

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, July 12, 1966.

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

QUESTIONS

BASIC WAGE INCREASE.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Previously, when an increase has been made in the basic wage by the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission, it has been contended (with much validity) that frequently the wage earner is little better off because the increase in the basic wage sharply increases the cost of the commodities he has to buy, but the increase in the basic wage is given as the reason for the increase in cost. What construction can be put upon the report in the newspaper this morning, which states:

The Minister of Transport (Mr. Kneebone) said yesterday that no increase in bus and train fares was being considered at this stage. "We haven't had an opportunity to examine the situation yet," he said. "The Railways should be able to tell me soon what is involved in the way of extra cost."

Can the Premier say whether this is a prelude to increased tram and rail fares, particularly in the metropolitan area? Is this the method by which a softening-up process has commenced, or does it mean that the Government intends not to increase charges and not to take away from the wage earner the \$2 increase the Arbitration Commission awarded him last week?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Regarding the increase of \$2 a week in the basic wage, with the best of administration (and we have not got the worst) it would be impossible to answer this question. Perhaps the Leader is trying to suggest that this softening-up process has begun, but the sooner he dismisses that thought from his mind the better. The Government has not considered using a softening-up process. The Minister of Transport has a big responsibility, but he receives no assistance from the Opposition.

Mr. Millhouse: What assistance did you offer when you were Leader?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Labor's policy has been quoted and requoted countless times in this House. What assistance did the Opposition offer to relieve the position when we introduced legislation to co-ordinate transport, thereby benefiting the railways? The Opposition now seems to be vitally concerned

with the welfare of the worker and to imply that we are using a softening-up process. I can only say that the Government will consider what effect the \$2 basic wage increase will have in respect of Government employees, and that we certainly hope it will not be necessary to take action along the lines suggested by the Leader of the Opposition. At this stage I am not able to say whether increases will or will not be effected: as the punter would say, I am having a bet each way on this occasion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Government of South Australia supported the unions' application in the National Wage Case and, so that there will be no misunderstanding about it, I quote from the April number of the Industrial Information Bulletin as follows:

Mr. Tattersall, representing the State of South Australia, then replied to questions posed to him earlier in the proceedings. He outlined the over-award payments to employees of Government departments which ranged from \$1 a week after 12 months' service to \$2.50 a week after 36 months' service. He said that the full claims of the unions would cost his Government \$34,000,000 annually. His Government supported in full the unions' claims for the reintroduction of quarterly adjustments, as it also did the unions' arguments based on prices and productivity. However, it had made no assessment of any specific increase to be granted; it regarded this as a matter for the Commission. Further, it supported the unions' opposition to the employers' claim for a total wage.

In view of that position put to the Commission on behalf of South Australia, I was surprised to hear the Premier say that no calculation, estimate or decision had yet been made as to any increase in charges by the Railways Department and the Municipal Tramways Trust that would be necessary. It is obvious that some calculations must have (or at least, should have) been made before those submissions were made to the Commission. Therefore, can the Premier say whether estimates were made, apart from what was disclosed in the passage I have read, as to the effect that a rise would have on the State's finances, especially on the financial position of the Railways Department and the M.T.T.? If such calculations were made, can he give to this House, at the earliest opportunity, the calculations made regarding the effect that a rise of \$2 would have?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Undoubtedly some calculations would have been made, but it would not have been possible to estimate what the rise would be. As a Government, we would be the last to oppose it. I am prepared to look into the information received by the

Minister of Transport and, if anything pertinent can be made available to the House on the matter, it will be made available. However, I assure honourable members that certain associated matters, including margins, will not be passed over and will have to be considered. This Government, like other Governments, does not know what the judges had in mind when they brought down their findings. I refer particularly to the margins figure of \$1.25 a week.

VALLEY VIEW SEWERAGE.

Mr. JENNINGS: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I recently asked, regarding the extension of sewers to Valley View, in my district?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Cabinet approval was given in May last for a sewerage scheme to serve the Valley View Estate subdivision at an estimated cost of \$135,000, involving the construction of about 23,000ft. of sewers. Because of financial restrictions, however, the Director and Engineer-in-Chief reports that no provision has been made in the current year's Loan programme for the work, although it may be possible, depending on the availability of funds at the time, to commence the main scheme in April or May, 1967. However, some work included in the scheme has been done. About 2,200ft. of 6in. sewer has been laid in Grand Junction Road at the request of the Highways and Local Government Department to fit in with reconstruction operations of this road. Also, sewers have been laid in Haddington Street at the eastern boundary of the subdivision, to drain a South Australian Housing Trust area south of the Grand Junction Road.

The honourable member will also be interested to know that, after completion of the Valley View Estate scheme, the next area to be seweraged would be St. Paul's Heights, and this will be the subject of a submission by the Director and Engineer-in-Chief to me late this financial year. If approved, it is proposed at this stage that sewer construction in St. Paul's Heights would be carried out in the financial year 1968-69. After completion of that scheme, approval will then be sought for the construction of sewers at Para Vista and, if approved, sewer construction in this area would be carried out either late in the financial year 1968-69 or early in the financial year 1969-70.

KALANGADOO CROSSING.

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I recently asked, concerning the level crossing at Kalangadoo?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Roads reports that an order has been issued on the South Australian Railways to install flashing lights and bell at the Kalangadoo crossing in the current financial year, at the estimated cost of \$5,080. The work will be carried out as part of a programme to improve many railway crossings throughout the State, and will receive the appropriate priority.

TEACHERS' SALARIES.

Mr. CLARK: Perhaps the Minister of Education has already seen or heard something about what appears to be an anomaly following the Teachers Salaries Board's decision on teachers' salaries. During the weekend before last the father of a young lady who began her first year's teaching at a school at Elizabeth came to see me on behalf of his daughter. The young lady did not want her father to come at all, because she felt it was unwise for a young teacher to see or to have someone see a member of Parliament, but I am sure the Minister will agree that she did not have to worry about that. This is her first year of teaching. When attending the Teachers College last year she was advised by her Principal (and I do not condemn him as I believe he gave the right advice under the circumstances) that she would do better to complete her Diploma in Arts and Education, which she did last year. Because she did this instead of doing one more second-year subject to complete her Diploma of Teaching (which I should say would be regarded academically as less important than the A.U.A.), her salary this year is much lower, because nowadays only a degree or diploma of teaching entitles her to be credited with years of service at the Teachers College. Yesterday I received a copy of the *Teachers Journal* (which the Minister may have seen) in which appeared a letter from another young teacher expressing a similar concern. Although I do not know whether my information is correct, I have been told that only about 12 young teachers are affected. Will the Minister have this anomaly examined to see whether it can be rectified?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to do that.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The Minister of Education has been good enough to indicate that he now has a reply to a question I asked last week regarding the payment of sewing teachers. Will he now give that reply?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have ascertained that cheques for work carried out by sewing teachers during the first term have all been issued.

BOLIVAR SEWAGE WORKS.

Mr. HALL: When interviewing a constituent of mine at Parafield Gardens last Saturday morning I received a complaint that an objectionable odour was emanating from near the Bolivar Sewage Treatment Works. While driving along the Port Wakefield Road, I have noticed this strong and objectionable odour on three occasions. Although I take it that this will not be a permanent feature of the works, will the Minister of Works have an investigation made into this objectionable odour to see what causes it and whether it can be stopped at its source?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I believe the honourable member will agree that the plant was designed to work without an offensive odour. Although I have not inquired, I should say that, as the scheme is somewhat incomplete, teething troubles might be experienced. As similar complaints have been made by other people, now that the honourable member has raised the matter I will have it examined to see whether relief can be given immediately.

ROLLING STOCK.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Has the Premier, representing the Minister of Transport, a reply to my recent question concerning the improvement of rolling stock used by the Railways Department?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: With regard to the reconstruction of railway trucks handling bulk grain, when the necessity arises for such an undertaking the waggons are reconstructed in the same form as they were originally built; that is, as open waggons. The Minister of Transport and the Railways Commissioner are aware of the type of hopper waggon being built in New South Wales for the handling of bulk grain.

MODBURY INFANTS SCHOOL.

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked on June 30 regarding the erection of a new infants school building at Modbury?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Director of the Public Buildings Department states that tenders are being invited in the *Government Gazette* this week for the new Modbury Infants School and that they will close on August 16. It is hoped that a contract will be let some time in September and that construction will commence soon after that.

SOFTWOOD FORESTS.

Mr. SHANNON: A week or so ago I asked the Premier whether the Government would encourage softwood planting in the Adelaide Hills by giving a remission of rates and taxes to those people who were prepared to plant trees to beautify our hills. Has the Premier any information on this matter?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Following the honourable member's question on June 29 I sought the advice of both the Woods and Forests Department and the Treasury. This advice has supported my view that it is proper that forestry should be regarded as primary production for purposes of the Land Tax Act and be entitled to exemptions and rebates already granted to other forms of primary production. I would expect to submit to the House appropriate amendments when a Land Tax Bill is placed before it soon.

ELECTROCUTION.

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked recently regarding the electrocution of a horse at Marino?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Electricity Trust does not know the actual time the wire was broken. The trust was notified of the incident at 1.57 p.m., and workmen arrived at the scene at 2 p.m. Power was cut off within two or three minutes, and supply was restored at 3.15 p.m. to the small number of local residents affected.

Mr. HUDSON: I am pleased to hear that the Electricity Trust was prompt in getting to the scene a few moments after the trouble had been reported to it. I understand that much of the delay that occurred between the discovery of the cable on the ground and the reporting of the matter by the employees of the South Australian Gas Company to the trust rested with the employees of the company. Will the Premier consult with the company's officials to find out what delay took place in reporting this matter to the trust, and what measures will be taken to ensure that this does not occur again?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Yes.

EYRE HIGHWAY.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads, a reply to a question I asked last week regarding the Eyre Highway?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, reports:

Departmental proposals for the reconstruction and sealing of the Eyre Highway extend to Ceduna, and no firm plans exist for the remaining length of 311 miles from Ceduna

to the Western Australian border. While South Australia is anxious to play its part in the sealing of this link to connect the two States, the facts clearly show that South Australia cannot economically justify all the expenditure from its own funds on this section. Accordingly, consideration is being given at present for an application to the Commonwealth Government for assistance to enable the completion of the works beyond Ceduna.

WATERWAYS COMMITTEE.

Mr. CURREN: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked last week about the progress of the investigation of the Water-front Recreation Areas Advisory Committee?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Water-front Recreation Areas Advisory Committee is proceeding with its investigation and considerable progress has been made. The Murray River has been divided into three sections for convenience of working. The first section extends from Goolwa Barrage to and including Mannum district, the second from Mannum to and including Morgan district, and the third from Morgan to the State border. The sea coast will be examined after the river has been completed. Plans have been prepared of the whole of the Murray River showing as much information as can be obtained from survey records. Preliminary inquiries, however, have shown that every area must be physically inspected and investigated in detail. For this purpose a senior officer of the Lands Department has been attached to the committee as a liaison and field investigation officer. This investigation is proceeding satisfactorily and the officer has been engaged almost full time.

The committee is now considering the information obtained, and will shortly arrange inspections and discussions with district councils of the Lower Murray areas. It will be some months before visits to the Upper Murray area become practicable. It must be pointed out that when this committee was formed, it was realized that the whole investigation would take several years to complete.

PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICERS.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I repeat a question I asked last week of the Minister of Works. In order to preserve the well-deserved reputation of the Public Service for complete lack of bias in Party-political affairs, will the Premier outline the circumstances of the recent appointment of the two public relations officers to his department, as well as their past and possible future activities with the Australian Labor Party?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: First, I should like to correct the honourable member and say that I have only one public relations officer on the staff of the Premier's Department at present. Secondly, when I am ready I shall consult my colleague, the Attorney-General, and inform him that, as a result of certain discussions held, an officer at present employed in the department controlled by the Attorney-General will be transferred. However, I am not ready at this stage. This question is a narrow one.

Mr. Rodda: Very narrow.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Yes, and so is a mind that can work in the direction indicated by the honourable member's question. The member for Alexandra last week asked a question about the appointment of a public relations officer in the Premier's Department. I explained the main circumstances surrounding this appointment, but the honourable member saw fit to ask a further question of the Minister of Works in my absence last Thursday. I shall read a report from the Public Service Commissioner that led to this appointment, and I ask the honourable member to take note of it. I did not send anyone from the Public Service overseas to accept a certain position—not yet. The report states:

I have considered the enclosed submission by your Secretary and have discussed with the Public Service Board the matter of recommending the creation of a new permanent position of Public Relations Officer in the Premier's Department. Having regard to the need for an early appointment and the fact that this is a new position, the functions of which can be expected to develop and expand as time goes by, I am of the opinion that a temporary appointment should be made forthwith, and the status of the position reconsidered in about six months' time when the duties and responsibilities will have become stabilized, enabling a more accurate comparison to be made with other positions in the Public Service.

An application has been received for employment of this nature from Mr. G. D. Crease, who seems to be well qualified by experience and is available for immediate appointment. I suggest that a temporary appointment be made initially for a period of about six months at the end of which the status of the position can be reviewed and the normal processes of permanent appointment under the Public Service Act (including the calling for applications) can be followed. Mr. Crease is aware of and is prepared to accept a temporary appointment on these conditions.

The honourable member also sought information regarding the political activities of this officer. I am pleased to inform the House

that Mr. Crease has volunteered the information that he is not and never has been a member of any political Party. I hope that information will satisfy the requirements of the honourable member.

Mr. Heaslip: He wouldn't be scabbing, would he?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: What is the scabbing position? I regret the circumstances that, after I had explained that I had made representations to the Public Service Commissioner and a further conference with the Secretary of the Premier's Department (Mr. White) had been held, a further submission should be challenged after the Public Service Commissioner had given me information to bring to Parliament, and that this further submission should be further challenged. I hope the honourable member will be honourable enough to accept the explanation offered today.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Premier has quoted from a document giving the report of the Public Service Commissioner, who referred to a letter or memorandum from the Premier's Secretary (Mr. White). Will the Premier read the latter document to the House?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will peruse the docket, but I do not know what is in it. I stated my case to the Public Service Commissioner and I have reported on the matter to the House. No doubt Mr. White, the Secretary of the Premier's Department, in whom I have the greatest confidence, has placed a submission in writing on matters I have intimated to the House. What more can I do? I now have a letter signed by Mr. White, Secretary of the Premier's Department, dated June 28, 1966, which states:

To the Public Service Commissioner: When the Premier's Department was established last year one of its responsibilities was to promote the establishment of new industries and the expansion of existing industries in the State. Considerable success has been achieved with this work but it has become apparent to both the Premier and me that much better means of public relations than are now available to the Government are necessary in this field of work. The present arrangements are that publicity work on behalf of the Government is one of the responsibilities of the Immigration, Publicity and Tourist Bureau Department. However, the staff of that department is more particularly geared to the requirements of tourism and immigration than to publicity. I am therefore satisfied that it is desirable to appoint a public relations officer in the Premier's Department. It is essential that this officer be located in the Premier's Department so that he can work in close contact with me as the permanent head of the department, and the Industries Promotion and Research Officer

(Mr. K. C. Belchamber) who is specifically engaged on industrial promotion.

I have discussed this matter with the Premier who agrees with this recommendation. He has further expressed the view that all public relations work on behalf of the Government should be carried out in the Premier's Department, and at a later stage he would consider transferring the officer at present engaged on public relations work of the office of the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs to the Premier's Department. The work of the proposed public relations officer in the Premier's Department would consist of the preparation of material and films for television screening and other viewing. He would also be required to prepare material for radio work and press announcements. It would be essential that any appointee to this position should have had experience in all phases of this work. I therefore recommend that the Public Service Board approve this request and fix a salary adequate for the position, having regard to the responsibilities and experience required of any appointee.

Although it will take a few weeks to complete, as soon as a certain documentary film is available invitations will be extended to all honourable members and others to attend a screening of the film, because I intend that, in the interests of South Australia, this type of publicity should be made available overseas.

Mr. BROOMHILL: Last week, in the Address in Reply debate, the member for Gouger made an extremely defamatory attack on the public relations officer attached to the Attorney-General's Department. *Hansard* shows that the Attorney-General challenged the honourable member who, however, did not withdraw his remarks. Can the Attorney-General say whether this officer or any other officer of the Public Service has any protection against such slander?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Normally, public servants do not have any protection against this kind of action. However, in view of the nature of the honourable member's remarks, I authorized the officer concerned (pursuant to section 58 (VII) of the Public Service Act) to make a public statement, which is as follows:

I greatly resent the fact that a member of Parliament has taken advantage of Parliamentary privilege to attack me personally and to make utterly truthless allegations about me and my work knowing that, as a permanent member of the Public Service, I would be denied opportunity to defend myself. Mr. Hall's vilifications constitute not only an attack on me, but also an improper reflection on the members of the Public Service Board, who recommended that I be appointed to my present position ahead of many other applicants, several of whom were already members of the Public Service.

Unfortunately, this action was taken within the House, and under Parliamentary privilege the honourable member is protected from the kind of action he would be faced with if he made the remarks outside the Chamber that he made here. In addition, I understand that the Public Service Association intends to make a statement concerning this matter.

SOUTH ROAD INTERSECTION.

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Lands a reply from the Minister of Roads to my question about the corrugations at the intersection of South Road and Anzac Highway?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague the Minister of Roads reports that the surface corrugations at the South Road-Anzac Highway intersection are the result of faults deep in the pavement, and cannot be removed by the replacement of the asphaltic concrete surfacing. Their removal therefore necessitates, virtually, the reconstruction of the intersection, and the heavy costs involved in this, plus the associated disruption to traffic, is not considered warranted by the minor inconveniences caused by the corrugations at present.

NURIOOTPA ROAD.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Has the Minister of Lands a reply from the Minister of Transport to several questions I have asked during the past nine months about the suggested re-opening of the old Tolley's Corner Road from Nuriootpa to Greenock Road to obviate traffic hazards in the main street of Nuriootpa?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague reports that the departmental investigation into the matters referred to by the honourable member has not yet been completed, as it has been necessary to utilize staff on more urgent planning projects, such as the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study.

OPAL.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Last week in a question to the Premier I drew attention to the difficulties being experienced by opal buyers, consequent on opal being proclaimed under the Gold Buyers Act, and I asked the Premier, referring to a paragraph in His Excellency's Speech, what the Government's intentions were regarding legislation on this matter and when it was intended to introduce the Bill dealing with the subject of opal buying. Has the Premier an answer to my question?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I normally pay the courtesy of sending to all members

a written copy of replies to questions, as soon as they are available, and there is no need to make second reading speeches. Amending legislation will be submitted to Parliament soon.

LOXTON SETTLERS.

Mr. QUIRKE: Has the Minister of Repatriation a reply to my recent question concerning living expenses to be paid to Loxton soldier settlers?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Steps will be taken to ascertain as soon as possible what variation, if any, the Commonwealth authority is prepared to allow on the basic amount to be considered for living expenses, following the recent rise in the State living wage.

AUBURN-EUDUNDA ROAD.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my question of June 22 regarding the Government's programme on the Auburn-Eudunda road?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Roads reports that at present about five miles of road is unsealed on the District Council of Saddleworth section of the Eudunda-Marrabel main road No. 123. It is expected that a further three miles of this length will be sealed during 1966-67, and the remaining two miles during 1967-68. The Auburn-Saddleworth section of the Port Wakefield to Saddleworth main road No. 24 is scheduled for construction and sealing to commence in 1967-68 and to be completed in 1969-70.

TAILEM BEND TO KEITH MAIN.

