

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, July 5, 1967.

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

QUESTIONS

IRRIGATION.

Mr. HALL: Over recent months I have heard from several persons who wish to divert water from the Murray River for irrigation purposes. In two or three instances (particularly in one case) small areas were involved and the people concerned desired assistance in the present dry season. However, throughout the river areas there is concern at the delay in any announcement of policy on this important matter. As I understand the Minister of Works has been involved in an inter-departmental inquiry on the matter, and as it has been reported that Cabinet has considered it recently, can the Minister say whether that is the position and can he tell the House when we can expect the Government to announce publicly its policy?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Leader did not stretch his imagination when he said this matter was important: Cabinet has received a report and, because of its great importance, is still seriously considering it. I hope that I will be able to give details of the report early next week.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Irrigation a reply to the question I asked last week about the Cadell irrigation settlement?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: At present a temporary pump is in operation at the new caisson to remove ground water from the vicinity. As soon as ground conditions permit, a short length of pipeline to divert drainage water from the old caisson to the new one will be installed and the permanent new caisson pump put into service. The date of completion, whilst not far distant, cannot be forecast precisely. In the meantime and for all practical purposes, the seepage water collected in the rehabilitated main drain system is being discharged *via* the old caisson.

APPRENTICES TRADE SCHOOL.

Mr. CLARK: As the Minister of Education knows, I have often raised the matter of the establishment of a trade school for apprentices in the Elizabeth-Salisbury area; in fact, I raised it again in the current Address in Reply debate. As I understand the Minister has some

information for me on this matter, will he give it now?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Together with my officers in the Education Department I appreciate the industrial growth in the Elizabeth area, the increasing number of apprentices, and the desire for local training facilities. It is hoped eventually to provide facilities both at the trade and other levels of technical education. However, as I informed the honourable member when he referred to this matter in the Address in Reply debate last year, a survey conducted by the Education Department showed that the numbers do not yet warrant the provision of such a school before very urgently needed schools in other areas. I can say, however, that at an appropriate time (taking into account the growing needs of the Elizabeth-Salisbury area in relation to those of other areas and schools) consideration will be given to the establishment of a technical college to provide a wide range of technical education facilities, including the technical education of apprentices, to serve the needs of the main areas of population between Adelaide and Gawler.

EDUCATION GRANTS.

Mr. COUMBE: The Prime Minister (Mr. Harold Holt) was reported, when laying the foundation stone on Monday this week at the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology, as saying that education grants by the Commonwealth Government to the States this year would increase by some 40 per cent. The Prime Minister went on to say that this outlay would rise from \$82,000,000 last year to \$115,000,000 this year, and that the Commonwealth would spend this latter amount on universities, colleges of advanced education, science laboratories and teacher training. Can the Minister of Education say whether he has discussed these substantially increased grants with either the Prime Minister or the Commonwealth Minister of Education and Science (Senator Gorton), and can he give me any details regarding what projects in South Australia will benefit from these grants?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: So far neither I nor my department has had any communication from the Prime Minister or Senator Gorton in relation to the details, with the exception that we have been advised of the independent schools that will receive assistance in regard to science laboratories and also of the amount that departmental schools will receive for this purpose. Apart from that, we have received no information on the other details referred to by the honourable member.

MURRIE ROYAL COMMISSION.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: During the first week of the present session I asked the Minister of Education and the Premier on successive days questions regarding the Murrie Royal Commission. The questions concerned the delay which unfortunately occurred during the illness of His Honour Mr. Justice Walters, the Royal Commissioner. On June 21 the Premier said he expected that the Minister would be able to make an announcement on the Royal Commission in due course. I understand that there is in the *News* today an item suggesting that the Minister is now in a position to make an announcement on the whole Murrie case. As this is a matter of very grave concern to members of this House and to the public generally in South Australia, I ask the Minister whether he is able to say what arrangements have been made for the resumption of the Royal Commission hearings or, if that is not proposed, what alternative arrangements are in hand.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I regret that I am not in a position at this moment to say what is being done in this regard. However, I hope to be able to make a statement within a few days.

CHURCH RATING.

Mr. CASEY: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Local Government, a reply to my recent question regarding rates on church properties?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague the Minister of Local Government has advised that church property that is used solely for religious purposes is non-ratable property under the provisions of the Local Government Act. Certain properties owned by church organizations are not used solely for religious purposes and these are ratable. I am not aware of which category covers the properties referred to by the honourable member. Places of worship were non-ratable prior to the amendment referred to by the honourable member. The amendment brought the particular provision into line with another provision in the Act and covered certain religious organizations that were not then covered. Any rates paid by these church organizations cannot be refunded or set against next year's rates. If the particular organization considered that its property was non-ratable, then it should have appealed against the assessment on these grounds. Apparently no appeal or approach was made to the council and, accordingly, the rates paid are not refundable.

