being so long under one Government. However, the present Government in South Australia by winning this election took it upon itself to make many promises. The price it is paying and will pay for winning the election is the fulfilment or otherwise of these promises. One of the main promises dealing with finance put forward by the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) so ably in the election campaign, and again in this House in his maiden speech, was not supported in this debate. If that is not so, I stand to be corrected.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It was not mentioned in the Governor's Speech.

Mr. HALL: No. Perhaps other members have paid strict attention to the Governor's Speech and have decided not to follow this theme. I have sat through most of this debate and I have noticed with interest that the honourable member for Glenelg (whom I congratulate on the manner in which he made his first speech) has not yet been supported on his financial proposals by any other member of his Party.

Mr. Curren: There are plenty more to go.

Mr. HALL: I am pleased to hear that and I shall listen with interest for amplification of the financial proposals put forward by the member for Glenelg. These proposals happened to be a main theme of the Labor Party's election policy. However, we have

heard nothing more about the claim that Government instrumentalities and councils would be forced to bank with a newly-amalgamated Savings Bank and State Bank, and that this would result in extra finance becoming available to the State. Of course, many other promises have been made by the Government and must be paid for. I agree with the member for Stirling, who said that it is not really necessary for the Opposition to draw attention to these promises, because the public will watch closely for their fulfilment or otherwise. However, I do not think it is too early to draw attention to some of the promises that have already been negated. Of course, the deferment of the Giles Point project was an obvious case and this took place early in the Government's term of office. I was interested in the proposal put forward by the then Leader of the Opposition for a hospital in the Modbury area. During the election campaign this was put forward as a proposal that would go ahead without delay. I am told that in the seat of Barossa the words "without delay" were frequently used and became the stock-in-trade of the then Opposition. The promise of a 500-bed hospital without delay must have had some influence on the outcome of the election, and, therefore, I was rather shocked to read a statement by the new member for Barossa (Mrs. Byrne) in the *Leader* of May 20. This is a local paper distributed in the Modbury area.

Mrs. Byrne: It is freely obtainable.

Mr. HALL: I agree that there is nothing hidden about it, and that is why I am bringing it forward. There is a local paper in my district, too. This paper has nothing secretive about it and I should exhibit it in the House if it were not for Standing Orders. The interesting portion of the article reads (referring to the council):

However, it now had some doubts as to whether the 10 acres it had purchased on the Golden Grove Road would be sufficient in size for a 500-bed hospital if the Government should grant her request for a 500-bed hospital in the Modbury area.

The significant words are, "if the Government should grant her request". How does this statement tie up with an election campaign in which it was stated that a 500-bed hospital would be built without delay?

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: You are not suggesting that the honourable member did not believe the promise herself?

Mr. HALL: I am not imputing anything to anyone, but I am drawing attention to the clash of intentions. It was to have been done

without delay, but now it becomes a request. How does one read these words? Both statements are attributable to the same source: these are not different organizations voicing these opinions. This is a serious matter.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It is confusing, isn't it?

Mr. HALL: Yes, to say the least. The construction of this hospital, which has been postponed from the present to the future, replaces a project that was proceeding.

Mr. Shannon: You are referring to the community hospital?

Mr. HALL: Yes, which was stated to be a 42-bed hospital. This article is available for all members to peruse if they wish. It is interesting to note that the initial proposal was for a progressive development of hospitalization in the area, not to stop at 42 beds or at any other figure. It was planned to go ahead with 60 beds.

Mr. Shannon: Isn't that a history of general community hospital development?

Mr. HALL: Yes. When the need arose, there would be a 60-bed hospital, then a maternity wing, then a hospital of 400 beds. The answer is for the Government to produce its 500-bed hospital, not 200 or 50, because anything else is a repudiation: it requires 500 beds.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Without delay!

Mr. HALL: Yes.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It could not be manned if it were built now.

Mr. HALL: Hospitalization would have been available at that site soon if the previous plan had gone ahead. At present nothing has been referred to the Public Works Committee.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The land has not been purchased.

Mr. HALL: Where do we stand with something that has now gone back to a request?

Mr. Shannon: The hospital will be built at South Road opposite the Bedford Park university before one is built at Modbury.

Mr. HALL: There may be a matter of priorities to settle with two hospitals of this size to be built at the same time.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Three; the Royal Adelaide Hospital is going ahead, too.

Mr. HALL: Let us consider two hospitals. This promise has to be honoured but nothing has been said of a definite starting date. I draw attention to that, and hope that next year we can have a further indication of the Government's intentions in this matter and a sign that it will honour its promises,

otherwise I fear we have seen an election conducted on the wrong set of facts. This unfilled undertaking is included in the price the Government has paid for its victory. Obviously times have altered and, in political life, this is "year one" for both the Government and Opposition. It has been said that things are different in Opposition from what they were when one was in Government. When we were in Government, we heard much about policy from the Opposition. Although we have listened patiently, we have heard nothing about policy from the Government in this debate, except from the honourable member for Millicent, who has made the best speech in this debate because he was not afraid to refer to Government policy. Nearly everyone else was afraid, but he was unafraid, and I congratulate him on his bravery in referring to such poor material. He presented his case in a well-mannered way and, if a democratic form of election does exist within that Party, as has been suggested by Government members, he will be on the front bench before long, because his qualities are evident. The honourable member for Port Adelaide spoke at great length but said very little.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Did he say anything?

Mr. HALL: He spoke a lot. He was offended by one of our members who spoke on union representatives in this House. He spoke about the background of the honourable members of the Government, a subject about

which he knew far more than I do. However, he got a little lost at one stage when he indicated that the honourable member for Frome was a member of the Labor Party of long standing. I cannot allow this to go by without making a correction for the honourable member's benefit. Perhaps he does not know the honourable member for Frome was a member of this Party for a few days before he was endorsed as the Labor Party candidate in the Frome by-election. Let me say that the honourable member for Frome's move in this House yesterday brands him as still having a good deal of Liberal independent thought in his make-up. I had not expected that so early in the session a member would move a motion that would stun his own colleagues, and I congratulate the honourable member on his courage. It ties in with his background and I also wish him well in his progress in his Party, because a man of such initiative must move on to the more important positions in his Party.

Mr. Jennings: We used to enjoy having the Hon. Mr. DeGaris as president of one of our sub-branches, too.

Mr. HALL: That must have been a pleasure. At this stage, I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.59 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, June 24, at 2 p.m.