Mr. NANKIVELL: On July 6, in reply to a question I asked the Minister of Works concerning proposals for the Tailem Bend to Keith water scheme, the Minister gave a certain answer. This is an important matter in my district, particularly for the traders in the township of Coonalpyn to know what is happening to the Engineering and Water Supply Department camp. Imagine my surprise to find on Monday that the Minister wished to alter the wording of the reply in *Hansard*, so as to contradict in actual sense the answer given to me in this House! As he obviously wishes to make an explanation, will the Minister explain to the House the reason for wanting to change the answer given me on July 6?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I do not blame the honourable member for asking the question with some feeling. Indeed, if he has more feeling about this matter than I have had for giving a wrong answer he has had great feeling. Prior to giving the reply, I

conferred with a departmental officer who gave me the reply that I gave the honourable member. On a reply being forwarded to my office, the Acting Secretary immediately contacted the department, as is the usual practice, and said he had been given the wrong information. We were busy in the House: I contacted the *Hansard* staff, and the reply was changed only with the concurrence of the honourable member (which concurrence was sought, I think, on Monday). I apologize for giving the wrong answer, but assure the honourable member that it was not deliberate. I had been given entirely the wrong information by a departmental officer who, in turn, has apologized. The Director and Engineer-in-Chief now reports:

1. Pumping Plant Contracts: (a) Tenders for the supply and installation of pumping plant for the No. 1 pumping station near Tallem Bend close on September 1, 1966. The preparation of the specification for the supply and installation of pumping plant for No. 2 pumping station south of Coomandook is nearing completion and will be called this month. (b) Preliminary sketches of the buildings have been prepared but final plans have not yet been commenced. Design of substructure for No. 1 pumping station is 80 per cent complete. It is planned to start work on the cofferdam and substructure of the No. 1 pumping station in September, 1966, with departmental labour. Installation of plant will not commence before about the beginning of 1968. (c) The plant at both pumping stations will be supplied and installed by contract.

2. Labour Force on the Tanks and Pipeline: (a) Work on the pipeline to Binnie Lookout is nearly complete and men are being transferred to tank construction. A total of 60 men is at present engaged on these works. (b) The labour force will decrease to 40 men in the near future and the surplus labour will be transferred to other projects.

I hope that clarifies the matter, and I again tender my most humble apologies for having inconvenienced the honourable member. I know he was vitally interested in the matter, and I assume he quickly passed the previous information on to other interested people.

Mr. Nankivell: It was put in the local press.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I assure the honourable member the mistake was not intended.

The SPEAKER: As Speaker, I think I should have something to say about this matter: I hope that *Hansard* has not altered any statement by arrangement between two members. A statement in the House is the property of the House and, if an incorrect statement has been made, it should be corrected in the House, not merely in *Hansard*.

PARADISE SEWERAGE.

Mrs. STEELE: For a long time now the matter of sewerage the areas of Paradise, Campbelltown and Athelstone has been considered by the Engineering and Water Supply Department and has been postponed from time to time. I have made many representations on this matter; naturally, I realize that the provision of sewerage to these areas is contingent on a prior sewerage scheme being undertaken in the areas of Paradise and Marden. The people in these areas whom I represent are anxious to know just how long it will be before the scheme is implemented. Will the Minister of Works call for a report on this matter and say whether a firm date can be given for the commencement of this scheme?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall endeavour to obtain a reply for the honourable member. I should remind her (and she is probably aware of this) that many of these plans have been postponed over the years because of limited finance and the number of schemes, all of which we consider have a degree of urgency.

Mrs. Steele: This has been under consideration for at least eight years.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: This morning I considered a scheme that has been projected for 24 years; that scheme has a degree of urgency along with all the others. I assure the honourable member that the department and the Government are anxious to give relief wherever possible and as soon as possible.

GAS.

Mr. HUGHES: In this morning's *Advertiser* appeared a statement, supposed to have been made by the Hon. H. K. Kemp, M.L.C., which contained certain allegations against the Government's mishandling of Treasury affairs. Part of the statement was that the Government was now considering buying gas from Victoria's off-shore wells. Did the Premier see the statement and, if he did, will he comment on it?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: My attention has been drawn to the statement. I do not think any worse approach than that made by the representative of another place could be made on a matter so important to the State. If the member of another place wanted to make a statement on these matters, he should at least have had his facts clear. I regret that the public of the State should have been misled by this statement. The Government does not intend to buy gas from Victoria. No

more damaging statement could appear in the press anywhere than the statement that appeared in this morning's *Advertiser*. At present, the Government is going to no end of trouble to present a case to the Commonwealth Government, and we hope that we will prevail on that Government to agree to contribute to the financing of this pipeline. Many problems are associated with this matter. We must have a reasonable rate of consumption to make it an economic proposition. This State already has ample natural gas deposits, without further drilling, to supply it for 20 to 25 years. It is beyond reason for a statement like this to appear in the press and mislead the public. Surely some questions could have been asked before this sort of statement appeared in the press.

Mr. CASEY: The Leader might have put him up to it.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a tendency to debate questions and answers.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I could not entirely agree with that interjection. I appeal to the sense of loyalty of members of this House, of the press, of the Australian Broadcasting Commission and of any other body interested in this State, to definitely contradict such a statement, because the Government does not intend to buy gas from Victoria. We intend to follow a course that will convince the Commonwealth Government that it should make a loan available to this State so that we can go ahead with our plans to provide natural gas from Gidgealpa-Moomba to Adelaide.

Mr. HEASLIP: The Premier said that there were proved supplies of gas at Gidgealpa to enable South Australia to be supplied for the next 20 to 25 years, and that it was only the question of economically getting the gas to the consumer that was being considered. He also said that gas was available in Victoria but that he did not intend to use that gas. If Victorian gas were available at a cost sufficiently below that of Gidgealpa gas, would the Premier, in the interests of South Australian consumers and industries, change his mind and consider using this Victorian gas?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The question is so hypothetical that I could not give an answer. To the best of my knowledge, overseas gas authorities have been able to satisfactorily provide piping for off-shore supplies: I think they have proved that they can successfully pipe, to land, gas from 130ft. below the surface of the sea. I ask the honourable member to consider whether we could expect

Victorian off-shore gas to be delivered to the nearest point on the mainland in South Australia. I doubt whether there would be very much difference in the distance from the Victorian gas strike to where it would have to be delivered to land and the distance from the South Australian strike to Adelaide where it would be used. I suggest that in the interests of South Australia our South Australian gas would be a more economic and cheaper proposition than any proposition involving gas from Victoria.

RAIL STANDARDIZATION.

Mr. HEASLIP: I understand the Premier, representing the Minister of Transport, has a reply to my question of last week concerning the standardization of the Port Pirie to Adelaide railway line. I hope the information in this answer will be more specific and enlightening than that in the answer given to the member for Mitcham.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Is that a reflection on the member for Mitcham?

Mr. Millhouse: Definitely not.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: If the honourable member desires the information, I have it here. The route of a standard gauge line between Port Pirie and Adelaide is still receiving consideration by the Commonwealth Government and this Government. No firm decision has been made to date. The District Council of Crystal Brook recently sought a deputation to the Minister of Transport, who has advised the council that he will receive a deputation on July 22 to hear any specific matters the council desires to raise. I hope the honourable member will accompany the deputation.

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked last week about rail standardization, and particularly the proposal to build a line from Port Augusta to Whvalla?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have been given to understand that the report of the Commonwealth Railways Commissioner will be submitted to the Minister for Shipping and Transport soon. Further negotiations will depend on this report.

GOODS TRAIN LIGHTS.

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Premier, representing the Minister of Transport, a reply to my recent question concerning lights on goods trains?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The proposal that lights be placed at intervals along the length of goods trains has been made on a

number of occasions in the past. It has not been adopted because it is not practicable to do so. Under existing safe working rules, marker lamps must be displayed on each side of the last vehicle only of every train, for the express purpose of indicating the position of the rear of that train. The display of side lights on intermediate vehicles would prejudice the indication given in accordance with the provisions of the existing rules. The display of lights on intermediate vehicles would also cause confusion in respect of signals exchanged between the engineman and guard, for which purpose hand lamps are used. It is understood that the lighting provided on the sides and rear of road transports forms part of a single installation, for which current is provided by the central battery installed on the prime mover. In the case of a railway train a separate lamp and power supply would be necessary on each vehicle so equipped. Further, owing to the changes which occur in the course of shunting, it would be necessary, in order that vehicles could be set down and picked up at intermediate stations, to provide such lamps and equipment for every vehicle. The problem presented to drivers of road vehicles who encounter trains in motion over level crossings at night, as described in the extract, is appreciated by all Australian railway systems, and considerable attention has been given to this problem by all concerned. The action taken in this State has been the initiation of a programme for painting all rail waggons a light shade of grey, which observation has shown is relatively easily discerned during the hours of darkness.

TROTTING.

Mr. CUMBE: My question, relating to the recent inquiry into trotting in South Australia that was conducted under the chairmanship of Mr. Andrew Wells, Q.C., follows that asked last week by the honourable member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda). Since the Premier's reply to that earlier question received some publicity, several people have told me that they gave evidence at the inquiry and therefore were most anxious to know the recommendations. In view of this, and in view of the interest that this inquiry holds for the general public and for members of this House in particular, will the Premier now table a copy of the committee's report?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have no objection to tabling the report, but I hope I shall not be asked to have it printed. Because

of pressure of work, I have not yet been able to get out a report concerning what amendments would be necessary to the Lottery and Gaming Act to give effect to the committee's recommendations. However, that will be done. I can lay the report on the table for the information of members, but if members still wanted something else done then perhaps it could be incorporated in *Hansard* in some way.

PATHOLOGICAL TESTS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Some years ago Cabinet considered a minute from the Hospitals Department regarding charges for pathological tests at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. It was pointed out that frequently a patient had to undergo tests which might not have been required had he gone to a private hospital, for the reason that as it was a teaching hospital it was necessary from time to time to show the reaction to tests to students at the hospital. At that time Cabinet approved of a recommendation that such charges should be reduced because of the number of tests that had to be undergone. I have here an account which has been presented to an employee of the Engineering and Water Supply Department who I understand is receiving a wage of about \$34 a week, out of which he has to pay \$5 for income tax and some \$14 for house repayment. The interesting thing is that on the day he went into the hospital he was given 17 pathological tests, the cost of which was \$44.10. In the course of eight days at the hospital he had in all some 28 tests, the cost of which has been notified to him as being \$62.40. That brings the account for eight days at the hospital, in a public ward, to \$115.80. I think the Attorney-General will see that charges of that description can only result in the gravest hardship to a person in the lower wage-earning bracket. Will he take this matter up with the Minister of Health and see what alleviation can be given in cases of this description? I consider it is not right to throw the whole book of pathological tests at a person the first day he goes into hospital, especially as the charges for some of those tests are up to \$8 each. I think the Attorney-General would agree that those charges are exorbitant in this case. The person concerned is a migrant who speaks very poor English and probably does not know what he can do to have his position alleviated. Will the Attorney-General take up this case with his colleague? More particularly, will he ask his colleague to look at the general problem of the very heavy costs of these tests to

patients who are in the public wards and yet are expected to pay the full amount for those tests?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am grateful to the Leader for bringing this matter up. I think it is clearly something that should be investigated, and I will take it up urgently with my colleague and let the Leader have a reply.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT BILL.

Mr. CLARK: Is the Attorney-General aware of a bitter attack on the Planning and Development Bill made by the President of the South Australian Chamber of Manufactures and published in the press today? Can he also say whether the Government received any representations from this organization concerning the provisions of the Bill, and, if it did, what was the Government's attitude to those representations?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I did see an attack by Mr. Curtis on the Bill, which surprised me considerably because Mr. Curtis had, at very short notice, sought an interview with me, which I promptly accorded him. I made arrangements to see him as soon as possible, on the day he asked for the appointment. We had a friendly discussion about matters in the Bill in which the chamber appeared to be interested, and I made it clear to Mr. Curtis that we would be grateful for representations from the chamber, and that those representations, along with all other representations which had been made to the Government (and we have had representations from many organizations in South Australia about particular provisions of the Bill), would be considered together, and when the Government had made a decision on any amendments to be made on the Bill we would communicate with the chamber again and discuss the matter with them. He asked that I see Mr. Blackburn (counsel advising the chamber on this matter) urgently, and I did so. I went through with Mr. Blackburn the matters that he raised as matters of law concerning various clauses of the Bill. I communicated to Mr. Blackburn also that we would consider these matters. I gave him some short explanations concerning the reasons for some of the clauses about which he had made some comment, and said that the whole matter would be taken up with Mr. Ludovici, the draftsman who drafted the Bill, and with the Town Planner, and that when the Government had been through the matter we would again communicate with the chamber. Throughout this, the chamber was courteously

received, and it was made perfectly clear that the Government was treating this Bill as a Committee Bill. It had lain on the table during the recess so that all interested parties would be able to examine it in detail, receive advice on it, and make representations so that the Government would get the widest possible area of agreement on it. Only yesterday I had a conference with the draftsman and the Town Planner to agree on proposals to put to Cabinet for many amendments including those that had arisen directly from the matters that Mr. Blackburn had put to me. Then I find in the newspaper this bitter attack on the Bill by Mr. Curtis. This is not the sort of thing one would expect from an organization seeking the co-operation of a Government in matters of this kind. I should have thought that, if Mr. Curtis or his organization were concerned to see that they obtained reasonable discussion and agreement, the Government would be treated with the same courtesy by the chamber as it received from other organizations making representations to it about this Bill.

MURRAY RIVER WATERFRONT.

Mr. McANANEY: Last year a committee was appointed to investigate the tourist and recreational potential of the Murray River and surrounding areas. As this concerns my district, and I have not heard of any activities of the committee, has the Minister of Lands a report on its activities?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have already replied today to a question that was directed to me last week by the member for Chaffey. The reply contains the information that the honourable member is seeking, and I suggest that he look it up in *Hansard*.

FAUNA AND FLORA RESERVES.

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my recent question about the fencing of wild life reserves?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is the policy of the Commissioners of the National Park and Wild Life Reserves to concentrate available funds on the erection of boundary fencing where adjoining landholders have cleared their land up to the boundary of a reserve. In the case of the wild life reserve in the hundred of Woolumbool, the northern boundary was fenced by the adjoining landholder and an application has been lodged with the commissioners for assistance to fence the southern boundary. This application will be dealt with by the commissioners in accordance with their usual priorities. The eastern and

western boundaries of the reserve both adjoin surveyed roads, each of which is fenced on the neighbour's side. In accordance with the policy of the commissioners for allocation of priorities for the fencing of reserve boundaries it cannot be expected that the eastern and western boundaries of the reserve will be fenced in the near future but, as I indicated to the honourable member when he first raised this matter, the intention is to eventually fence all reserve boundaries. A firebreak has been established around the perimeter of this reserve and is maintained.

The problem of kangaroos from the reserve presenting a hazard to motorists at night has not previously been reported to the commissioners, but they consider that the risk of accident could be reduced greatly by the installation of notices and this is being investigated. If the kangaroos have increased to plague proportions and are encroaching on newly pastured land, the landholder could apply to the honourable the Minister of Agriculture (through the Department of Fisheries and Fauna Conservation) for a permit to destroy a limited number on his property. The commissioners state that patchy infestations of salvation jane in the reserve have been sprayed annually under the supervision of the District Council of Lucindale, since the reserve has been under their control. The commissioners are anxious to establish a resident ranger on all sizeable reserves under their control and are, in fact, budgeting with a view to the appointment of the first full-time ranger in the near future. Further appointments will, of course, be dependent upon the availability of finance and it is not possible at this stage to indicate when a ranger will be appointed to this particular reserve.

CHANDLER HILL TO HEATHFIELD MAIN.

Mr. SHANNON: Has the Minister of Works any information concerning augmenting the water supply to the Mount Lofty area from the Onkaparinga Valley scheme?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief reports that a contract for the manufacture of pipes has been let, and deliveries actually commenced yesterday. Construction of the pipeline will start in two weeks' time, with a view to finishing actual pipelaying in 1966-67 financial year, but the date on which the pipeline will be completed will depend on steel deliveries to the pipe manufacturers. Construction of the 250,000-gallon tank at Ironbank will be the subject of a call for tenders

in about six weeks. The specification for the pumping plant is well in hand for tenders to be called soon, but the delivery date of the pumps is likely to be 12 months after the letting of a contract, so that the installation of the pumping plant will not be undertaken until the 1967-68 financial year. However, it is expected that temporary plant could be available for pumping when the tank and the pipeline are completed.

EVANSTON PARK LAND.

Mrs. BYRNE: I have received correspondence from a constituent stating that she and her fiancé had purchased land at Evanston Park, via Gawler, about nine months ago, and had been told by the land salesman concerned that although no water was connected, no problem existed in that regard. As a water supply is still not connected, the couple concerned recently contacted the Engineering and Water Supply Department and were told that there was no possibility of a water supply servicing that area soon, as it was not a developed area. However, the local council told the couple that they could lay their own pipes to the nearest main, but that meant traversing a gully. A clipping from a newspaper was enclosed in the correspondence (dated June 22, 1966); it advertised land for sale in this area and stated "water available". As this advertisement is misleading, will the Attorney-General have this matter investigated if I furnish full particulars?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member lets me have the information I shall refer it immediately to the Land Agents Board for investigation.

MINLATON MEETING.

Mr. CURREN: I understand the member for Glenelg attended a public meeting, by invitation, at Minlaton on Yorke Peninsula last Friday night. Will the honourable member report to the House on the meeting and say whether any Liberal and Country League member of Parliament accepted an invitation to attend?

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable member wish to reply?

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am glad this question has been asked. As the member for Chaffey presumed, I attended a public meeting at Minlaton last Friday night, as I had been invited to do by the local branch of the South Australian Institute of Teachers. The meeting was called on the subject of Commonwealth aid for education. I had been told

before I went to the meeting that a State Opposition member would attend. Although it was a Friday evening (many other functions were taking place) and a cold night, about 100 people attended and the meeting was successful. Those attending showed a considerable appreciation of the problems the State Government has in financing the educational needs of South Australia and of the need that arises, therefore, for Commonwealth aid for education. Nobody who asked a question or spoke at the meeting opposed the idea of Commonwealth aid. I was surprised that no Opposition member attended the meeting, for as late as 8.30 p.m. the chairman announced that it was hoped some Liberal and Country League representative would attend. I can only assume that no Opposition member attended the meeting because the Opposition did not want to expose itself on a subject like education in such a politically hostile (that is, hostile to the Liberal and Country League) area as Yorke Peninsula.

SULPHUR PRICE.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Primary producers throughout the Commonwealth have been perturbed at the rise that is to take place in the price of phosphate rock, which will have an important reaction on the cost of superphosphate in the local market and on the general activities of primary producers. In this morning's *Advertiser* appeared a short paragraph to the effect that a steep increase in the price of imported sulphur would also take place, which would mean that the price of sulphuric acid (an important manufacturing ingredient in this fertilizer) would also rise steeply. It was stated that the increase in the price of sulphur would mean an additional \$1 a ton on the already steep increases that are to take place in the price of superphosphate. If my information is correct, most superphosphate used in South Australia is made from local materials, not from imported materials. Therefore, as South Australian sulphuric acid is mainly derived from the pyrites mine at Nairne and from the smelting works at Port Pirie, will the Premier examine the matter before an automatic increase in the price is determined as a result of the increase in the price of sulphur?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I assure the Leader that a full investigation will be made. The Prices Commissioner is the authority concerned and I do not think he will delay in investigating any possible price increase.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL.

Mr. LAWN: In March of this year, when I spent a few weeks in the new east wing of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, I found that the air conditioning plant was sadly lacking. In some rooms the air blown directly on to the patients from the ceiling is icy cold, as though it is coming off the Antarctic. I suffered and ran a temperature on occasions because of it. Further, I was told by the nursing staff that patients in the room next door had made several requests since the east wing had been in operation to be changed from that room, and while I was there a patient (a doctor himself) asked in my hearing, a few hours after he was admitted, to be shifted to another room. I have taken this matter up with the Chief Secretary, and investigations have proved my statement to be correct. I understand that approval is now being sought for the Public Buildings Department to carry out the work. As some time has elapsed since I took this matter up with the Minister of Health, and as the weather at present is very cold and I know what these patients must be suffering, will the Minister of Works inquire of his department and let me know when the Public Buildings Department could install baffles similar to those being installed in the building now being erected?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I point out that the Public Buildings Department does the work at the request of and at the instruction of other departments, and the department is often accused of not doing jobs when it has had no instruction to do them. Further, it sometimes receives requests to do jobs but not to do them immediately because funds are not immediately available. Nevertheless, I will take up the matter and see whether relief can be given. I assure the honourable member that any time we get requests from hospitals, or from schools where unfortunate scholars are being taught, such jobs are given first priority so that suffering can be avoided.

BAROSSA BUS SERVICE.