GLADSTONE-WILMINGTON LINE.

Mr. HEASLIP: Has the Minister of Social Welfare a reply to a question I asked on June 22 about the standardization of the Gladstone-Wilmington line?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Railways Commissioner reports:

I have to report that although the standardization agreement covers *inter alia*, the conversion of the whole of the Peterborough Division of the South Australian Railways, at this stage the Commonwealth Government has only approved the conversion of the line from Port Pirie to Cockburn. However, this department has always pressed for the work to be carried out in full, as covered by the agreement, but at this juncture approval for this has not been received.

KINGSTON BRIDGE.

Mr. CURREN: Yesterday, in reply to my question about when tenders would be called for the building of the bridge at Kingston, on the Murray, the date mentioned was October, 1968. Can the Premier say why it will be so long before tenders are called and, if it is because of a shortage of design engineers, will the Government seriously consider engaging outside consultants to carry out the design work for this important undertaking?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will consult my colleague the Minister of Works and get an early reply for the honourable member.

SHOPPING HOURS.

Mr. McANANEY: Last year the Government appointed a committee to inquire whether restrictions on shop trading hours should be relaxed. As a recommendation was made that certain commodities could be sold during extended hours, will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Labour and Industry what action the Government is taking concerning the report of this committee?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall be pleased to do so.

ABORIGINES.

Mr. FERGUSON: Yesterday, in reply to my question on notice the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs said that all positions on the Aboriginal Lands Trust had been filled. The Act provides that no more than nine additional members may be appointed at the Governor's pleasure on the recommendation of Aboriginal reserve councils. Can the Minister say whether any reserve councils have made such recommendations, and whether the Government intends to add to the number already appointed to the trust?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I know of no recommendations as suggested by the honourable member, therefore the matter has not been considered.

HOUSE SALES.

Mr. LANGLEY: The inner suburban districts contain many old-type houses, and because of family circumstances many "For Sale" notices may be seen. A house is generally a person's largest outlay, but only a certain amount of loan finance is available for the purchase of an established house. Occasionally, sales of these houses are effected by salesmen who promise verbally that bank finance will be available within 12 months. Temporary finance is then arranged for the bridging period but, eventually, the loan is not granted, and all is lost. Will the Premier, as Attorney-General, consult the Land Agents Board with a view to stopping this type of salesmanship in order to curtail unnecessary hardship?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: For some time I have discussed this matter with the Land Agents Board and the Real Estate Institute of South Australia. Some safeguards to ensure that this sort of thing does not occur in the future will be placed before the House when the new Unfair Trade Practices Code is introduced later this session.

GRAPES.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Can the Minister of Agriculture say what price a ton has been paid to grapegrowers for 1965 vintage surplus grapes delivered for processing, and what further payments are expected?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I shall obtain the information for the honourable member.

TEA TREE GULLY SEWERAGE.

Mrs. BYRNE: No doubt the Minister of Works is aware that last Wednesday (June 28) a conference was held between officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department and of the District Council of Tea Tree Gully concerning sewerage plans for the Tea Tree Gully area, particularly area No. 2. As I have received many inquiries from constituents about these plans, can the Minister of Works say what decisions were arrived at and what plans were suggested at this conference?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am aware that a conference was held, and I have been promised a report on it. When I receive it I shall tell the honourable member what it contains.

STATE'S FINANCES.

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the honourable member for Gumeracha to ask his question, I should like to extend to him birthday greetings on this very special day.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Has the Treasurer a reply to the question I asked yesterday as to whether it will be necessary to refer to the Public Works Standing Committee a certain payment to one of the larger hospitals?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The answer is "No". The relevant section of the Public Works Standing Committee Act is section 25 (1), which states:

After the first day of July, nineteen hundred and twenty-eight, it shall not be lawful for any person to introduce into either House of Parliament any Bill—

- (a) authorizing the construction of any public work estimated to cost when complete more than one hundred thousand pounds; or
- (b) appropriating money for expenditure on any public work estimated to cost when complete more than one hundred thousand pounds;

unless such public work has first been inquired into by the committee in manner provided by this section:—

The Act further states:

"Public work" means any work proposed to be constructed by the Government or any person or body on behalf of the Government out of moneys to be provided by Parliament.