Mrs. BYRNE: It has been requested by the Barossa Line Coach Service that its bus service be extended to Nuriootpa. The existing bus service, travelling between Adelaide and Seppeltsfield-Greenock (via Daveyston and Sheaoak Log), operates three days a week, namely, Monday, Wednesday and Friday. At present there is no bus service from Nuriootpa to Adelaide, but this coach service does most of

the charter work for Nuriootpa. Will the Premier ask his colleague, the Minister of Transport, to consider this request?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall take up the matter with my colleague and ascertain whether it is practicable to put the honourable member's request into effect. I shall bring down a report as soon as possible.

INSURANCE.

Mr. HALL: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked last week about insurance rates in the areas immediately north of Adelaide?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am informed by the Fire and Accident Underwriters Association that since April of this year member companies of the association have added a surcharge to householders' insurance premiums and to fire insurance premiums as an offset to the increased contributions payable by the companies towards fire brigades services. This surcharge applies only to risks in areas proclaimed under the Fire Brigades Act and does not apply in areas not served by the Fire Brigades Board. The surcharge is therefore not applicable in respect of properties at Para Hills, which is outside the proclaimed Fire Brigades Act area. If, as a result of an error, some person in the Para Hills area has been billed with the surcharge by a company which is a member of the association, the association would appreciate information on the matter so that the mistake can be rectified. If the charge has been made by a company which is not a member of the association then, if the honourable member will let me have details, I will have the matter investigated.

MINNIPA DENTIST.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked recently about school dentists at the Minnipa Area School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: A school dental officer is expected to visit the Minnipa Area School early in August on completion of his current work at the Port Kenny Primary School. The programme in this area has been delayed because of the unexpected increased amount of treatment needed by children in the schools visited this year.

SWAN REACH TO STOCKWELL MAIN.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question whether favourable consideration will be given to the use of locally made bricks in construct-

ing three residences and a pumping station in connection with the proposed Swan Reach to Stockwell main?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief reports that the pumping station building and residences contemplated at Swan Reach for the Swan Reach to Stockwell main will be erected under contract. Tenderers to the department for the construction of the pumping station would obtain materials in the best market consistent with acceptable quality. In the case of the purchase of bricks, there is little doubt that the proximity of the Nuriootpa brickworks to the site of the work would be attractive to tenderers. The Housing Trust, it is expected, will arrange the construction of the residences by contract, and the use of Nuriootpa bricks could similarly be attractive to tenderers for these buildings.

GILES POINT.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Some time ago I asked the Minister of Marine a question regarding the difficulty of South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited in building facilities at Giles Point resulting from the proposals of the Harbors Board. The Minister said that it might be 1970 before the Harbors Board completed its work. Has he further information on this matter?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Lower Yorke Peninsula farmers are currently losing money in the production and delivery of grain for two main reasons:

- (i) Inability to go over to bulk handling methods because of lack of silos within easy reach.
- (ii) Large differential because of distance from the nearest deep sea bulk grain loading terminal.

On the evidence tendered to the committee at Yorketown on November 3, 1965, the inability to engage wholly in bulk handling is costing the local farmers about \$670,000 a year and the differential is costing them a further \$240,000 a year. Even if these figures are on the high side, the costs are still very substantial, and I can see no reason why the construction date of the silos should be held back to the construction date of the bulk loading facility. In fact it would be of great advantage if the silos could be built immediately as it would save the local grain producers a great deal of expense in the purchase of grain sacks, twine, and sewing costs. Notice has been published in the *Government Gazette* stating this to be a terminal port for the purpose of bulk handling.

SHOPPING HOURS.

Mrs. STEELE: Several times last session I asked questions of the Premier about shop trading hours, and on November 18 he said that a committee had been set up, but that it would be some months before a report would be received. I considered that fair enough. On perusing the annual report of the Department of Labour and Industry, I noticed in the section dealing with the shop trading hours committee that the committee, acting under the charter by which it was empowered to function, had decided:

To invite any person, company, or organization to make submissions, in writing, on any of the above matters—

and these matters are enumerated. The report continues:

As this would involve a considerable amount of research, the members of the committee fixed January 28, 1966, as the final day on which the submissions could be made.

As it is now nearly six months since the date on which the final submissions were to be made, I ask the Premier whether he has received a report yet.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I received information today from my colleague, but I am somewhat hazy about the exact nature of the report. I hope to have more definite information by the end of this week, if I can get it. I understand that an interim report is being prepared, but I hope to be able to give further information soon.

PEAKE WATER SCHEME.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the Peake water supply?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The scheme to supply Peake township with water was originally restricted to people within the township, but was later extended to provide a supply to the properties of Messrs. C. F. Wray and G. Smyth. Levels taken showed that the property of Mr. Smyth on section 70 could not be supplied continuously from the tank as originally sited, and two alternatives were therefore proposed: the tank to be on a higher stand at the bore site, or on a 20ft. high stand located in the park lands opposite section 70. Although these alternatives increase the overall cost of the scheme, the Director and Engineer-in-Chief has confirmed that the proposal for the council to lease the scheme under the terms set out in letters to the honourable member dated January 20, 1965, and June 4, 1965, has been made as a

firm offer, and that, consequently, it should stand.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT PAYMENTS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the questions concerning Education Department payments that I asked him last week?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: No, the information is not yet available.

REYNELLA SOUTH TRAFFIC.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: On June 2 I took a deputation to the Minister of Lands, acting as Minister of Roads, concerning traffic problems at the shopping centre at Reynella South. Has the Minister yet been able to confer with his colleague, and can he comment on that deputation?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Having discussed this matter with the Minister of Roads, I have been informed that an officer of the Highways Department has visited the area and the people concerned in this matter, but I have not received a detailed report of what transpired. However, I shall be happy to refer the honourable member's request to the Minister of Roads and to obtain a report for him on this matter.

At 4 o'clock, the bells having been rung:

The Hon. FRANK WALSH moved:

That Orders of the Day be postponed until questions on notice and notices of motion are disposed of.

Motion carried.

MURRAY RIVER POLLUTION.

Mr. HALL (on notice): What authority or authorities in South Australia are responsible for the prevention of contamination and pollution of the water of the Murray River?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Several Acts confer powers on the responsible Ministers in respect to pollution of the Murray River. That section of the Murray River between Mannum and the eastern boundary of the State has been proclaimed under section 12 of the Control of Waters Act, 1914-1925, which empowers the Minister of Works to take action to prevent pollution of the waters of the river. Under the Waterworks Act, 1932-1962, administered by the Minister of Works, it is an offence to allow any foul water to run into any stream used for water supply purposes. The Health Act, 1935-1963, empowers the Central Board of Health or the Local Board of Health to take action to prevent pollution of any river or stream where this may become injurious to health. The Murray River is a proclaimed harbour under the Harbours Act. A regulation

made under this Act on April 20, 1921, prohibits the discharge of deleterious or offensive matter below high water mark in any harbour.

PHYSIOTHERAPISTS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Has the Physiotherapists Board of South Australia sent a circular letter, dated July 1, 1966, to registered physiotherapists?

2. Does this circular seek from non-practising registered physiotherapists either payment of a fee of \$3 or an application for de-registration?

3. Does the circular refer to the entitlement of a person to be registered as a physiotherapist pursuant to section 39 of the Physiotherapists Act? If not, why not?

4. Does the board intend to send a further circular to registered physiotherapists explaining their rights pursuant to this section? If not, why not?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The replies are:

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. No. It is considered that to set out the present entitlement to registration under any section of the Act could only be confusing and, possibly, misleading. Entitlement or non-entitlement to registration today may or may not be so at some future date, as the provisions of section 39 or of any other section of the Act may be amended at any time. Whether or not it will be possible to grant re-registration if and when applied for can only depend upon the then provisions of the Act, not necessarily those applying today.

4. No. For the reasons set out above it is considered that the fairest and only proper course is to draw to the attention of each registered physiotherapist the fact that in the event of de-registration he will not be entitled to practise here until again registered, and this has been done.

MINES DEPARTMENT PUBLICATIONS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. How many publications does the Mines Department issue free, annually?

2. What are these publications?

3. What classes of person and organization are on the free distribution list?

4. What is the annual cost of:

(a) these publications;

(b) dispatch to those who receive them?

d1

5. When was the free distribution list last reviewed?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran, for the Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The replies are:

1. 1,950.

2. Formal publications which include mining reviews, reports of investigations, annual reports, bulletins, also geological and geo-physical maps.

3. The department's mailing list comprises the following classes of person and organization: members of Parliament, Government departments, universities, colleges and libraries. The pamphlets are made available to members of the public.

4. (a) \$1,103.

(b) \$105.

5. August 2, 1965.

In addition to the above, 21,500 information pamphlets, costing \$432, were issued to the public. Many of the publications are issued on an exchange basis from which the department receives 600 publications at an estimated value of \$360.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: GOVERNMENT COSTS.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I ask leave to make a statement. Leave granted.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Last week in this House the Government refused to make public the amounts of emoluments paid to members of Royal Commissions and inquiries but offered to give full information in confidence to the Opposition. The reason for this was that the emoluments of various officers of the Commissions are professional fees not normally discussed publicly, and the view of many senior members of the Law Society and of the Government was that these should not become matters for public debate. Professional emoluments of this kind are not net returns to the persons to whom they are paid, and both the Commissioners and counsel will have numbers of expenses in relation to their work and Commissions to pay out of the fees paid to them. Nor did the Government believe that it was desirable that figures for different kinds of work done should become matters of debate publicly because this kind of debate can evoke comparisons which are both odious and unjustified. The Government had supplied to the House the estimates made by the Commissioners of the total cost of the Commissions,

and the Government has had the utmost co-operation from the Commissioners in endeavouring to see that the costs of their Commissions are kept to a minimum.

For instance, the Royal Commission on the Licensing Act has been organized in working sessions with the requirement that evidence in chief be presented in writing and not by oral examination, which has significantly reduced the cost both to the Government and to the parties appearing before the Commission. However, in view of the fact that members of the Opposition have called in question the figures supplied to this House by the Commissioners as to the total costs of the Commissions and have persisted in demanding that the

figures be made public rather than taking advantage of the assistance which the Government was prepared to give them to show that all was well and that the utmost care and economy was being exercised, the Government now deems it in the public interest to release figures which would have been better dealt with as the Government originally suggested, but it feels now that, in view of the irresponsible attitude of the Opposition, public mischief could accrue if these figures were not publicly stated. The Government therefore sets forth in the following schedule the fees payable to the Commissioners and officers assisting the Commissions and Committees (except for the Trotting Act Inquiry, fees for which have not yet been fixed):

1. Royal Commission on the Licensing Act:

Royal Commissioner (Mr. Sangster, Q.C.):	\$
Fixed fee	11,000
Each sitting day	210
Assisting Counsel:	
(1) Daily fee applicable to:	
(a) days spent in open session of Commission;	
(b) other activities requested by Commissioner, such as interstate visits	140 per day
(2) Fees for conference with witnesses, prospective witnesses, counsel and other interested parties	20 per hour
(3) Lump sum fee for all other work up to end of sittings of Commission	3,330
(4) Services of partners and staff to be charged for on ordinary solicitor and client basis. Ministerial travelling allowance paid for interstate trips only.	

2. Royal Commission on State Transport Services:

Royal Commissioner (Mr. Nelligan, Q.C.):	
Each day or part thereof on which the Commission is sitting or travelling or day or part thereof when engaged on Commission business	60
Assisting Counsel:	
Each day or part thereof on which the Commission is sitting or travelling or day or part thereof when engaged on Commission business	40
Public Service members, per sitting or travelling day	20
Non-Public Service members, per sitting or travelling day	30
Travelling allowance:	
Within State, \$12 a day or part thereof.	
Outside State, \$20 a day or part thereof.	

3. Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal:

Chairman, \$25 a sitting.	
Members (2), \$20 a sitting.	
Secretary, \$300 a year.	
Travelling allowance, \$9 a day or part thereof intrastate; \$13 a day or part thereof interstate.	

4. Local Government Act Revision Committee:

Chairman, \$700 per annum.	
City Members, \$10 a meeting each.	
Country Members, \$10 a meeting; \$11 expense allowance a meeting.	
Travelling expenses at Public Service rates.	

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Flagstaff Hill Water and Sewer Services,
Morphett Vale Primary School,
Smithfield Plains Primary and Infants
School,
Whyalla (Scott Street) Primary and
Infants School.

Ordered that reports be printed.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on the motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 7. Page 366.)

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER (Angas): I support the motion. I associate myself with the remarks of other members relating to the demise of former members of this Chamber and of a member of another place, namely, Sir Frank T. Perry, the Hon. Sir Richard Butler, and Messrs. Albert V. Thompson and Edward J. Craigie. With other members, I extend my condolences to the members of their families. It is interesting to note that the four members, during their lifetimes, gave a total of 90 years' Parliamentary service in this State, and one member gave service in the Commonwealth sphere, too. All members can agree that each of these men, during the time such services were given, gave them unsparingly and conscientiously. We, who are here today, might well follow in their footsteps with regard to the conscientious exercise of our duties.

Perhaps I would be ungallant if I did not commend the member for Barossa (Mrs. Byrne), who preceded me in this debate, for her scholarly discourse on the latest foundation techniques that can be used in house construction in South Australia. Her remarks indicated that she had done considerable research into this subject and had attended a field day. I wonder whether, if the advice she tendered to the House last Thursday could have been tendered earlier in another sphere (and I refer to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Labor Party), the cracks that appeared in that edifice some time ago might not have eventuated, and the name of Calwell might have become synonymous with "Wall-well".

The honourable member said that the member for Gouger (who preceded her in the debate) had at no stage in his speech said one constructive word in favour of primary producers. I think the member for Barossa would agree that the member for Gouger himself is

a primary producer and that, if any member has stood up in his place over the years and spoken in the interests of primary producers, it has been the member for Gouger, along with other members on this side.

I suggest to the member for Barossa that she might well read through her own speech, because I could not find a word from her own lips that would console the primary producers of the State. I say that advisedly, for the greater portion of her district is an area where primary producers carry on their activities. The honourable member quoted figures regarding unemployment in South Australia, and she expressed some delight that members on this side were concerned with the matter. I assure honourable members that we are vitally concerned. The honourable member appeared to attribute unemployment in this State in a great measure to the fact that too many migrants from overseas were coming to South Australia. She said:

For the benefit of the House I will now give figures of the arrivals of migrants in this State through the assisted passage scheme. In 1963, there were 9,557 arrivals; in 1964, 14,583; and, in 1965, 17,206. These figures prove conclusively that more migrants are now coming to this State than came in the past. I maintain that those figures do not prove that more migrants are coming to this State now than came in the past. If the honourable member's figures are correct, they prove only that more migrants are coming here under the assisted passage scheme. Although I do not dispute the honourable member's statement, I say that those figures in themselves merely prove that more assisted-passage migrants are coming to South Australia. No doubt the overall position, taking into account those who come under other schemes, is that more migrants are coming to South Australia but, while the honourable member attributed the increase in the number of migrants as being a contributing factor to the unemployment position, I make the point that if in 1963 there were 9,557 arrivals under this scheme in this State, most (if not all) of them found employment in this State, because at that time the Playford Government was in power and the rate of unemployment was considerably less than it is at present. In 1964, when 14,583 migrants arrived in this State (an increase of 5,000 on the previous year), the position was still considerably better than it is at the present time, and most persons who came here found employment. The year 1965 saw a further increase to 17,206, as the honourable member stated, which was an

increase of nearly 3,000. However, it is since March, 1965, when the present Government came into office, that the unemployment position has become worse. Indeed, in March, 1965, when the previous Government went out of office, 3,420 persons were registered with the Commonwealth Employment Service in this State. We must bear in mind that at the same time 5,032 job vacancies were registered with the department, which means that the number of job vacancies in this State was 1,612 more than the number of unemployed persons. A year later (March, 1966) 6,471 persons were registered at the Commonwealth Employment Service, and the job vacancies registered had decreased from 5,032 in the previous year to 2,431, so the number of unemployed persons was 4,040 more than the number of job vacancies.

The latest figures I have been able to get show that at the end of May this year the number of unemployed persons registered in this State was 6,714 and the job vacancies registered had further dropped to 1,864. Therefore, at the end of May the number of unemployed persons in this State was 4,850 more than the number of job vacancies. The position has deteriorated considerably since the Playford Government went out of office. Last month the position in the various States was as follows: In New South Wales, 1.2 per cent of the work force was unemployed; in Victoria, 1 per cent; in Queensland, 1.8 per cent; in South Australia, 1.5 per cent; in Western Australia, .9 per cent; and in Tasmania, 1 per cent. Members will see from those figures that South Australia is second highest of all the States in the Commonwealth in unemployment. That these figures bear out the correct position is further verified by the statistics which honourable members receive from time to time, and which are contained in the *Quarterly Abstract of South Australian Statistics*, relating to unemployment benefits. At the end of March, 1965, when the Playford Government went out of office, 640 persons were receiving unemployment benefits. In March of this year the number had increased to 1,635, and at the end of May this year it had increased still further to 2,156.

Those figures should make every honourable member think, and particularly they should make the Government realize that it is most essential that progressive developmental works be put in train immediately to alleviate the unemployment position in South Australia. I know that the percentage I quoted does not appear to be so very high, but I am just

wondering whether honourable members opposite subscribe to what one member of the Australian Labor Party said in the House of Representatives some years ago when speaking to the debate on the re-establishment and re-employment legislation. I believe this member of the House of Representatives was a member of the Commonwealth Labor Party shadow Cabinet at the time. I refer to Mr. Leslie Haylen, a former M.H.R. and member for Parkes, who in recent years lost his seat. Speaking in that debate in the House of Representatives, he said:

It is an empty gesture to tell men who have fought for us that we shall give them preference in employment unless we also say that we shall create, so far as possible, total employment. I realize that there cannot be total employment, but if we can get down to 5 per cent of unemployment, for all practical purposes that can be regarded as total employment.

If this were the criterion fixed by Mr. Haylen, according to him we could tolerate an unemployed force of about 17,500 people in this State. I do not subscribe to what Mr. Haylen said, because if we had unemployment at a rate of 5 per cent the position would be exceedingly critical.

The mover of the motion, the member for Chaffey (Mr. Curren), said that much important legislation, as signified in His Excellency's Speech, would be placed before Parliament, and said:

The principal new measures to be introduced are a Bill to set up a lottery controlled by the Government, as a result of the referendum held last year; a Bill to establish totalizer agency board betting in South Australia as a result of the opinion expressed in this House last session; and the proposal to establish a State Government Insurance Office.

If these are considered to be the three most important matters to be introduced, how insignificant to the welfare of the people of this State must be the other matters. I do not regard these measures as being the most important for this session. Much has been said about the housing position in this State, but there is a considerable decline in building activity. Page 41 of the *Quarterly Abstract of South Australian Statistics* shows that in the year 1964, when the Playford Government was in power, 14,576 building approvals were given in this State. Last year, following the change of Government in March, approvals totalled 11,631, a decrease of about 3,000. A similar position is shown by the statistics of houses and flats under construction. At the end of March, 1965, 6,864 were under construction; by September

1965, the number had decreased to 6,397, and by the end of March, 1966, the number had further dropped to 5,757. Further emphasis to this position is given by building employment. Statistics show that in March 1965, 15,558 persons were employed in the building industry. In September last year that number had fallen to 14,531, and in March of this year it had further fallen to 14,086. Additional evidence to show that there is considerable gloom hanging over the building industry, is provided by a comment in last week's *Sunday Mail* by Arthur Bryan, which stated:

Until the South Australian building industry receives a real "shot in the arm," investors are bound to continue their anaemic support of the shares in companies most closely associated with the industry.

The best available gauge of the situation is the set of figures prepared by the Commonwealth Statistician which show the total value of all types of building work approved.

Lately the South Australian score has been much below average.

The three months of January, February, and May this year are the only times in the 26 months covered by the latest Commonwealth returns, when approvals in this State have fallen short of \$9½ million.

The normal level is somewhere above \$11 million, as South Australian approvals in 19 of the past 26 months have ranged from a minimum of \$11.3 million to almost \$25 million.

The South Australian Premier, Mr. Walsh, has turned his back on this information and this week quoted only the figures for homes built by the South Australian Housing Trust.

The trust does a magnificent job, but investors see this as only part of the picture. Not surprisingly, the Premier's remarks have done nothing to change the all-pervading lacklustre tone of the market in building shares.

Since February when investors' hopes were reasonably high, market prices have fallen as follows:

	Per cent.
City Bricks	23½
Cowell Bros.	12½
Harris Scarfe	17½
Lloyds	10
L. G. Abbott	23¾
Reid Bros.	21½
Thompson and Harvey	18½

The index of all ordinary shares compiled by the Sydney Exchange shows virtually no change from its early February level.

I was pleased to hear the Premier say that he intends to give a facelift to the headquarters of the South Australian Agent-General in London. I was there in December, 1964, and, as I have said previously, I was agreeably surprised at the fine window display at the headquarters building in the Strand. It consisted of a large variety of attractively labelled South Australian wines. I agree with the Premier when he says that considerable improve-

ment can be made to the premises, and I welcome the move. I pay a tribute to the former South Australian Agent-General (Mr. M. A. F. Pearce), who for many years effectively fulfilled the duties of that office in London, but who has now been superseded by Mr. Milne. I realize that the Agent-General for a State tries to obtain oversea industries for the State, in addition to carrying out his ordinary duties. I was interested to read some comments made by Mr. Pearce on his return to South Australia about the competition in Australia for United Kingdom industry. Mr. Pearce is reported in the *Advertiser* as having said, among other things:

The Australian States are competing keenly overseas for new industry, and some have established separate departments in London with the sole function of attracting industry. Considerable money is being spent in these campaigns, perhaps not all of it wisely, but if South Australia wants to keep pace with the other States the Government will have to review the amounts allocated for industrial promotion. Considerable interest is being shown in Germany, where big industries are looking for new fields of investment in Australia.

I consider that, in view of the keen competition among the various States for further oversea industries, the appointment in the United Kingdom of a roving industries promotion officer may help to obtain further industries for this State. I realize that this work cannot be done solely by the Agent-General. During my tour of part of Europe in 1964 I learned that there was a labour shortage in some European countries. Mr. Pearce said he thought that in West Germany there would be considerable interest in establishing industry overseas. At the suggestion of Mr. Pearce, I had the opportunity in 1964 to discuss with a prominent West German industrialist an industry that was then receiving consideration, and he told me that West Germany had employment for an additional 700,000 persons. If this was the case, it will be increasingly difficult for us to obtain industries from some European countries. I was told that the labour shortage was so desperate in many places in West Germany that many Spaniards, Italians and Yugoslavs were flocking there to obtain employment (which they found readily) because although many of them were skilled they could not find work in their own countries. I was told that Spaniards were paid very attractive wages; indeed, they earned as much in one hour in West Germany as they had earned in a whole day in Spain. If we want to attract more oversea industry we must appoint someone to be on the spot and to be able to

make continual contacts with industrialists in Europe and England. In paragraph 32 His Excellency said:

It is the intention of my Government to place before you legislation to continue the operation of the Prices Act.

As honourable members know, an amendment to the Prices Act passed early this year made it possible for minimum prices to be fixed for the 1966 vintage. I listened with interest to the remarks made by the member for Chaffey (Mr. Curren) about the viticultural industry. From them one would gather that as a result of the passing of that Act all was well with the viticultural and wine industry, but I assure the House that that is far from true. I assure the Premier that grapegrowers in my district are not satisfied for the position to remain as it is. The member for Chaffey referred to the remarks made by the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) on the Prices Act Amendment Bill. The member for Burra in that debate said that a state of chaos could arise as a result of the passing of the legislation. I assumed that he meant by that remark that there could be chaos if that type of legislation remained in force indefinitely without any other action being taken to alleviate the position. He was taken to task by the member for Chaffey, but I say definitely that if the position remains as it is and nothing further is done chaotic conditions could soon arise.

The efficacy of the prices legislation introduced early this year cannot be gauged by its operation in respect of the 1966 vintage alone, because in that vintage there was no surplus; it was barely average. In the Barossa Valley it was reliably estimated that the 1966 vintage would produce between 35 per cent and 40 per cent less than the previous vintage. The estimate for the 1966 South Australian vintage was 125,000 tons. In 1965, 158,340 tons of grapes was processed, and in 1962, which was a bumper vintage, 171,213 tons was processed. There was no surplus from the 1966 vintage; in fact, there was a shortage of grapes.

Some winemakers, in order to obtain the variety of grapes they required, paid more than the usual market price for them, as indeed has happened previously. The legislation enacted earlier this year, relating to the fixing of grape prices, will not in itself solve the industry's problems. What will happen if we have a surplus next year, similar to the one that occurred in 1965, or to the bumper vintage in 1962? The legislation does not and cannot compel the winemakers to purchase

grapes. Indeed, any legislation of that type would not receive the support of this House; it certainly would not receive my support. If large surpluses occur in a few years' time, and if winemakers resist purchase, we could have chaos in the industry, as the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) pointed out. I think I have stated previously that for some years there has been over-production in South Australia, for a number of reasons. I should say the first reason was the additional planting and replanting of better-bearing varieties; secondly, the replacement of older uneconomic vineyards with new ones; and, thirdly, the adoption of better viticultural methods, resulting in higher yields. Another reason, of course, is the record vintage to which I have just referred; in 1962, 171,213 tons was produced, and in 1964, 148,800 tons.

The report of the Royal Commission into the Grapegrowing Industry makes it abundantly clear that considerable acreage increases have taken place in various parts of the State. The report refers to four districts; the central district, the lower north district, the south-eastern district, and Murray Mallee district. In 1959-60 the central district (which includes the Barossa Valley) had 29,646 acres of vines, and in 1964-65 that acreage had dropped to 29,299, a decrease of 347 acres. That was undoubtedly the result of a decrease of 955 acres in the metropolitan area. In 1959-60 the lower north district had a vine acreage of 2,432, and in 1964-65 it had increased by 492 acres to 2,924. In the south-eastern district in 1959-60 the acreage was 353, and 605 in 1964-65, an increase of 252 acres. The Murray Mallee district, which includes the irrigated area, had a total acreage of 24,416 in 1959-60, and 25,972 in 1964-65, an increase of 1,556. These figures show that the total increased acreage in bearing and non-bearing vines during 1964-65 had increased by 1,953 over those five years, but it does not end there. Greater increased plantings than those in South Australia have taken place in other States, and the wine grape production in other States has also increased. Page 6 of the Royal Commission's report makes the following somewhat alarming statement:

The increase in total acreage in South Australia has not been significant. There is evidence of an accelerated rate of plantings in the Murrumbidgee irrigation area. Figures obtained from the New South Wales Department of Agriculture indicate the acreage planted to wine grapes in the Murrumbidgee irrigation area has "increased from 4,338 acres at December, 1961, to 5,368 acres at December, 1964. Assuming yields of seven tons per acre,

the vintage will increase by about 2,000 tons per annum if expansion continues at the present rate". The production of wine grapes in the Murrumbidgee irrigation area has virtually doubled since 1960 to exceed 36,000 tons in 1965.

The wine production figures relating to South Australia, New South Wales and Victoria for 1959-60 are tabled on page 7 of the report as follows: South Australia, 21,576,000 gallons; New South Wales, 3,834,507 gallons; and Victoria, 2,146,676 gallons. However, for the year 1964-65, we note the following significant increase in wine production figures: the South Australian total is 27,762,000 gallons, only a little over 25 per cent more than the 1959-60 figure. New South Wales' total for 1964-65 is 6,500,000 gallons, an increase of almost 100 per cent. Victoria's total wine production for 1964-65 is 3,800,000 gallons, an increase of over 50 per cent on the 1959-60 figure. A similar position applies in respect of brandy production. South Australia's brandy production in 1959-60 was 941,282 gallons and, by 1964-65, the production had risen to 1,183,112 gallons, which is no significant increase. The combined New South Wales and Victorian production for 1959-60 was 70,552 gallons, which had increased to 149,612 gallons by 1964-65. It had more than doubled during that period.

The grapegrowers in my electoral district and I are concerned for the future. As I have already pointed out, the prices legislation in itself is not the answer to the problem. There is increased production in the Eastern States, where we have many big markets for South Australian wine. Unless something is done to remedy the position, our markets there may well be in jeopardy. The South Australian wine exports to New South Wales and Victoria have been as follows in the last five years. I do not want to quote all the figures but I have tables here showing what wines have been exported from South Australia to New South Wales and Victoria during each of the years 1960-61 to 1964-65, inclusive, and the total South Australian wine exports to all the States of the Commonwealth. I ask that I have leave to have them inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN WINE EXPORTS TO NEW SOUTH WALES AND VICTORIA.

	N.S.W. Gallons.	Vic. Gallons.
1960-61	2,753,813	2,172,311
1961-62	2,697,580	2,063,524
1962-63	2,554,730	2,136,178
1963-64	2,703,815	2,309,885
1964-65	3,065,594	2,360,778

TOTAL SOUTH AUSTRALIAN WINE EXPORTS TO ALL STATES.

	Gallons.	
1964-65	7,213,146	
1963-64	6,775,000	From <i>Pocket</i>
1962-63	6,390,000	<i>Year Book.</i>
1961-62	6,395,000	
1960-61	6,619,000	

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: These figures show that South Australian exports to the populous Eastern States of New South Wales and Victoria have been about 5,000,000 gallons a year for each of the past five years. It is a considerable market that we have in those States, but what will happen because of the increased plantings in the Eastern States if nothing is done in the interests of the country's viticultural industry? At page 6, the Royal Commission's report states:

It is pertinent to mention at this stage that the substantial increase in production in the Murrumbidgee Irrigation Area cannot fail to adversely affect the sale of wine from South Australia unless markets generally increase at a greater rate than at present. Wineries have been established in the Murrumbidgee Irrigation Area, and in view of the location of the area in relation to the extensive markets in Eastern Australia, production from these areas gives winemakers a freight advantage which has been estimated at about 1s. per gallon. One very large Australian winemaking firm has advised that, to supply New South Wales and Eastern markets, they have extended their buying in the Murrumbidgee Irrigation Area to the exclusion of South Australia, and that this policy will continue.

That is the position. One prominent South Australian winemaking industry was at that time extending its activities in New South Wales, and I heard only recently that another large South Australian winemaking firm had bought substantial acreages in Victoria for the purpose of growing vines there. As a result it will be nearer attractive markets in the Eastern States. Unless the viticultural industry can be stabilized on an Australia-wide basis, we may soon have considerable difficulties, because the prices legislation in itself is not the answer to the problem. Unless something is done rapidly to stabilize this industry on an Australia-wide basis, other winemaking firms in this State may increase their activities in the Eastern States and we could lose a considerable portion of the industry in South Australia. At page 34, the Royal Commission's report states:

As the general problems of the industry are those of supply and demand, the only courses open are to increase the demand or restrict the supply. Restriction of supply involves control of vine plantings and to attempt this in South Australia alone would be ineffective. It would have to be Australia-wide. Evidence has been given that the industry in South

Australia has been adversely affected by increased interstate production from areas which have a cost advantage in respect of some eastern markets.

So the Royal Commission was able, from the evidence it took during the course of its inquiries, to establish the fact that it was a problem that should be tackled on an Australia-wide basis. I trust a move will be made by the Government through the Minister of Agriculture to do something in that direction or to give its good services in connection with any move for the stabilization of the industry on an Australia-wide basis.

I consider, too, that because of the large amount of Excise revenue obtained by the Commonwealth Government from the industry some financial assistance could be given by the Commonwealth Government to the industry, particularly as in 1965 the Commonwealth Government derived no less than \$5,819,928 in Excise duties from the industry in South Australia. To show that this was not merely an isolated large figure, I point out that the Excise duties collected by the Commonwealth Government from the viticultural industry were \$5,207,814 for each of the past five years. The Royal Commission made certain recommendations referred to previously in this Chamber during this debate. If most of them are given effect to, some alleviation of the situation may follow. I refer particularly to recommendation No. (4), on page 35 of the report:

The Commission recommends that a Grape Growing Industry Advisory Committee should be set up to study trends to ensure that well-informed advice is available to growers and to provide guidance on the desirability or otherwise of expansion in the various grape-growing areas.

I was pleased when the Minister said that he would consider this matter and that it was proposed to appoint such a committee, the objects of which would be:

(1) To ascertain the requirements of the winemakers with respect to quantity, quality and varieties of grapes for wine.

(2) To consider the relationships between the production and sale of dried wine and table grapes.

(3) To estimate quantities of the various varieties which will be produced.

(4) To determine the demand for types and varieties and consider the problems of over-production.

(5) To advise the industry on future planting policy.

I was also pleased to note that, in accordance with the fifth recommendation, an economic extension officer would be appointed. This committee can do much work in the

interests of the industry. In my own district, concern has been expressed by some grape-growers that various grape or vine stocks other than the best available are being planted in some areas and that, because of the lack of any thorough selection process, this could lead to decreased production from each vine or acre. This committee could be helpful to growers, because it could advise them on the best types of vines to plant, having regard to the particular locality and the requirements of the industry.

I now desire to refer briefly to a matter that has been brought to my notice recently and on which I should appreciate the ear of the Minister of Works. The Minister will know that, after the new Warren trunk main was constructed (I think about five or six years ago), the old Warren trunk main was dug up. Although I am not certain about this, I think a contract was let to some person to dig up the old main. In my district, the piping has been dug up for a distance of about seven miles and some of the long, heavy, rusty pipes have been left on the sides of roads. Other pipes have been stacked and some of them are perched precariously on sloping roadsides. These pipes are a virtual hazard.

Councils have asked me to raise the matter in the House, because they are concerned about the perilous position and the injury that they could cause, particularly if they are left in these positions for any length of time. Those that have been left on the sides of the roads could cause injury to persons or livestock. There are also other problems. I understand that some of the old pipes have been placed close to the trenches from which they were excavated and the trenches have not been filled back completely. In some instances councils find it difficult to carry out such activities as roadmaking or the checking of weed growth.

Will the Minister consider this matter to ascertain whether the persons responsible can be actuated to remove these unsightly pipes or, failing that, find out whether the department itself would have these pipes removed? I do not know whether there is a cause of action against the contractor, but the matter ought to be dealt with expeditiously before injury is suffered by members of the public or livestock.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: I think you will find that, during the term of the previous Government, attempts were made to get rid of these pipes. Attempts are being made all the time.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I think a few have been removed but the position is unsatisfactory and I assure the Minister that district councils in Barossa, Tanunda, Angaston, Kapunda and Riverton are concerned about the matter.

Mr. Freebairn: Up to Auburn, actually.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Yes. Today I received a letter from the District Council of Angaston regarding this matter, and other councils have approached me. This letter, which puts the position in a nutshell and draws attention to what could result if something is not done in that particular locality, states:

re: Old Warren Reservoir to Paskeville pipeline.

My council has requested that your assistance be sought in an endeavour to have the old pipes from the above main, which have been lifted from the ground almost 12 months ago, removed. The main source of complaint at present is coming from residents of the Light Pass area. As you well know, this area is very prone to flooding from the Gawler River, and the residents fear that the pipes, as they have been left, could cause floodwaters to bank up unnecessarily and cause damage to homes and contents. Other reasons for complaints are that, because these pipes are still in the positions they were left when lifted, the old trench cannot be back-filled properly. This back-filling of course the contractor is still required to do. Council road maintenance and weed control work cannot be fully carried out either, and of course there is the unsightliness of the pipes themselves. Any assistance, or information you may be able to give in relation to this problem would be greatly appreciated.

The letter is signed by the District Clerk, Mr. LePage. I know the Light Pass area well. It is frequently flooded and, if the Gawler River breaks its banks, the water spreads out over a wide area, flooding many acres of land in that area. That is when the position of these pipes could cause considerable trouble. I ask the Minister to regard this matter as one that should receive urgent attention.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: It has had much attention, but there are many difficulties.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I ask the Minister to consider it. Finally, I make one other request. With many other members in this House, I love band music. In the Barossa Valley area of my district there are five brass bands within a radius of four miles of Nuriootpa. At least two of them, the Tanunda and Angaston bands, originated well over a century ago. People in the area are very musical and for over 40 years Tanunda has been the venue of band competitions. The State championships have been held there for

many years and attract many bands from South Australia and from other States as well.

In 1953, I spoke in this place about assistance for the Tanunda brass band competitions by way of Government grant. The then Government was good enough to make an annual grant of \$1,000 from 1953 to 1956 inclusive. In 1957, a grant of \$4,000 was made to enable the Australian band championships to be held at Tanunda, which was much appreciated at the time. From 1958 to 1962 the Government made a grant of \$2,000 each year for these competitions. In 1963, the South Australian Band Association was the body to which grants were made, and from 1963 to 1965 an annual grant of \$6,200 was made to the association which, in turn, made available that money to hold competitions in Tanunda, the Murray River areas, the South-East, and Whyalla. I know that the association has appreciated the increase in the grant that has been made since 1963.

It is under the patronage of the Lieutenant-Governor (Sir Mellis Napier), and has been in existence for 67 years. This year it successfully completed the third year of a five-year band developmental programme. In this State, 31 senior bands are members of the association and these bands have 950 members. Also registered with the association are 10 junior bands with a membership of 330 boys and girls. The association's activities in 1965-66 have been laudable. They included, first, a brass band week from September 17-25, 1965, when 30 functions were held throughout the State to give people a greater appreciation of brass band music. Secondly, the association was actively connected with the 1966 Adelaide Festival of Arts, presenting nightly concerts at Elder Park. The President of the association, Mr. C. F. Sorrell, was Director of the Festival Pageant for which seven bands provided the music.

Thirdly, in the past year the association did much to promote contests for established junior bands in city and country areas. In Adelaide, three contests were held, the State championship, at which eight junior bands and 14 senior bands competed, was held at Tanunda, and another contest was held at Whyalla. Fourthly, in August last year a drum majors' seminar was held and was attended by 35 senior and junior drum majors. A seminar of this nature is important because emphasis is placed on the leadership qualities that are required for this important position. Fifthly, senior band contests were held under the aegis of the association, namely, the Murray Valley contest when

five bands and 20 teams of marching girls attended; the South Australian band championships at Tanunda in November, 1965, when 14 senior bands and eight junior bands attended; the South-East bands carnival at Mount Gambier in November which nine bands attended; and the northern bands carnival at Whyalla in May, which five bands attended. Sixthly, the association also promoted a festival of youth contest at Hindmarsh in March this year, when 10 junior brass bands, five junior drum corps and 35 teams of marching girls competed. Seventhly, the association was connected with many other major engagements, particularly the fire-day appeal, the John Martin's pageant, the Kensington and Norwood Christmas pageant, the Glenelg Christmas pageant, and the Mount Gambier Christmas pageant. These activities have been throughout the State and have been in the interests of the cultural life of the community and in aid of charitable, civic and church organizations.

I understand that the Governments of some other States are more actively identified with brass band work, particularly in the junior field, than is the case in South Australia. I believe that in some other States a brass instrument tutor is attached to the music branch of the Education Department. Such an appointment has been made in other States as a result of the interest of their Governments in this matter. I commend this to the Minister of Education, and ask him to see whether a brass instrument tutor can be appointed in South Australia and be attached to the Education Department, because his advice and work would be of inestimable benefit to the development of junior bands in South Australia, as there are some junior school bands at present. I believe this matter has also been brought to the Minister's notice by the South Australian Band Association. Because of the importance of the work the association does here and because of the increase in the number of bands, I also suggest that the annual grant of \$6,200 that has been made to the association in the past few years be increased during the current financial year and in subsequent years so that the activities of the association can be further extended, particularly in the realm of junior band work. I trust that the Government will favourably consider this matter.

Before concluding I should like to say a few words of appreciation to the Leader of the Opposition, Sir Thomas Playford, this being the eve of his retirement from the leadership of the Party with which I am happy to be

associated. During the time Sir Thomas guided the destinies of South Australia (he was at the helm as Premier from 1938 to March, 1965), the State was extremely fortunate inasmuch as during those years he and his Government were able to produce in this State a healthy economic climate, as a result of which many industries were attracted to this State. The statistics show that in 1938-39 we had 2,067 factories, employing 43,371 people. In 1964-65, the year in which he took over the leadership in Opposition, there were 5,887 factories, employing 116,183 people. The value of the output rose in those years from \$140,021,056 to \$2,413,660,000.

The accomplishments over those years are indeed astounding, and I would say definitely that never in the history of the State of South Australia has so much been owed by so many to one person, namely, Sir Thomas Playford. I feel that it could be said of him, as was said of Sir Christopher Wren, the architect of St. Pauls; *si monumentum requiris, circumspice*—a written epitaph which, translated, means: if you require a monument for him, look around. The monuments which have been created over that term of office will always be a memorial to the Premier of South Australia during the period 1938 to 1965. I refer particularly to such accomplishments as the Morgan-Whyalla main, the Mannum-Adelaide main, the Electricity Trust, the Whyalla steelworks, the Port Stanvac oil refinery, the City of Elizabeth, the Leigh Creek coalfield, and the Chowilla dam, which is in the course of construction. I trust that the economic stability of the palmy days of the Playford era will not be dissipated in the future. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. FERGUSON (Yorke Peninsula): I, too, support the motion. Other members have complimented the Lieutenant-Governor on the way he opened the session and delivered his Speech. The only comment I make is that I had to read the Speech after the opening of Parliament to know what was in it. Great pleasure was expressed at the visit of the Queen Mother during the Festival of Arts. The occasion of the Parliamentary reception to the Queen Mother certainly will be long remembered by all members of this Parliament. Reference has been made to former members of this Parliament who have passed on to their reward. Although all those members were not personally known to me, I feel sure that they all made some contribution to this Parliament, and I join with others in expressing condolences to their families and relatives.

I join with the member for Angas (Hon. B. H. Teusner) in commenting on the announcement of the pending retirement of the Leader of the Opposition (Sir Thomas Playford). This could well be the last day Sir Thomas will be occupying the position of Leader of the Opposition and leader of the Liberal and Country Party. Although this announcement was received with disappointment and regret, I think it helps to remind us once more that men may come and men may go but that men do not go on for ever. I would say that Sir Thomas's coming into the political life of this State started an era of great development. A man with great vision and foresight, he fought to the last for what he believed to be in the best interests of the people and of the State, and because of his long Parliamentary experience he always willingly passed on to the younger members coming into this Parliament advice and guidance which has been well received and much appreciated. In his stepping down and, later, in his retirement, Sir Thomas will leave behind him a record of good works; but above all he will leave behind him the record of a good life, and this will be his memorial. Therefore, personally and on behalf of the electors whom I represent, I wish him well in the remainder of his Parliamentary career and, after that, in his retirement, all the pleasure and happiness that this life is able to give him.

Many members of the Government have blamed the poor season last year for the state of the Government's finances today. The member for Frome (Mr. Casey), along with other members, referred to the dry season and made some comparisons. He said that in the last season, when we had a 36,000,000-bushel wheat harvest, we had a drought year, and he compared that year with the 1961-62 and 1962-63 seasons. However, no-one at that time considered that those years were drought years: they were considered to be average harvests. Therefore, I say that the 36,000,000 bushels quoted by the member for Frome would be considered an average harvest. In 1961-62 and 1962-63 (the seasons he compared with last season), there was a 15-bushel and a 14-bushel average per acre. I think that if the honourable member wanted to talk about droughts and dry seasons he would have to refer to the harvest of 1959-60, when there was a drought. In that year the wheat harvest was 12,000,000 bushels, and the average was only 7.7 bushels an acre. If it had not been for the valuable work of the officers of the Agriculture Department, last year's harvest would have been much less.

These officers have made great progress in plant breeding and in establishing new varieties of wheat which today have high yields. As a result, they are helping to increase the average yield per acre. The department is also helping to raise the average of cereal production by discoveries of soil deficiencies. The introduction of manganese for deficiencies in soil types on the lower end of Southern Yorke Peninsula has greatly assisted the producer in that area, but has also been beneficial to other places where it has been applied with good results.

Before the application of manganese sulphate to these deficient soil types the average was perhaps three or six bushels, but today that has been increased to 20 and 25 bushels an acre. Yields and production in this State are increasing as a result of these discoveries. I realize that we must have rain to produce food and cereal, but in future we may, because of the discoveries by the department, produce better crops with less rainfall. For some years the department suggested that after so much superphosphate had been applied it was necessary to apply a little superphosphate at regular intervals. I believe this theory has changed, and primary producers are being advised to apply more superphosphate, as in certain areas four bags an acre can be economical for the increase of cereal and pasture production. Hence, we are getting increased production in cereals, wool, and meat to the acre. Heavier dressings require a heavier rainfall, but it has been proved that in the average rainfall areas heavier dressings benefit production.

Mr. Shannon: Your area has a good rainfall?

Mr. FERGUSON: Yes. It is good for the primary producer that these increases in averages have occurred because the increase in the cost of production has more than equalled any gain made because of increased production. In my travels since the last harvest was completed, I have noticed stubble paddocks being burnt. This indicates that the economics of primary production, and cereal-growing in particular, are not healthy. Costs have caught up with the man on the land so that he has decided to sow another paddock of barley to keep up with his costs. I hope we will not return to the early 1930's as I well remember those days when year after year land was cropped until its fertility was destroyed.

Mr. Rodda: Those times destroyed many good men, too.

Mr. FERGUSON: Recently I asked the Minister of Agriculture whether he was aware that a new Dampier variety of barley had been developed in Western Australia by the Agriculture Department, and that this year it had been released to select growers in that State. This variety may interest barley producers in South Australia, particularly growers in my district where the largest proportion of two-row barley is produced. I understand that the new variety is shorter and has a stronger straw. There has always been a weakness in the straw of the Prior variety which is mainly grown in South Australia, and because of storm many bushels have been lost to producers and consumers.

Mr. Casey: Is this in South Australia?

Mr. FERGUSON: Yes, and in other parts of the Commonwealth where two-row barley is grown. Some years ago the Agriculture Department, in conjunction with barley interests, set out to produce a new variety for South Australian growers. However, this has taken too long and producers are weary of waiting. They had to devise ways and means to save the type of barley they were already growing. By trial and error it was discovered that barley could be successfully rolled and harvested without loss. Today, barley rolling is almost universally accepted as a means of saving the two-row barley crop, but it is another operation that has to be performed and it adds to the cost of production. Growers generally eagerly await the release of a new type of two-row barley that will withstand wind damage and be easy to harvest.

I was interested in the answer the Minister of Works gave the member for Ridley this afternoon about the establishment of a terminal at Giles Point. I was pleased to hear the Minister say that Giles Point had been gazetted as a terminal for the bulking of cereal, and this is great news for the people of Yorke Peninsula. I believe that the erection of a terminal silo at Giles Point before the facilities for bulking have been completed will be of little use to producers. Co-operation must exist between the bulk handling co-operative and the harbour authorities in establishing these facilities. The Minister said that the establishment of this terminal would relieve growers of the cost of bags. That is so, but I believe that this would be offset by the double-handling. If barley were put into a silo at Giles Point at present, it would have to be transported to Ardrossan to be bulked.

I wish now to refer to something of particular interest to my district—the work done among

Aborigines on Aboriginal reserves, particularly the Point Pearce Reserve. I understand that many Aboriginal reserves in South Australia had their beginning as a result of the concern of some church organizations for the welfare of the Aboriginal. This was not the case with Point Pearce, but I do not think many people in this State or even the residents at the reserve would know much about its establishment. This reserve was started in 1868 by the Yorke Peninsula Aboriginal Mission Incorporated. The management of the original mission was vested in trustees, whose object was to civilize and evangelize Aborigines on Yorke Peninsula. The original settlement comprised 600 acres, and this was subsequently increased. I believe the trustees were appointed from men who lived in the Moonta area, and they were mainly responsible for the establishment of the reserve.

There have always been economic, social and moral problems associated with Aboriginal reserves. The economic problems arise because Aborigines have never been able to exercise any control over their financial affairs, which I believe is understandable because their forebears had no necessity to interest themselves in these matters. In the earlier days of the reserves many of the necessities of life were provided. However, the proclamation of the new legislation has started a new era for Aborigines, and things have become more involved for them. I understand that, because they now receive the basic wage, they no longer get housing, electricity and many other things.

Mr. Casey: They are treated the same as white men.

Mr. FERGUSON: That is correct. Residents of all reserves who live in rental houses have to pay rent, but in many cases it is not being paid and prosecutions have been laid. I believe the amount of rent should be deducted from their pay packets, as I believe is done in relation to officers of the department who are living on reserves in rental houses.

Mr. Casey: Perhaps they have asked for this but the Aborigines have not.

Mr. FERGUSON: The Minister of Aboriginal Affairs may not agree with what I have suggested.

Mr. Casey: I think you're right.

Mr. FERGUSON: The Minister may say we must help these people to be self-reliant and to be able to control their financial affairs, but I believe my suggestion would overcome the difficulties. Another problem is having far-reaching effects. Since the introduction of the new Act, Aborigines have been

responsible for their own medical and hospital attention. Before the Act was passed, practically all hospital cases were taken to the public hospital at Wallaroo. Now, however, people from Point Pearce receive medical attention from the doctor and hospital at Maitland, and both have many outstanding debts.

Mr. Casey: I think doctors and hospitals all over the State have outstanding debts.

Mr. FERGUSON: That is correct, but the Maitland Hospital has a large outstanding debt from the Point Pearce people. I believe the Minister realizes this. Recently I introduced a deputation from the Maitland Hospital board to the Minister of Health asking whether something could not be done, and I understand that the board has written to the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs asking him whether he can do something to assist. In his reply the Minister said:

The department itself is having to prosecute in numbers of cases of rental arrears at Point Pearce and I fear that the only way in which there is likely to be any successful action in this matter is for legal action for the recovery of the debts to be taken. I am afraid that the assistance which the department can give is exhausted.

I wonder if members regard this as the best way to bring this matter to a satisfactory conclusion. I am not sure that prosecutions will clear up the matter satisfactorily for the doctor or the hospital, as we all know what usually happens after prosecutions are laid. I still believe in the old saying that prevention is better than cure.

Mr. Casey: What happens when white people in your district refuse to pay a hospital bill?

Mr. FERGUSON: Probably they are prosecuted.

Mr. Casey: Aren't we treating Aborigines on the same basis as white people?

Mr. FERGUSON: Perhaps, but I do not believe it is the most satisfactory way to settle the matter.

Mr. Shannon: I think it is fair to say that some white pensioners would be embarrassed if forced to pay hospital dues, and they are deserving cases.

Mr. FERGUSON: That is so.

Mr. Casey: The Aborigines are entitled to join a hospital benefits association.

Mr. FERGUSON: Yes, but I understand that, when the hospital and medical arrangement came into being, arrangements were made with the Aborigines, but within six months payments had almost ceased. I ask the Minister whether some arrangement cannot be made for an officer at the reserve to act as an agent

for a medical and hospital benefits scheme so that he can collect payments.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That sort of thing is done on the reserves. It is a question of whether they are prepared to make payments.

Mr. FERGUSON: That is correct.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: On pay days officers are waiting to collect a weekly sum towards hospital benefits.

Mr. FERGUSON: I believe my suggestion is the only practical solution. As I have said, there are many economic, social and moral problems connected with Aboriginal reserves of which I am sure all members are aware. No one (not even the advisory board or departmental officers) has ever come up with a practical answer to these problems. I am conscious of the heavy responsibilities borne by the officers concerned; we respect men like Professor Cleland and Dr. Duguid for their knowledge of Aboriginal affairs, but I am afraid theirs is mostly a theoretical approach. Whilst the Aboriginal lives in his existing environment and under the present conditions, the problem will be difficult to solve. Fortunately no racial discrimination exists between the people living at Point Pearce and those living in the surrounding district. Only a few weeks ago I had the pleasure to attend a debutante ball at Point Pearce with the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, and I think as many people from outside the reserve as residents of Point Pearce were present at that ball.

To illustrate the interest being taken in the welfare of those who live at Point Pearce, I point out that arrangements are at present pending for an Army captain of the Church of England to be appointed to Point Pearce for two years. I think an application was made to the Government for a subsidy of \$800 in respect of this appointment, but the Government apparently could not see its way clear to help. I do not know what difficulties were encountered, but I think a precedent for such an appointment has already been created: about eight years ago the Salvation Army undertook the religious supervision of people living at the Point Pearce Reserve, in respect of which the former Government assisted. Although no subsidy from this Government will at present be forthcoming, I believe that the appointment will be made possible by churches of every denomination on Yorke Peninsula which have indicated their willingness to support the scheme. I understand that, if the churches cannot raise the required \$2,000 to implement the scheme, certain individuals in the community

will, themselves, subscribe to it. If the prospective appointee, Captain Polgen (a full-blooded Aboriginal) were appointed, he would live on the Point Pearce Reserve. Although I intended to say something about the tourist trade and water supply, I shall content myself with those remarks.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT (Ridley): I support the motion and, like other honourable members, wish to refer to the passing of a previous Premier of South Australia (the late Sir Richard Butler) who was, in fact, the Leader of this House when I first entered it in 1933. His was a distinguished career and even after he was defeated in contesting the Commonwealth seat of Wakefield, he took part in many public affairs. It was with great regret that I heard of his death. The late Sir Frank Perry, a member of this Chamber before transferring to another place, was a great industrialist in this State. The late Mr. Thompson who represented Port Adelaide was renowned for his speeches in this House and I was sorry also to learn of his passing. Previous speakers have referred to the advocate of a single tax, Mr. Jack Craigie, who was also a distinguished member and an able debater in this place. As other honourable members have done, I extend my sympathy to the families of those people in their sad loss.

The Leader of the Opposition, when discussing the difficulties associated with the flour trade, referred to the closing down of the flour mill at Loxton. Regrettably, that important industry which employed up to 30 people was forced to close down, because no flour miller today can expect to survive in the industry unless he has connections with a good export trade. The manager and owner of the Loxton mill (Mr. Roy Glatz) had an arrangement with Noske Bros. at Murray Bridge in this regard, but the flour trade was rapidly diminishing, mainly because Borneo and other such places were establishing their own flour mills. As other countries proceed to crush their own wheat into flour, South Australia's flour trade will suffer. Another factor leading to the closing down of the Loxton mill was its distance from Adelaide and the freight charges that had to be met.

Reference has been made to the 31,000,000-bushel wheat harvest. Prior to 1955 the average annual yield for the State over many years was 27,000,000 bushels, but since then, because of increased productivity (mainly the result of the work of scientists in their laboratories) production has increased considerably, and in 1963-64 reached 53,971,269 bushels. In

the previous year it was 38,338,860 bushels, and in 1961-62 it was 33,854,157 bushels, with an average of 15.19 bushels an acre. In 1962-63, notwithstanding that the yield was about 38,000,000 bushels, the average yield per acre was 14.77 bushels, and in the year in which the yield was over 53,000,000 bushels it was 19.26 an acre. That shows how improved varieties are increasing the acreage yield. Much of the progress made has been the result of the experiments carried out by scientists at Northfield who have already said that they believe that in the next decade they can double the acreage yield.

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

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Dealing with yields of production, it is interesting to note the prevailing tendencies, not only in production figures but also in acreages sown. In 1961-62, the acreage sown to wheat was 2,229,211; in 1962-63 it was 2,595,145; and in 1963-64 it was 2,802,258. It will be seen from those figures that there has been a slight increase in acreages sown to wheat. On the other hand, barley sown in 1961-62 was 1,270,904 acres; in 1962-63 it was 1,052,886 acres, a drop. In 1963-64 it was 1,123,104 acres, which shows that the acreage sown to barley is gradually dropping. The reason for this fall in barley acreage is the lower first advance given by the Australian Barley Board, compared with the first advance given for wheat, which has a guaranteed price.

It has been stated by many people in the industry that "over the border" trade in barley is caused by the fact that a grower can get a higher cash payment for barley from the merchants trading over the border compared with what he would get as a first advance for barley. That is true. After the Barley Board has sold its crop and made out its final realization, generally the grower who has stuck to the Australian Barley Board is better off financially, but some growers contend that they are short of cash and are tempted to accept these lower prices from the merchants operating over the border.

My organization has approached the Australian Barley Board and the State Government to see whether it is possible for the State Government to consider guaranteeing rail freights on barley. There is nothing wrong with that in principle because, when the Barley Board approaches the Commonwealth Reserve Bank for the payment of the first advance, the board, strangely enough, takes into the calculation of its advance from the Reserve Bank the amount

of money paid for administration of the Barley Board as well as the freight costs. I contend that that is a wrong calculation, because that has nothing to do with making an advance to the bank since the grower has to pay it anyhow. Nevertheless, the Barley Board has not been able to break down the Commonwealth Reserve Bank on that point, so we are approaching the State Government to ask it to consider guaranteeing the freight and administration costs, which have to be paid anyhow, so no revenue would be involved. Then, when an approach is made to the Commonwealth Reserve Bank the bank should give a first advance with a guarantee of the freight and administration charges. In the final analysis it would mean a higher first advance to the individual grower—probably from 10 cents to 15 cents a bushel—which would probably mean the difference between the grower's selling over the border to the merchants and the grower's selling to the Australian Barley Board. I hope the Government will look at that and consider it favourably.

While I am dealing with acres sown, I want to show that the acreage sown to oats is increasing. In 1961-62 there were 323,662 acres sown to oats; in 1962-63 the figure was 415,613—an increase; in 1963-64 the figure was 500,650. So it can be seen there is a gradual increase in the acres sown to oats. I have given the figures of barley acreages. Now let me give the barley production figures. In 1960-61 the production was 42,233,118 bushels, an average of 27.15 bushels to the acre. In 1961-62 the drop was considerable: it went down to 21,292,421 bushels, the average yield per acre being 16.75 bushels. In 1962-63 the figure dropped down to 18,004,881 bushels, an average of 17.10 bushels to the acre. In 1963-64 the yield increased slightly to 24,336,555 bushels, an average of 21.67 bushels to the acre. It can be seen from those figures that the yield dropped to 16.75 bushels and then increased to 21.67 bushels to the acre. I have not the latest figures but I know that the yield is still dropping.

I now come to deal with wheat and link it up with world trade. I shall try to give the House the benefit of a study of this problem and lead up to what is happening overseas today, with the talks that have been going on for some time at Geneva in the "Kennedy round", the talks in regard to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, and the part that wheat will play in these and other matters. It is interesting to note the change taking place in regard to wheat sales from Australia with wheat marketing and allied matters. If we look where we are going to and where we are

selling from Australia, we find the present picture is that for the last two seasons, 1963-64 and 1964-65, the main wheat export went to the People's Republic of China, which took 38.18 per cent, the highest of any. Soviet Russia took 17.78 per cent of the total exports. The E.F.T.A. and allied countries took 13.19 per cent, Japan 7.56 per cent, the Arabian countries (including Iran and Iraq) 6.99 per cent, India 5.42 per cent, the European Economic Community countries 1.79 per cent, and the others 9.08 per cent. We sell practically nothing to E.E.C. and Comecon countries, excluding Russia. Our sales to the traditional exporter, Russia, are substantial and our sales to the People's Republic of China dwarf all other sales. It is interesting to look at the way our competitors are selling. Let us take Canada for the same years—1963-64 and 1964-65. Canada's total exports of wheat to various countries are as follows:

	Per cent.
People's Republic of China	11.48
Russia	24.47
Comecon (excluding Russia and including Yugoslavia)	11.77
E.F.T.A.	19.49
E.E.C.	12.58
Japan	11.05
Asian countries	3.50
Americas	4.73
Others	0.93

Argentina's exports of wheat to other countries are as follows:

	Per cent.
People's Republic of China	27.04
Russia	6.86
Comecon (excluding Russia)	0.86
E.F.T.A.	10.49
E.E.C.	22.29
Brazil	20.64
Americas	9.17
Others	2.80

The total exports of United States of America to other countries are as follows:

	Per cent.
Russia	4.50
Comecon (excluding Russia and including Yugoslavia)	7.15
E.F.T.A.	3.53
E.E.C. (including Greece)	7.48
Brazil	6.20
Americas	8.66
India	27.41
Pakistan	8.99
Japan	9.64
Near East and other countries ..	8.05
Far East	5.60
Others	2.49

The total exports of wheat from France to other countries are as follows:

	Per cent.
People's Republic of China	8.88
Comecon	28.36
E.E.C.	29.30
E.F.T.A.	23.73
Others	9.74

No country relies more on the People's Republic of China as a country to which to export wheat than does Australia, and no country relies on any single market as heavily as we do on that market. Every country other than France has a better market spread than Australia. France has placed most of its eggs in the Western European basket and it also exports 23 per cent of its wheat to E.F.T.A., which does not denote lack of prudence. Australia relies more heavily on Russia than does any other exporter, other than Canada.

Of course, honourable members know that this has not always been the case in regard to wheat sales because only a few years ago we did not sell wheat to China at all; we sold most of our wheat to European countries. We had an agreement to sell the United Kingdom 28,000,000 bushels of wheat a year. This has dropped considerably, and I believe the figure for last year was about 14,000,000 bushels. I am trying to show that we must re-orientate our thinking with regard to wheat trade. We are continuing to build up our wheat acreages. During dinner tonight the members for Eyre and Victoria painted a glowing picture of the wonderful wheat crops on the Eyre Peninsula. These members told of their trip over the weekend to this area; they described the magnificent crops there and told how the acreage of wheat is extending west of Kimba towards Buckleboo.

Mr. Rodda: Wonderful quality crops.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Yes. However, the point is: what will we do with the wheat? Tonight I hope to take members on a trip around the world and to show them where our wheat is sold and what we must do if we are to maintain the present acreage. We must also consider the prognostications of scientists at the Waite Agricultural Research Institute. I think we can take them seriously when they say that the wheat yield per acre will be doubled in the next decade. We must consider where we are going with wheat trade, and that is what I hope to deal with tonight.

Mr. Quirke: Could you find a market for wheat if China pulled out?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: No, we could not. Many people say that we should not sell wheat to China, and this argument has been used in the Commonwealth Parliament. Millions of people live in China and the population explosion there means an additional 14,000,000 to 16,000,000 people a year. The argument is that we should not sell wheat to China because

of the struggle in North Vietnam. However, we are not at war with China.

Mr. McKee: We haven't declared war on Vietnam.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Not at the moment, but I am talking about trade. I was a lad, studying economics, when the First World War broke out. At that time, the whole of the wheat was acquired but it became known some years later that wheat was being sold by the United Kingdom to people with which she was at war. What would happen if Australia stopped selling wheat to China? As I have said already Canada has developed this market—she would sell wheat to China. Members can see the enormous quantity of wheat China has been importing from Argentina, France and Canada. If we stopped selling wheat to China, Canada would buy wheat from us and sell it to China; of course, they would make a profit on it. That is an ordinary commercial transaction. While the situation remains as it is, the Australian Wheat Board will continue to sell wheat to China. What would happen if we did not? The sales of wheat to Europe are falling. Probably we could sell more to India and Pakistan but, as honourable members know, those countries would like the wheat but they do not have the cash to pay for it. Under public rule 480 the United States of America sells wheat to India on a long term loan, which I will explain later.

Mr. Quirke: They never get paid.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I do not think the United States of America worries much about that. Australia is not in a position to be able to give large quantities of wheat to India. At present we are making credit sales to China. Many times people have asked whether China pays, and the answer is that it has always paid and, in fact, it has paid three months before the due date.

Mr. Freebairn: That is because there is a penalty for non-payment.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: There is a slight penalty, but Australia would never have entered into these sales without first making exhaustive inquiries into the credit of China, which is backed by the Bank of England; we are paid in sterling if we wish. We have always been paid long before the due date.

It is interesting to examine how the situation has changed from when we sold mainly to European countries. Two factors are involved. The People's Republic of China's output fell short of requirements, which was magnified by its policy to export the dearer rice and import

the cheaper wheat. It is a matter of good politics and good financial arrangements. Soviet Russia suffered a temporary (or permanent?) setback in both its virgin lands programme and its traditional wheatgrowing areas. This made her an importer of wheat. This is where we stepped in to take up part of the slack. We found that we could sell large quantities at close to cash-on-delivery terms (the 10-20-20-50 arrangements are not very generous from a buyer's point of view) and at reasonable prices. Further, the People's Republic of China market is close to Australian ports. We could have sold to Comecom (excluding U.S.S.R.), the Arabs and some Latin American countries in fairly small quantities, which might have added up to 750,000 tons a year in total but we could have had to offer better terms to get those sales, such as two years credit, or perhaps three years credit, and if we gave this sort of credit the chances were we would have had to give the People's Republic of China the same terms. To arrange for, say, a three-year credit would have been more difficult.

To give the same terms to everyone would have been most expensive. Of course, the wheatgrowers of Australia, particularly those of South Australia, would have been squealing, as they are today, and saying, "When are we going to get the next payment from the Australian Wheat Board?" If credit had been extended to three years, what would have been the position? It would have meant that growers would not have had the necessary cash to finance their operations and would have had to go to the bank to get finance and pay interest on the advance or stand firm until the wheat payments were made. It is bad enough now and should not be made worse. As we could sell the crop without going to the expense and difficulty of arranging for such credits, we did not worry very much about the smaller, non-competitive buyers.

This is how we got into the position of a high degree of reliance on the People's Republic of China and, to a lesser extent, Russia. Where do we go from here if we have an annual harvest of between 300,000,000 and 400,000,000 bushels in future? The members for Eyre and Victoria have told me that the production on Eyre Peninsula this year could be up to 16,000,000 or 17,000,000 bushels. We have had 346,000,000 bushels of wheat delivered to the Australian Wheat Board. The wheat acreage in Australia has increased this year and, if the weather conditions are favourable, another 300,000,000 bushels could be delivered to the board in this

coming season. Most of us know that the drought is over in New South Wales and my latest report, which was received during the weekend from parts of New South Wales, is extremely encouraging.

If we have harvests in the future of, say, an average of 10,000,000 long tons, can we rely on disposing of about 2,000,000 to 2,500,000 long tons to China, 750,000 to 1,000,000 tons to Russia and 500,000 to 750,000 tons to the United Kingdom? This question raises a number of problems. Before I deal with that, I should like to clear up something that is often accepted as being a fact. There is an argument that goes something like this: "Why worry? Everyone knows that hundreds of millions of people in the world today are starving. Things will be worse in the future, with the population growing as it is. Markets for wheat will be plentiful because they will have to be fed somehow and wheat is one of the cheapest ways of feeding them."

This argument is wishful thinking, because people are starving and in certain places have been starving for many centuries. While some people starved, other countries had food surpluses. The problem will not change unless there is a bold reorganization in world marketing. The simple fact is that starving people are no good to us unless they have the money with which to buy the wheat. We cannot ship wheat to foreign countries unless they have the foreign exchange, except under public law 480, as I have related, and we have not the credit resources to enable us to do that.

So, large-scale starvation in an insolvent Asia and Africa does not help our future wheat marketing unless either the Australian Government, which is the taxpayer, after all, is prepared to make large gifts of wheat or a world wheat agreement is forged, either as a result of the Kennedy round of talks or otherwise, with North America and western Europe putting up the bulk of the cash to buy up the world's exportable wheat and gives it away to the needy, or we go into barter trade or bilateral trade balancing with hungry countries.

What do the experts say about this? They say the prospects for increased commercial sales of wheat to developing countries are not good, because export earnings of such countries are unlikely to rise substantially in the near future. I quote there from the International Wheat Council of April, 1966, so it is fairly recent. Where we go from here will depend, in the absence of the above, on the supply and demands in the traditional commercial markets.

I now look ahead for the next three to six years. The three countries I am considering are non-commercial producers, France, Russia and the United States of America. I call them non-commercial producers because their wheat production is governed mainly by factors other than the world commercial wheat price. France produces moist soft wheat. She increased her wheat acreage by 1,330,000 acres in 1964-65 and by an estimated 290,000 acres in 1965-66. Up to now the farmer has fixed his production with an eye on two main things, an artificial price fixed by the Government and supported by the Government organization O.N.I.C. (originally it was a cereals monopoly) and in 1965 this was \$2.44(A) a bushel. The quantum to which this high price applied now stands at 8.7 metric tons. The farmers must help to finance the export of any surplus above the quantum. That is, they get less a ton for any tonnage in excess of 8,700,000 tons.

What will happen from this year onwards? The French farmer will get more for each bushel. He will get \$2.58(A) in July, 1967, and he will get this price for everything he produces. There will be no quantum fixed at all. It is intended to wipe out the quantum limit on production in France, so the real boost to the French wheat farmer is far more than the 6 per cent increase in guaranteed price. This is because all his production will attract the full guaranteed price, and this is a greater incentive than applied hitherto. Will the French farmer produce more wheat because he gets a much higher price as far as his total wheat crop is concerned?

The answer to that question depends on how profitable it will be to produce other things, especially other grain for which he can use his existing machinery. In 1967 he will get 14.6 per cent a bushel more for rye, 9.9 per cent a bushel more for barley and 7.8 per cent a bushel less for maize. I cannot answer the question, because I have not all the facts, but I can repeat the opinions of people who are better informed on European agriculture. I have looked up these opinions from time to time. That is part of my job.

The *Financial Times* of December 7, 1965, states that the Common Market Commission (that is, the public servants of the European Economic Community), seems to think that the 1967 grain prices could cause Common Market farmers to switch from fodder grains to wheat and that fodder grain prices might be set a little low relative to the price of wheat. Again, the *Financial Times* of March 16, 1966, (which was a short time ago) said:

The incentive to grow wheat in France is such that pasture land is being turned to wheat and France's meat output as a result of this is declining.

Again, from the *Financial Times* of May 11, 1966—only a few days ago—we find the following:

It is likely that the eventual agreement on a common agriculture policy for Europe will put the wheatgrowers back into the picture, with considerably less emphasis on barley.

I quote those so that members will have the up-to-date expert opinions on this phase. The chances are fairly good that France and the Common Market as a whole will grow more wheat. Wheat itself can be used as a stock fodder, so Common Market prices for eggs, poultry meat, pig meat and possibly also beef, veal, and milk and butter will influence how much grain will be left over for bread, biscuits, pasta—and export. However, the answer to this seems to be that livestock and livestock products prices in the Common Market will be relatively low compared with wheat prices. Hence there seems to be an encouragement not to feed wheat to animals but to sell it as a grain. Here is what the *Economist* said on May 14, 1966:

Acceptance of the European Economic Community's 1967 common grain prices, however, would raise British ones by up to one-third, fostering a wasteful employment of resources on marginal lands. The hope is that in resisting these rather ludicrous price levels Britain should find a lot of support . . . The French, Italians and Dutch are as keen as the British to encourage the production of beef rather than high cost grains.

It seems to boil down to this: the Common Market wheat price is high by world standards and by French standards as compared with other grain prices and as compared with livestock prices. The Common Market wheat output will rise while the Common Market wheat usage will be pretty stable, because the population is growing slowly in that area and as people get richer (and they are getting richer in the Common Market) they eat less bread and pasta. The Common Market's wheat imports will fall and its exports, consequently, will rise. When England joins up, its wheat output will rise and its import needs will fall. Given normal seasons from 1967, the Common Market countries will import less wheat and maybe export more wheat than at present. When Britain joins the Common Market in, say, 1969-70 (it seems to be a fairly widely held opinion that it will do it then), and if the present price pattern is unchanged or not changed much by then, it seems that the present British set-up will change and much

more wheat and much less meat will be produced there. This will mean that, apart from France getting the lion's share of the U.K. market, this market itself will shrink because the U.K. itself will produce more wheat.

The following facts are worth noting in regard to Russia, and I quote from the International Wheat Council reports, taking the provisional statistics for 1964-65: Russian imports amounted to 1,754,000 metric tons, exports to Comecon countries totalled 774,000 metric tons, and to other countries 381,000 metric tons. This makes the net imports 599,000 metric tons. The Comecon countries, excluding Russia, imported from Russia 774,000 metric tons, and they imported from elsewhere 4,183,000 metric tons. Therefore, total net imports amounted to 4,957,000 metric tons. It is also worth noting that Russia imported practically no wheat until 1963-64. It exported wheat on an average of some 4,000,000 metric tons each year in the 10 years before 1963-64. Russia has 173,000,000 acres under wheat, which is rather staggering. The acreage is more than the acreage in North America, Western Europe, Australia and Argentine combined, and more than 10 times the Australian acreage of wheat. With all this land, production was low, the yields in Russia being amongst the lowest in the world today, as low as 7.7 bushels an acre in 1963-64. It has risen to 10.9 bushels an acre in 1964-65. Honourable members may wonder why the yields are low. The answer is that farms are not in the hands of owners who would automatically try to make the best of things but are run by managers who so far have not been given enough incentive by the planners to make them go out of their way to make sure that yields are increased. Fertilizers were short because the planners did not succeed in making them available in sufficient quantities. The weather in Russia is a bit more chancy than elsewhere. The Russians are now moving ahead on the management and fertilizer problems. Of course, they cannot do much about the weather. One of the reasons for their recent decision is obvious: wheat imports have cost them dearly in scarce foreign exchange. The main decision to move ahead was taken in March, 1965, by its Council of Ministers, which decided to put more emphasis on agriculture in general, that is, move agriculture up the ladder of priorities in the national plan. To increase wheat prices paid to farms, the council worked out a fairly complicated system. I will not go into that now, but details are included in the International Wheat Council's *Review of World Wheat*

Situation, 1964-65 (pages 77-80). It intends to produce much more fertilizer, to give tax concessions to farms, and to produce many more tractors and combines. It was planned to produce 1,790,000 tractors in the five years 1966 to 1970, as opposed to what was produced in the last five years, namely, 1,090,000; it was also planned to produce 550,000 combines as compared with 387,000. The idea is to boost grain production by 30 per cent in the next five years compared with the last five years.

Let us say that much of the above is wishful thinking, and that there may be a fair amount of propoganda mixed in. Still, if only a part of the fertilizer and farm machinery decision is carried out, and if the price and tax measures make the managers put in just that little extra effort, Russia could disappear as an importer altogether on that basis. After all, on the basis of 1964-65 performance, Russia needs to increase yields by only 7 lb. or .12 bushels per acre to break even. To export at the 1964-65 level to Comecon countries without having itself to import, it needs a yield rise of only about one-third of a bushel per acre. Of course, the weather could be bad. Let us have a look at the weather situation and at the area over which wheat is sown. In Russia the wheat lands stretch in an almost continuous belt from the Polish border in the north-west to Lake Baikal in the south-east, a straight line distance of more than 3,000 miles. In a north-south direction they span over some 2,000 miles, and at their southernmost point they are pretty well in line with Southern Italy. Therefore, Russia's wheat lands are in many different climatic regions, and it must rain over some of them. If Russia's effort is at all genuine and meets with any success at all, it would take a great deal of bad weather over a terrific lot of country to force it back to importing wheat on a large scale. This is what the International Wheat Council's experts said in April of this year:

The new policy measures with their provisions for increased investment in agriculture and their emphasis on more mechanization and the greater production and use of fertilizers, and price incentives . . . are designed to create the conditions for the better exploitation of agricultural resources. These measures will, however, require time for their full development and Russia may in the meantime remain vulnerable to annual crop fluctuations with the possibility of considerable imports of wheat recurring from time to time. As a rule, the International Wheat Council's experts are not always correct. In the meantime, let us consider America. The United States Government has established a complicated

system of subsidizing agriculture, the main features of which are well known. There is production control; price support by the Commodity Credit Corporation; and disposal of exportable surplus to a small extent by private traders and to a large extent by the credit corporation under public law 480. The basic legislation leading to the present system was passed in 1933, and the credit corporation was established in 1948. Public law 480 was passed in July 1954 with a major amendment in 1962. The conservation reserve or soil bank programme started in 1956. Production was kept in check mainly by withdrawing ploughed paddocks from production. These were put in the soil bank which now has about 60,000,000 acres of them. Farmers were paid for not cultivating these paddocks.

For food (and some other things) they did grow, farmers were paid an artificially high price, kept high by Government intervention mainly through the Commodity Credit Corporation which stock-piled to reduce supply to the United States market, and hence to keep up prices in that market. The credit corporation and private traders' stock-piles purchased at the artificially high United States price then received a subsidy from the Government to get the price down to world price and to enable it to sell off in world markets without loss. The amount of the jiggering that this system involved was so great it broke the lax laws of G.A.T.T. applying to agriculture, and the United States asked G.A.T.T. to be excused from not abiding by its laws. This set-up was not good enough. Stockpiles (which the price support made necessary), grew too large to be sold off in the normal way in the commercial markets of the world. They would have glutted the markets and sent prices down, so the United States had to devise some way of getting rid of the wheat without putting world markets into complete chaos. The main thing was to devise public law 480, which was officially known as the Agricultural Trade Developmental and Assistance Act, and was made law on July 10, 1954. This law is divided into four parts known as titles. Section 101 states:

The President shall give special consideration to utilizing the authority and funds provided by this Act in order to develop and expand continuous market demand abroad for agricultural commodities, with special emphasis on undeveloped and new market areas.

An amendment on October 8, 1964, makes foreign currencies paid to the credit corporation convertible to dollars to some extent and

in special circumstances. Paragraph (b) provides:

That Title 1 sales are shipped at importer's expense, such expense being paid in dollars. However, the credit corporation is to pay any extra cost of shipment incurred as a result of carriage in U.S. ships.

Paragraph (c) establishes a committee, with the Secretary of Agriculture as Chairman, to advise on the use of foreign currencies acquired through title 1 sales. Title 2 provides for food to be donated for famine relief and for other assistance, and that is a straightout give-away. Title 3 provides for barter and other matters. Section 302 authorizes the credit corporation to barter surpluses of perishable commodities etc., and to donate surpluses. Section 303 is a more specific definition of the barter powers under section 302. For example, in May 1963, the United States exchanged 200,000 tons of wheat for 200,000 tons of Brazil's manganese ore. Title 4 provides for sales which have to be paid for in U.S. dollars within 20 years. However big hearted the Americans want to appear to be, the hard truth is that public law 480 is not a give-away as most of us were led to believe. The figures I now quote relate the proportion of United States wheat exports in 1964-65 and 1965-66, and are as follows:

Normal commercial sales for dollars, 25 per cent; long term credit sales for dollars, under public law 480, title 4, only 6 per cent; Commodity Credit Corporation credit sales for dollars, 1 per cent; sales mainly for currencies other than dollars, public law 480, title 1, 62 per cent; public law 480, titles 2 and 3, mainly barter, 5 per cent; and donations 1 per cent. Straight out give-aways total at most 3 per cent or 4 per cent of the total wheat exports.

The main sales were for currencies other than for dollars on credit terms. The main features of this system mean that United States wheat farmers are paid for not producing wheat, and land laid idle by this system is put in the soil bank. The credit corporation steps in to mop up any excessive wheat supply. These measures restrict supply of wheat to the home market to such an extent as to permit high wheat prices in U.S.A., that is, a good return to wheat farmers. Because normal commercial exports must be priced lower per bushel than sales at home, there has to be a subsidy, otherwise the United States would not compete in normal markets. Because United States surpluses are bigger than normal world commercial demand can absorb without a drastic fall in price, about one quarter of the surplus is sold normally. About three-quarters of the surplus is disposed mainly through public law 480, and

3 per cent given away, so that about 72 per cent is sold under various conditions and at the subsidized export price.

Who finances all this and how much does it cost? The export subsidy has been as high as 91c(U.S.) or 81c(A) a bushel of wheat. In his evidence to G.A.T.T. in 1962, the United States representative stated the whole set-up costs the United States about 3½ per cent of its annual budget—an enormous sum. But as the committee pointed out to the U.S. delegate, this was only a fraction of the total cost. Most finance comes from the consumer who pays the artificially high home price. What does this do to the Australian wheatgrower? The United States Government claims that public law 480 sales do not harm other wheat exporting countries. It states that public law 480 applies to countries that cannot buy wheat on normal commercial terms, and which need wheat. The Government says that an effective system of consultation exists between the United States Government and the Governments of other wheat-exporting countries, including Australia, which ensures that the others do not suffer as a result of public law 480. That is true in part. Several countries that claim they cannot afford to buy wheat on normal terms and have been receiving wheat under public law 480 would probably have found money to buy wheat in the normal way if public law 480 had not existed. Therefore, public law 480 has probably been responsible for taking from us a few markets to which we may otherwise have sold.

The U.S. Government has recently taken an important step, consisting of two parts. The first part deals with matters at home, and involves a Food and Agricultural Act that will come into force for four years later this year. The second part deals with exports, and involves the "food for freedom programme", sent by President Johnson to the U.S. Congress on February 10, 1966. The two parts tie in closely. The food for freedom legislation, which I received last week from Washington, was passed by the House of Representatives on June 9 this year, and was introduced into the Senate of the United States on June 13. I am informed that the Senate will pass the legislation without major amendment. There are about 8,500 wheat farmers in South Australia and about 53,000 in Australia. Naturally, the welfare of these farmers is something in which I have more than just a passing interest.

For many years now the United States has kept its production of agricultural commodities

at low levels, mainly by paying farmers not to produce. The land withdrawn from production was placed in the hands of the United States Soil Bank which has accumulated 60,000,000 acres in this manner. The United States Government was of the opinion that it was cheaper to pay farmers not to produce than to allow them to produce as much as they wished. Had the farmers been allowed to grow all they could, markets would have been glutted, and prices would have fallen dramatically. This policy is now being reversed and land is being released from the Soil Bank. In its Food for Freedom Act the American Government will allow the farmer to produce much more, which will be sold on very easy terms to many countries.

Mr. Quirke: Are American farmers paid the one price, or is a certain price paid as a first advance, as is the practice here?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: America pays the full price, whereas we pay it in stages. We pay \$1.10 a bushel first advance and, as sales are made by the Australian Wheat Board, more credit is obtained, the overdraft at the Reserve Bank is reduced, and a second advance made.

Mr. Quirke: The U.S. farmer sells at one price?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: That is right. In part, this new policy aims at providing food to cater for the population explosion taking place in the world today, by helping the needy countries to buy the food they so urgently require and by offering them easy terms on which these purchases can be made. But this is not the full story. There is good indication that the present legislation will enable the U.S. Government to offer the same easy terms to countries which could well purchase their wheat and other agricultural products at normal commercial terms and prices. I sound a warning note here: all may be well with our wheat sales today, but there is no guarantee that this will be true tomorrow. The world population explosion is creating tremendous markets for wheat, but it is also true that these are not commercial markets because the very countries where the explosion is taking place are the countries that do not have the foreign exchange to make their wheat purchases. For this reason one cannot help but view with concern any attempt by any country to erode or cut down the size of those commercial markets that at present exist. With these preliminary remarks I now will quote parts of the printed document that I have received from Washington.

The legislation establishes 40-year credits on which interest is charged. It envisages annual sales of wheat and other products worth \$3,330,000,000. Apart from using these sales to reduce world hunger, the Congress of the United States regards the legislation as a vehicle to establish the U.S. in markets that will turn into commercial markets. In short, the Congress looks at food for freedom as being partly the thin end of the wedge. The Senate Agricultural Committee, which handled the legislation, stated, with reference to one section of the Bill:

Officials should strive to bring about trade with developing countries on a basis of commercial dollar sales as rapidly as this can be accomplished.

With regard to another section of the Bill, the same committee states that food for freedom is, in part, an attempt at market development. It said:

Such market development activities are even more essential in view of the increased competition and other impediments to the marketing of U.S. agricultural products in foreign countries.

In another part the committee stated:

Food distribution programmes consisting of U.S. products, particularly school-feeding programmes where young people learn to like food products made in the United States are natural market development activities, but they can be made more effective by the deliberate application of market development techniques designed to make today's schoolchildren adult consumers of U.S. products 10 or 15 years from now.

It is clear from the document I have received that this new U.S. legislation also aims in part to win, by way of long-term credits, the markets of some of the Communist countries in East Europe. These are markets which at present purchase wheat on commercial terms. Finally, the legislation will allow those countries that will buy the U.S. agricultural products sold under the very easy credit terms, to resell these products once they have been manufactured in any other country. This is contained in section 103 which is aimed "to prevent the resale of or transshipment of the agricultural commodity itself, not of the products which might be made from that agricultural commodity".

Therefore, nothing will stop a country such as Malaysia from buying a large quantity of bargain wheat from the U.S., making it into flour and selling it in Japan in competition with Australian flour and wheat. Honourable members may therefore realize why I am concerned at the closing down of the Loxton flour

mill. I do not object to the U.S. making a profit out of the world population explosion. I say "profit" because food for freedom will be a profitable deal for the United States. At present it costs the U.S. Government, according to the printed document I have received, \$1.03 to prevent the production of one bushel of corn. The price of a bushel of corn on the farm is \$1.10. Therefore, if the U.S. sells corn at 7c a bushel under the food for freedom legislation, it will make a small loss equal to the cost of transporting and storing that bushel. If it sells the corn for, say, 50c a bushel it will make a great profit. These remarks also apply to wheat. But, while I do not object to the United States of America Government making profits from the population explosion, I object strongly if they are to be made at the expense of the Australian farmer. I believe that this House should know, and the United States of America Government should know and be told, that the people of a country that is one of the closest allies of the United States expects the United States not to engage in underhand competition with Australia.

Under that first part, the farmers will receive a basic price of \$(U.S.)1.25, which in Australian currency would be \$1.12 a bushel of wheat. On top of that basic price they will get an additional minimum of \$(U.S.)1.25, or \$(A)1.12, a bushel on each and every bushel sold at home; so for home sales the United States farmer will get \$(A)2.24 a bushel as a minimum; he may get more. The above prices apply for the 1966-67 crop. The Government can change them in each of the following three years. For the export wheat the United States farmer will get on top of the basic price an amount to be fixed from time to time. This amount is roughly a type of export subsidy. The average amount that the farmer will get for every bushel will be the average of the home price (\$(A)2.24) and of the export price (\$(A) 1.12 + ?). Now all of the above returns apply only to those farmers who toe the line—that is, those who "participate in the voluntary wheat certificate programme". To be in this programme the farmer has to not produce on (or keep in the Soil Bank) a certain amount of his land.

Now let us look at the second part, which is rather interesting. It provides for a great expansion in and an alteration of Public Law 480. It means that all sales will be in U.S. dollars, and long-term, low interest credit will be provided. The all-dollar sales set-up will

come in after a five-year transition period during which title I, Public Law 480, sales will stop. Among other things, the President of the United States (Mr. Johnson) said:

I recommend a new Food for Freedom Act that retains the best provisions of Public Law 480, and that will make self-help an integral part of our food aid program; eliminate the "surplus" requirement for food aid; emphasize the development of markets for American farm products; authorize greater food aid shipments than the current rate; emphasize the building of cash markets and the shift toward financing food aid through long-term dollar credits rather than sales for foreign currencies. (Except for U.S. requirements, we look to the completion of that shift by the end of five years); continue to finance the food aid programme under the Commodity Credit Corporation.

In connection with a supplement to the Food for Freedom Program, President Johnson said:

The legislation I recommend to Congress will enable us to draw strength from two great related assets: (1) the productive genius of our farmers; and (2) the potential that lies in the 60,000,000 acres now withdrawn from production.

So much for the second part. To show that the President of the United States meant business under this new legislation, he turned to the home front (part 1) and ordered a release of 7,700,000 acres of wheat land from the Soil Bank. This means that farmers can grow more wheat (say, 200,000,000 bushels more) and still toe the line and get the high support prices. It looks as though the 7,700,000-acre release of wheat land from the Soil Bank is just the first instalment. This is how I read the President's speech and this is how others read it, too. Let us look at what the *Economist* said on May 14, 1966, at page 706, and what *C.E.C. Grain Bulletin* of March, 1966, said at page 380.

What does this change mean to the Australian wheatgrower? The United States is moving its "aid" dangerously close to what one may call unsavoury credit competition. After all, they will be selling normally, for dollars. The main difference is that they will offer much longer terms than we can. They will sell more than they used to under the old set-up. This means they will get more of the under-developed country markets, giving others less chance to get in. How do we separate aid from underhand competition? I will leave this for some people to answer for themselves. Why did President Johnson do this? He did it partly because of the coming elections, I believe. He needs a tame Congress to get his legislative programme through, so he needs the farmers' votes. And

he did it partly, possibly, because of a genuine desire to help and induce self-help. Also, the United States balance of payments is not quite as healthy as it was in 1954, when Public Law 480 came in. This could explain the scheme to cut out sales for foreign currency and substitute for it sales for dollars.

Other conclusions are that France is likely to cause the Common Market as a whole to import less wheat, and possibly also to export more wheat. The people who will suffer are outside suppliers to the Common Market, like Australia. It is also possible (but the degree of this risk is not as large) that the six Common Market countries will sell more wheat in world markets. When the United Kingdom joins the six Common Market countries, the E.E.C. agricultural policy as it stands at present will cause British farmers to go out of meat and into wheat production. Russia appears certain to produce exportable wheat surpluses, even if it succeeds only partly in the effort now under way. It may have adverse weather from time to time, but not overall. However, as time goes on and the effects of the policy become more and more pronounced on all of its vast wheatlands, bouts of adverse weather will give rise to smaller and smaller imports. So residual needs caused by bad weather will diminish. (This is where the experts are not 100 per cent correct.) As I said a moment ago, it is also possible that Russia will establish a policy of stockpiling and, therefore, of holding some of the excess production from good seasons as an insurance against deficient production in seasons when weather is bad. The Comecon countries may take Russia's surpluses, but this is not certain. Signs are that the satellites in Eastern Europe are likely to follow more independent trade policies. That has become evident in Yugoslavia, with the recent visit of the Chinese Prime Minister to that country, where he did not get the reception he thought he was entitled to. The United States of America is certain to sell more wheat to the under-developed countries. It will sell for dollars and on long-term credit.

To tie up this story, we return to China. Apart from small occasional purchases, China came into our lives in 1960-61, and immediately purchased over 1,000,000 metric tons in that first year. These purchases escalated to over 2,500,000 metric tons in 1963-64, and somewhat less in 1964-65—because we did not have the wheat. The development is summarized as follows:

People's Republic of China—Imports of Wheat and Wheat Flour.

Year.	(Million Metric Tons)		(Wheat Equivalent).		1963-64.	1964-65.
	1959-60.	1960-61.	1961-62.	1962-63.	(Provisional)	
Total imports	0.0	1.960	4.746	4.871	5.198	5.120
Australia's Share	—	60%	41%	42%	49%	45%

The figures for Canada were as follows: 1960-61, 40 per cent; 1961-62, 41 per cent (the same as Australia); 1962-63, 34 per cent (slightly less than Australia); 1963-64, only 19 per cent; and 1964-65, 34 per cent. The figures for the Argentine, the E.E.C. and Russia were much less. It might be interesting to note the figures of Russia's exports to China. It did not export anything in 1959-60 or 1960-61; it exported 3 per cent in 1961-62 and 1 per cent in 1962-63; and it exported nothing in 1963-64 and 1964-65. I shall give the figures for area under wheat in million hectares. As members know, a hectare is 2.74 acres. The figures for Argentina were:

	Million hectares.
1959-60	4,378
1964-65	5,444

That is an increase in those years of 24 per cent. Australia showed an increase of 47 per cent for those years, Canada 21 per cent, and the other three countries showed an increase of 29 per cent. Australia recorded the largest increase both in the absolute and in the percentage sense. Australia was quicker off the mark and able to build up new acreages.

The question has been asked: how stable is the People's Republic of China? I believe it is possible to continue to be optimistic about this major market. The main cause for optimism is the growth of population, which is variously estimated at between 14,000,000 and 17,000,000 a year. Next there are the policies of the Chinese Government. The idea is to concentrate its efforts on the more expensive crops which use relatively less land and more labour than wheat. It is a fact that the Chinese appear to be set on a course towards producing rice, soybeans, cotton, tobacco and peanuts. This makes sense in a country where labour is plentiful and cheap. It makes sense to grow exportable surpluses of these crops and to use the foreign exchange so obtained to buy the cheap wheat. Rice, soybeans and so on fetch a higher price a ton than wheat so that the Chinese, by exporting them and buying wheat, make the food go further. The Chinese have difficulty (according to the International Wheat Conference) in getting wheat from their own growing areas to where the population is. On the other hand, they are finding it easy to control and distribute the wheat they import to their northern ports.

The Australian Government, in the interests of balance of payments, cannot afford to allow an industry such as the wheat industry (which, in the last two years, made up almost 14 per cent of Australia's exports) to suffer serious damage. Nor is it possible for the Government to turn around and tell the wheatgrower that he has been riding the crest of an export wave and that all that will happen will be that the wheatgrower will return to the 1959-60 situation. The plain fact is that much has happened since 1959-60 and it is simply not possible to go back. That is the picture I have been painting of the transfer of trade from Europe and the United Kingdom (where it was hitherto) to the Far East—Hong Kong, Singapore, Indonesia, Borneo and other countries. Much more capital has been tied up since 1959-60 in the machinery and storage capacity on the average Australian farm; by the bulk handling organizations in this and other States in storage and handling equipment; and by port authorities in wharf facilities and by State railway departments in special rolling stock. The bulk handling organizations alone have more than doubled their investment since 1960. Their investment in bulk storage and bulk handling facilities is more than \$105,000,000.

All told, at the Australian farm level (and particularly in South Australia), at the bulk handling organization level, and at the port authority and railway departmental level, there would be not less than \$600,000,000 tied up in specialized wheat facilities, be they headers at the farm, silos at the railhead, or conveyors at the ports and so on. What is more, silo capacity, port facilities and so on are being constantly extended. Farmers buy more equipment and every day more capital is being tied up in wheat. Just imagine if we went back to the 1959-60 situation—how much capital would be lying idle, how much waste would take place and how heavy an overhead burden the industry would have to carry? Australia has a big stake in maintaining wheat production and exports at a high level.

There is another reason why the Government should help us: it has allowed the industry to attach itself to China. The Commonwealth Government never objected, nor did any State

Government. They allowed us to place a heavy reliance on this market, even though the risk of China cutting us out has always been on the horizon, although not perhaps to the same degree as is the case now with Australian troops fighting in Vietnam. It is no use saying (as Mr. Holt apparently did) that the wheat industry is run by private enterprise. A possible inference would be that if it is in a spot then this risky situation is of its own making and if it sells to China that has nothing to do with the Government. I do not subscribe to that theory. It is no use saying this because the Government could have at any time made it plain to the wheat industry that it did not wish it to sell to China, and at the same time it could have afforded the industry the necessary access to insurance and credit that would have permitted expansion of sales to other less risky but more competitive markets, or it could have established really long-term credit facilities through a policy similar to the American "food for freedom" legislation, which would have put us fair and square into the insolvent markets.

Mr. Casey: We could be put on the spot if China decided to forget our wheat and get it from Canada, for example.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Supposing the war escalated, which I hope it will not, as the Chinese troops are saying they will not help in North Vietnam. If this happened, we would be cut off. Our wheat would be left in the silos to the weevils, or we could sell it to Canada which would sell it to China. There is a bit of a risk in selling to China but I am not alarmed by it. The Government has allowed things to go on and it has not helped us to make the Chinese market more secure. It has practically done the opposite. At the same time, it failed to provide the incentive through direction and the means through insurance and credit arrangements to make us less reliant on what has now become quite a risky customer—risky because of the Government's decision to go into Vietnam.

When the Minister of Agriculture attends the Agricultural Council he will be concerned with these matters, and I point out that what we need to recognize is that this risk is due to a large extent to Government policy in Canberra. The Government should agree that if the worst does come about it will stand by the industry and help it out of the situation by promptly amending section 21 (7) of the Wheat Industry Stabilization Act to read:

a number equal to the number of bushels of wheat of the season exported by the board or sold by the board for export.

Those words should be included in that section. That would eliminate the existing qualification which provides "or 150,000,000 bushels, whichever is the less." This would mean that the Government, instead of limiting a guarantee to 150,000,000 bushels of export, would guarantee every bushel of export wheat or would promptly help the industry to secure new markets by improving export credit insurance and by helping it to secure credit facilities at reasonable rates.

Naturally, the Government would be unlikely to agree to my suggestion of guaranteeing the whole, but we could probably compromise on 250,000,000 or possibly more if the acreage increased, and I repeat that the scientists may increase or double our yield to the acre. As I have said, production reached 346,000,000 bushels in one year. However, the Government ought to be prepared to give the industry an undertaking that it will act along some of the lines suggested if the worst comes to the worst. After all, such an understanding would not commit the Government to any immediate action; it would merely commit it to act in case a crisis arises.

The picture is not as clear as I would like it to be and there is a risk of a crisis occurring at any time. Of course, we all hope that that does not occur. Let me look at the action required to cope with the long-term risk, that in the absence of any significant agreement stemming from the Kennedy round, competition will stiffen. We should aim at two things, one of which is steady markets. The best way to achieve this is by appeal to self interest. This simply means that one should buy more from those who do or would buy more from us. This is not as straightforward as it sounds.

Any sensible economist will say that bi-lateral trade balancing is bad economics but he will say that this is true only where Government protection of industrial tariffs, subsidies, import quotas, etc., does not exist and where there are good international financial arrangements, and today's world is marked by government protection and defective international financial arrangements. Although this is a fact, it does not follow that bi-lateral trade balancing is necessarily a good policy. For example, Japan simply cannot afford to insist that Australia balance its trade with her, because Japan's raw material imports from Australia enable that country to export the manufactured goods made from those materials.

The sensible trade policy for any country is to have a mixed outlook—multi-lateral balancing with an eye firmly fixed on bi-lateral balances. The foregoing is the first point to be kept in mind. The second point is that Australia subscribes to a general trade club called G.A.T.T., which lays down rules of fair play in international trade and frowns on bi-lateral trade balancing. It has benefited exporters of manufactures but has done almost nothing for importers of primary products. The big boys can act against the spirit of G.A.T.T. and get away with it. Noted examples of this are the United States of America and the E.E.C. G.A.T.T. has done nothing at all for the communist countries, most of whom are not members, anyway.

While G.A.T.T. tries to promote a multi-lateral approach to trade by laying down the rules, the international financial arrangements are supposed to be part of the means that will make these rules work. The cornerstone of these arrangements is the International Monetary Fund and the real power behind the scenes is a group of 10, which decides how much money is available for those countries who cannot get enough foreign exchange to buy what they need to import; that is, those who cannot balance their balance of payments. If this body made sufficient money available and if all countries had access to this money, then trade could be more multi-lateral. A country would not have to worry too much if it ran a little short this year provided it could make it good in some other year. The set-up would work like a bank—the country would borrow when short and repay later.

However, this group is so tight, mainly because France will not allow it to be otherwise, that it is an international scandal. It forces countries into a more bi-lateral trade approach. In other words, it is an attitude of, "If you want to sell to me, you have to buy from me so that I will have the money to pay you." Furthermore, the Communist countries do not have access to the money, so they have to be fairly bi-lateral. Whatever way we try to stabilize our market we must never forget that bi-lateral trade balancing is important, especially in the case of the poor countries, who are the best markets for wheat, and the communist countries. In trying to make trade more bi-lateral, we should try to break as few G.A.T.T. rules as possible but, if we do break them, we should not be too worried, because G.A.T.T. has never done much for Australia, anyhow. Dealing with the G.A.T.T. Kennedy round of trade negotiations, this was a matter of

urgency, because progress in the negotiations had been very slow. The authority given by the United States Congress for United States participation lasts for barely another year. Commonwealth Trade Ministers were all agreed that the potential benefits of the Kennedy round were such that the Commonwealth should, as a group, do everything possible to bring a sense of urgency to the negotiations. Mr. McEwen said that, if the Kennedy round failed to produce worthwhile results, there could well be a widespread sense of disillusionment against the ideals of multi-lateralism in world trade. This might then lead to a tendency towards groups of countries combining to form highly protective trading blocs.

The European Economic Community—possibly enlarged—could be one such bloc, the countries of the North and South American continents another and the Communist countries a third. Australia, and other countries not easily falling within such groupings, could find themselves isolated and confronted with new restrictions on their trade opportunities. This information is up to date, having become available only last week. At a time when the growth and prosperity of Australia, and indeed of every country, depends so much on maintaining a continued expansion of exports such a development would be deplorable. It is, indeed, a major reason why a successful outcome of the Kennedy round is of fundamental importance. Mr. McEwen said that, if the Kennedy round failed, and there followed the emergence of a series of powerful trading blocs, the many new and developing nations of the world would, no doubt, be forced to seek attachment to one or another of the blocs. This, he said, could provide a fertile field for political competition in which he could see nothing but danger and tension—the very reverse of the objective of maximum freedom in trade and other matters which we believe in, and towards which the United States Government, in launching the Kennedy round, had taken a leadership initiative.

Mr. McEwen said that a number of other subjects was discussed at the Trade Ministers' meeting, ranging from trade in manufactured exports from the lesser-developed members, to the trade promotion efforts of developing countries and means of stimulating tourism. "In all cases", said Mr. McEwen, "Commonwealth Ministers were able to reach agreement on the most useful means of co-ordinating Commonwealth efforts in these fields." The Minister said he was particularly heartened

by the support expressed by developing Commonwealth countries for the Australian initiative in legislating for a system of preferences to apply to a range of products of interest to developing countries. He went on to say:

These new nations needs more than grand declarations if they are to grapple successfully with the vast economic difficulties facing them, and avoid the political trouble that so often accompanies such difficulties. The Australian initiative was widely acknowledged to be one of the few positive steps that have yet been taken by any country specifically to help the trade problems of the developing countries.

Mr. McEwen said that while he was in London he had also taken the opportunity to assess the progress being made in the campaign to promote Australian meat, dairy products, fresh, canned and dried fruits, eggs, other processed foodstuffs, and wine. Total expenditure in Britain on the promotion of Australian products amounts to several million dollars a year. The Commonwealth Government and Australian primary producers and exporters, through the Marketing Boards, subscribe directly \$1,100,000. This co-operative effort attracts associated expenditure by exporters and British importers of Australian products of very substantial additional funds. Mr. McEwen commented:

I am sure that this trade publicity programme has done much to create and encourage the demand for these Australian products in the United Kingdom market. Without it, the returns to a wide range of Australian producers would have been considerably lower.

Mr. McEwen added that in recent years a much greater emphasis had been given to the promotion of Australian products in markets other than Britain: He said:

We are producing more; our development needs require ever-increasing earnings of foreign exchange; and there are uncertainties about Britain's ultimate action in regard to the Common Market. All these considerations make it necessary that we exploit every possible marketing opportunity.

Mr. McEwen said that, following the London meeting, he had visited Poland and Bulgaria and had concluded trade agreements with these countries. Mr. McEwen said that Australia had given most-favoured nation tariff treatment to Poland and Bulgaria for many years. However, exporting to countries which controlled their imports by measures other than tariffs had no predictable basis. As a general rule, such countries prefer to buy from countries with whom they have trade agreements. In recent years, many Western countries have negotiated trade agreements with nations of Eastern Europe. The Minister said that last year Australia concluded a reciprocal most-favoured-nation trade agreement with the

Soviet Union. Following this, Poland and Bulgaria had sought trade talks with the object of concluding similar agreements. His visit and the trade agreements which had been signed were the outcome of these requests.

Mr. McEwen said the new agreements accorded to Poland and Bulgaria, as of right, the most-favoured-nation tariff treatment they had hitherto enjoyed. From the point of view of Australia's interests, we now also have assured entry to these markets on the equivalent most-favoured-nation basis. Mr. McEwen added that Australia enjoyed a favourable trade balance with both Poland and Bulgaria—a substantial balance in the case of Poland, which was a valuable buyer of Australian wool. Both countries were undertaking industrialization programmes, with heavy investment in a wide range of manufacturing industries. This offered the prospect of increasing opportunities for the sale of Australian raw materials and possibly also beef, mutton and other foodstuffs. At the same time, it could be expected that the products of the new manufacturing industries in Poland and Bulgaria, which are already significant exporters of certain specialized types of machinery, would be of increasing interest to Australian industries. The new trade agreements would provide a very useful framework for the development and expansion of Australian trade with Poland and Bulgaria.

Deliveries of wheat to the Australian Wheat Board for No. 29 pool (1965-66 season) at the end of March, 1966, were about 234,000,000 bushels compared with 344,000,000 bushels for the same period to No. 28 pool last season. A greatly reduced crop during 1965 and the provision of wheat for drought stock feeding purposes limited supplies available for export, and there were no outstanding sales of Australian wheat on the world market but rather a steady trade with regular buyers. This season's shipments of wheat and flour by main markets to April 9, 1966, are compared with those of the same period of last session in the following table:

Shipments of Wheat and Flour.

December 1 to April 9.

	1965-66.	1964-65.
	Wheat	
	('000 long tons).	
China, People's Republic of	441	982
United Kingdom	222	169
Iran	162	165
U.S.S.R.	161	222
Japan	84	167
Other	444	589
Total	1,514	2,294

	1965-66.	1964-65.
	Flour ('000 short tons).	
Ceylon	59	81
Pacific Is.	18	18
United Kingdom	12	18
Other	47	95
Total	136	212

Local sales of wheat for stock feed have been heavy this season. For the period December 1, 1965, to April 9, 1966, the Wheat Board sold 6,600,000 bushels for this purpose, compared with 3,600,000 bushels for the corresponding period of last year.

I turn now to another subject on which I spoke in this Chamber some time ago. I refer to the Planning and Development Bill. These proposals of the town planning legislation give me some concern. Here we have a proposal of a Town Planner, in complete control and with most unusual authority, to set out freeways in the metropolitan area and to carve up people's properties. The main idea behind it all, of course, is to overcome the congestion in the city of Adelaide, which is a wonderful idea. I agree that we must have a plan, but I doubt whether this is the right one. Let us look ahead a few years to the time when we have these freeways through Adelaide. We have already built the Flinders university, which is a wonderful institution, but I do not think all of it should have been built at Bedford Park. We have the big Electricity Trust building in Greenhill Road, the Waite Agricultural Research Institute, which is expanding, and we are building the big power station on Torrens Island.

The result of this policy, of course, is that more and more people will be attracted to the metropolitan area of Adelaide, and I think that is wrong. I admit that we must have a plan, but not all the development should be congregated in the metropolitan area. Many of us have spoken in this Chamber about decentralization, but this is far from decentralization because it is bringing population from the rural areas into the city of Adelaide. Instead of building the whole of the Flinders university at Bedford Park, why should a portion of it not have been built in, say, the Upper Murray districts in order to create an agricultural graduate force, following the same pattern as Armidale in New South Wales which is recognized as one of the greatest agricultural colleges in the world?

The other day at Loxton I had the privilege and honour of presenting trophies to between 1,200 and 1,300 schoolchildren from the high

schools of Renmark, Glossop, Barmera, Waikerie and Loxton. Wonderful children they are, and naturally from their parentage and environment many of them have a bias towards agriculture. What a glorious opportunity exists to build an agricultural university at Loxton to accommodate those school leavers for a year or two instead of bringing them down here to the Waite Agricultural Research Institute or the Flinders university and thus congesting the city more and more. I am opposed to this policy of trying to overcome congestion of this city by constructing freeways. Admittedly, we need some freeways, but we do not need all of the proposed ones. We are going to provide increased amenities to the people in the metropolitan area, and as the rural people will be attracted here more and more the congestion will become worse than ever. What are we doing about Whyalla and Port Augusta? The Minister of Works has headaches and probably nightmares trying to get the money to pump water to keep Adelaide going. Why not reverse the procedure and take people to the water at Murray Bridge and Loxton?

Mr. Burdon: What about Mount Gambier?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: The honourable member would probably count me out if I went to that city and spoke as I am speaking now. Consider Elizabeth: General Motors-Holden's went there and the Housing Trust built houses, but what happened? Chrysler Australia Limited went to Tonsley Park and a railway line was built. G.M.H. or Chrysler could have taken part of their works to Loxton, to Waikerie or to Mount Gambier, to build mudguards, hub caps and other equipment, and the factories would be much closer to the Melbourne market. When I travel to Mildura, or anywhere over the border, the roads are congested with semi-trailers from Elizabeth and Tonsley Park carrying goods to other States. This policy is wrong, and people should be warned about it.

Decentralization is not taking place, and the present town-planning policy must be stopped. We should reconsider it, and this is the Government to do it. Many industries are active in Whyalla, Port Augusta, Mount Gambier, Peterborough and the river districts. What are we doing about it? A halt should be made to the present town-planning propositions to be discussed this session, because they are going too far and far too fast. Some time ago I visited Los Angeles, and the friends I have in that city send me magazines and other information. Many

traffic problems are associated with that city and freeways were built to solve them. The authorities in San Francisco watched with much interest what was happening in Los Angeles and when the programme was completed, these authorities considered that it did not solve the problems, and now San Francisco has rejected the freeway system that we are to introduce here.

Mr. Casey: That is not quite true.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Yes it is. The honourable member can read these magazines.

Mr. Casey: I had a good look at the San Francisco freeway system, which takes the form of a spider web. It is an eyesore to the general public, and it is intended to do away with it. It is there now, or was when I was there last year.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: When I was in San Francisco I wanted to visit Yosemite Park, which is 200 miles away. I said to my co-delegate, "How do we get there?" He said, "See what you can do." We finally hired a car and after some argument, I drove it. The left-hand drive was awkward and the traffic was heavy. On the left-hand side of the main road is a slow traffic lane, then a mid-fast lane, and the fast traffic travels on the outside lane. I managed to get into the slow-traffic lane but people were shouting at me. My friend said, "You are travelling the wrong way." However, we went on: I was still trying to keep in the slow-traffic lane and, at the same time, watch all the traffic. Presently a policeman stopped us and said, "Where do you think you are going?" I said, "I am trying to follow that car." He said, "You have just gone through the red lights." I said, "Where?" He said, "Can't you see them?" I said, "They are on the wrong side of the road." He said, "Where do you come from?" I said, "From Australia." He said, "I thought you came from somewhere where they can't drive. Where are you going?" I said, "To Yosemite Park; can you escort us?" He took us over the harbour bridge and put us on the correct route, for which we were grateful.

Sufficient thought has not been given to the development of Adelaide and of country districts. The Electricity Trust, instead of building the large premises on Greenhill Road, should have built in country districts, and I know that one section of the trust is to be stationed at Barmera. Other industries could be attracted to country towns. We have heard the argument that factories have to be near ports; should be able to obtain

the necessary labour; and that there is a freight disadvantage when they are situated in the country. I reject those arguments because if an industry like G.M.H. or Chrysler were at Loxton and manufactured parts, the products could be loaded on trucks and, being so much nearer to Sydney, Melbourne, and Brisbane markets, this would save freight. Many acres of land could be bought at Loxton, Mount Gambier, or Murray Bridge at a lower cost than at Elizabeth and Tonsley Park, with a considerable capital saving. I believe that the population of Adelaide will reach about 1,000,000 by 1970.

From that year there will be a rapid expansion, not only of the area set out in the town-planning project but to areas beyond Gawler and Noarlunga, with a congregating population in the city area in the future. Melbourne figures are astonishing as the population extends beyond Frankston, which is some distance from Melbourne. Borrie and Spencer, population authorities, have predicted that the population of Australia will reach 24,600,000 by the year 2000 with three-fifths or 15,500,000 in urban areas which had more than 50,000 in 1961, that is, the seven capitals, and Newcastle, Wollongong, Geelong, Ballarat, Townsville and Toowoomba. The smaller capitals of Brisbane (622,000 in 1961) and Adelaide (588,000) and Perth (420,000) may "face the prospect of a 50 per cent increase by 1976", that is, within the decade that we are considering tonight, and may reach the 1,000,000 mark before the end of the century. The conurbations of Sydney-Newcastle-Wollongong and Melbourne-Geelong-Yallourn may reach the astounding figures of 6,600,000 and 5,600,000 respectively at the end of the century, if the present trend for an increasing portion of the population to congregate into the main urban areas continues. If such a prediction is only partly true, it emphasizes the urgency of the need for preparing a plan now for the next 10 years. I think many aspects of the plan to be considered by Parliament are wrong.

If such rapid growth is to occur in our population, increasing demands will be made for more and more space. For example, the area necessary to accommodate the expected increase in Sydney's population alone has been estimated by Linge to be close to 30,000 square miles each year. At present expansion is rapidly taking place haphazardly in what we are pleased to call "suburbia". Our use of land for this purpose is extensive and not intensive; every house has its own garden, and a growing network of roads has to be supplied

to take the workers from their homes to their jobs. Commuting is no longer a matter of choice; it has become one of the most wearing and unpleasant features of urban life. The question that will have to be asked sooner or later (but preferably sooner) is: can we afford to have so much space devoted to urban living? There is no doubt that our large cities will grow still larger, but the speed of growth may be checked if some of the increase of the likely population can be absorbed in the non-metropolitan areas.

In the decade ahead land has to be found for more than 3,100,000 people, if we accept the predictions made that Australia's population in 1976 will be 14,800,000, of which 9,300,000 will be in the 14 larger cities. The urban areas outside the capital cities will have to absorb 1,200,000 people. Compare this figure with the actual increase of 884,000 that occurred in the period 1947-61. Either we plan now for a better distribution of people and jobs, or the greater part of the population and employment increase will be concentrated in these areas that are already overcrowded in many chaotic communities. The Minister for Housing and Local Government in England recently published an interesting booklet called *The Southeast Study 1961-81*, in which arguments are advanced for planning new cities and expanding existing cities near London to take care of a population increase of 3,500,000 for the region in the 20-year period. New towns were created after the war and many thousands of London families were given new homes in a better environment. However, the situation is changing rapidly; it is far from being static. A change in economic balance within the south-eastern region is needed to moderate the dominance of London and to get a more even distribution of growth. We should examine this whole matter, as it affects us.

The member for Burra (Mr. Quirke), the previous Minister in charge of soldier settlement, recently asked a question in regard to Loxton soldier settlers. Obviously, the Lands Department intends to obtain figures from settlers in regard to the preparation of a budget. I have spoken to the Director about this matter and I believe that the department's plan will eventually work. However, when soldier settlers received the questionnaire regarding budgetary control, some were considerably alarmed to learn that certain particulars on the form had to be completed within a specified time. A meeting of settlers was called at Loxton, during which concern was expressed at some of the questions on the

form and at the shortage of time in which answers had to be given. The form also stated, in effect, that unless a satisfactory arrangement was reached a notice to quit the block might be given. I deplore that attitude; it is entirely the wrong approach for a department first to seek a settler's co-operation and then to threaten that sort of thing. I believe that if the District Officer was unable to handle the matter the department should have sent its officers to Loxton to explain the way in which it was seeking a better system of trying to help the settlers concerned.

Many difficulties experienced by soldier settlers were created by the low price of navel oranges two years ago. Settlers in the area did not experience the ordinary drought; it was a drought in regard to prices. Despite the fact that oranges were plentiful, the prices paid did not help settlers meet their commitments. One particular settler (and he is not alone in this regard) experienced bad soil on which stone fruits had been planted. The fruit was affected and, with the subsequent rising of the water table and the introduction of salt, trees started to die. The person concerned approached the department through the Loxton District Officer, and asked for an expert's advice. He was advised to pull out the trees and, after having acted on that advice, the settler approached the department in regard to re-planting the trees. However he was told that that would have to be done at his own expense. As that man is experiencing financial difficulties, where will he get the money?

Through faulty planting on the part of the department in the first place, eight acres of his trees were pulled out. However, to make matters worse, this man has been told that unless he complies with the budgetary control requirements and fills out a satisfactory statement, he will be forced off his block. His figure fell to below 2,000 gross, whereas it should have been up to 3,500. The department is obviously not satisfied with this man's production figures, but what else could he do? I appeal to the Minister of Repatriation to adopt a more sympathetic attitude in this regard than that being at present adopted by the department. Budgetary control is necessary in regard to some soldier settlers, but the big stick should not be wielded in this way.

On the matter of quinquennial land tax assessments I have received certain assessments, many of which have been increased and, on making a rough estimate, I find that the increase is about 50 per cent. The Government has not yet—

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Do you think the Minister knows about the position?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: He ought to.

Mr. Quirke: It is more than 50 per cent at Loxton.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: There are some more than 400 per cent greater. Many people have appealed against it; on the other hand, there are many who have not worried about appealing, because they think they will get nowhere. My question is: what is going to be the rate? The present rate is $\frac{3}{4}$ d. If the assessments have increased by 50 per cent, obviously if the rate remains as it is, at $\frac{3}{4}$ d., the Government will get much more revenue because of the increased assessment. I say that the rate should be lower than $\frac{3}{4}$ d. with the increased assessment, and that the Government should not attempt to get any more revenue from this sort of land tax than it got previously. If it has a lower rate with a higher assessment, it can get revenue equal to what it has collected in the past—about \$4,969,300. I do not want to see that amount of revenue increased. I ask the Government to lower the rate. I do not mind if it gets the same amount of revenue as before but I strongly protest if the rate either remains as it is or is increased and the Government asks for more revenue from land tax than it got previously. After all, it is a capital tax, and a capital tax is no good in any community.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It is a tax on production.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Of course it is. If we want to encourage production, we have to do it in a proper way. So I am indulging in a soft impeachment of the Government. I will not stand for a higher rate of land tax. I do not mind if it lowers the rate to get the same amount of revenue as hitherto but I will not subscribe to an increased rate. The Government will get increased revenue as it is, but I want it to equal the revenue it got previously.

I now pay a tribute to the South Australian Police Department. Some few weeks ago I made a mistake while travelling from my office to King William Street in Adelaide. I generally go down to Gilbert Street, and reach King William Street where there are traffic lights. On this occasion I waited, as the red light was against me, until all the north-bound traffic running up King William Street was moving and I then turned round the corner from Gilbert Street into King William Street with a free go. I got nearly to the police station when the police pulled me up and took my name and

address. They said, "You have gone against the red lights." I replied, "I did not turn against them; I thought it was in order to turn around Gilbert Street into King William Street with the lights as they were." We all know there are many places in Adelaide (for instance, at West Terrace) where we have to cut away. We are told, "You can proceed without hindrance if you have a clear go." I understood that that was all right: apparently, it was not all right. That is wrong. The law should be altered. The policeman said, "You must attend a police lecture", which I willingly did. I attended the lecture, at which I suppose there must have been between 800 and 1,000 people. It was most outstanding.

Mr. Quirke: Enough to swamp you!

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I want to pay a tribute to the way in which the Police Department conducted that lecture. It gave me some good pointers about the traffic law, of which I was to some extent ignorant. I am not an expert on the traffic law but almost without exception the people who attended that lecture went out—

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: We want more people in the Police Force.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Yes, but we want to encourage them to get there. This is the type of thing that would encourage youth to go into the Police Force. There is not enough encouragement for young men these days to embark on this career. Most people like to condemn the Police Force but I take this opportunity of paying it a worthy tribute. It deserves full marks. The police did a wonderful job at that lecture and it would not be a bad idea if the Registrar of Motor Vehicles, when he issued a new licence or a new registration of a motor vehicle, told the person getting the new licence or registration to attend a police lecture so that the police could, in the cordial way in which they conducted the lecture that I attended, instruct him on the traffic laws. It would probably avert many accidents.

I shall not deal with the grape position because the honourable member for Angas (Hon. B. H. Teusner) has already dealt with it. I plead with the Minister to try to do something for this industry. I agree with what the member for Angas said this afternoon about the danger of increased acreage creating a greater grape surplus. Although we got through last year because there was no surplus of grapes, a surplus could arise again, particularly if we were to have an unlimited increase in grape acreage. The Citrus Industry Organization Committee is just getting into gear and

seems to be going along fairly well. I had the pleasure of attending a conference of all States, its purpose being to try to get an all-Australia stabilization plan for the citrus industry. Honourable members will know that the legislation that I prepared and introduced into this Chamber, which was substituted by the committee of inquiry later, did provide for an all-Australia stabilization scheme for citrus. The Citrus Industry Organization Committee is the first step. It is confined within the borders of South Australia. It cannot expect to get 100 per cent success unless it is extended to the other States. We hope to get eventual agreement among the growers so that we can approach the respective Ministers of Agriculture at the Australian Agricultural Council to get legislation through that will put the Citrus Industry Organization Committee onto an all-Australia basis, with a guaranteed price for exports. Exports from New South Wales are very small. It sells most of its citrus from Gosford and the Murrumbidgee Irrigation Area on the Sydney markets. The biggest export would be from South Australia. Some people in discussing this plan seem to get into difficulties about the respective grades. That is not a problem: it is a matter of administration.

In the wheat industry we use various grades. The year before last people paid up to 85c a bushel for premium wheat in northern New South Wales, because it is a particular variety of wheat needed for blending for flour pur-

poses. If oranges do not meet the export requirement, they are reduced to a lower grade, as is the case with the dried fruits industry. That is an administrative detail that can be worked out without having to face many insuperable problems, if we have the necessary legislation. The dried fruits industry, although it has a partly voluntary plan at the moment with a stabilized price in it, is not satisfied that that is the answer. They had conferences with me with a view to getting an all-Australia plan for the dried fruits industry, too. That industry we must encourage from a national point of view.

I have dealt tonight with all these problems. I apologize for keeping the House so long. I hope that some questions I have raised will bear fruit and that some members, at least, will take notice of them. I hope to see some of my suggestions given effect to. I know that the Minister of Agriculture is interested in the citrus and grape problems. I trust that some remarks I have made tonight will help him and the industries I have mentioned. I look forward to greater prosperity for primary industries in South Australia in the years ahead.

Mr. JENNINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.41 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, July 13, at 2 p.m.