The moneys provided to the Home for Incurables are not moneys for a public work in the terms of this section, and I point out to the honourable member that this was clearly evident from the payments made by his Government for this project. In 1963-64 \$200,000 was voted to this project without its having been inquired into by the Public Works Committee. In 1964-65, a revenue year in which the honourable member was Treasurer for nine months, \$600,000 was voted to the project, again without its having been inquired into by the committee.

Mr. Millhouse: Out of general revenue?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, but there is no difference. The Public Works Standing Committee Act makes no distinction in relation to appropriations either from Loan or from Revenue—none whatever. If the honourable member can point to any difference between the Loan Account and the Revenue Account in respect of Appropriation Bills, I invite him to do so. Irrespective of whether these moneys are paid from Loan or Revenue, the situation is no different. If it is not a public work within the terms of the Act, it does not have

to be inquired into by the committee. This project is not a public work within the definition.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: As far as I know, the Public Finance Act governs the way in which money can be made available for public works. If the work referred to by the Treasurer is not a public work within the meaning of the Public Finance Act or the Public Works Standing Committee Act, will he obtain a report explaining the provision authorizing the Government to make the proposed payments? At present, I am not concerned about the purpose of the payment: I am merely concerned with the means by which it is to be made.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I thought I had previously answered that question when I explained the processes by which these amounts would be recouped from Loan funds. However, I shall obtain a further report for the honourable member.

PUBLIC RELIEF.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On June 27 I asked the Minister of Social Welfare whether or not, up to October, 1964, class A widow pensioners had been entitled to supplementary relief in this State and whether they were still eligible for relief. As a week has since gone by, can the Minister now answer my question?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I had certain documents in the bag yesterday associated with this question. However, as no question was asked, I did not bring the bag down today.

TAX REIMBURSEMENT.

Mr. McANANEY: Yesterday, in reply to a question I asked, involving population figures and the period on which the tax reimbursement formula was based, the Treasurer referred to "this Government". The Minister of Lands, improperly interjecting at the time, implied that the situation to which I referred arose during the term of the Liberal Government. My question related to whether the new taxation formula was introduced at the Premiers' Conference in the time of the Labor Government. The Commonwealth Government offered a new formula which would have worsened the position in the first year but which would have improved it considerably in the following four years. However, that offer was rejected by the Labor Government in place of a formula more favourable in the short term. My question is that it was a Labor Government and not a Liberal Government.

Mr. Jennings: That's a statement!

Mr. McANANEY: My question is as follows: Was it a Liberal or a Labor Government that supplied data for a new taxation formula, and was it accepted by the Labor Government?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get details for the honourable member on that matter, and I am sure they will be of interest to him. However, in reply to the question that he asked yesterday, I have the following information. The figures of tax reimbursement grants mentioned at the recent Premiers' Conference and quoted in the press are not amounts determined for each State for 1967-68: they are merely estimates of what amounts are likely to be payable under the existing formula given certain assumptions about probable population and wage movements. The final determination for 1967-68 will not be possible until the Commonwealth Statistician has been able to calculate the population increase in each State in the 12 months to December 31, 1967, and the increase in average wages throughout Australia in the 12 months to March 31, 1968.

In other words, the present estimates of the amount we are to receive are based on forecasts of what will be the results. Apart from the special addition of \$2,000,000 for Queensland, incorporated in existing Commonwealth legislation, any variation as between States in the estimated rate of increase in tax reimbursement grants arises only from differences in estimated population increase. The other factors involved (Australian wage movements and betterment) are the same for all States.

Mr. McANANEY: I thank the Treasurer for giving me such a full reply to the question I asked yesterday, but for the edification of the honourable member for—

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable member seek leave to make a statement?

Mr. McANANEY: I will ask my question, Mr. Speaker. Can the Treasurer say whether a Liberal or a Labor Government was in power in South Australia when the new taxation reimbursement formula was sent out?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I answered this question before and said that I would get full details for the honourable member.

GAS.

Mr. HALL: Yesterday, when answering questions about the supply of natural gas to the metropolitan area, the Premier said that the price the Victorian consumer would pay would be substantially above the South Australian price and that the purpose of our

negotiations was to achieve a cost advantage. The Premier also said that he would support an arrangement wherein the Electricity Trust of South Australia could purchase gas at the same price as that of alternative fuels. Is the Premier aware that the Victorian price, which is stated publicly as being just over .3c a therm, is significantly lower than the price in excess of 4c a therm agreed to by the South Australian Gas Company? Is he also aware that if, as predicted, the Electricity Trust becomes the major user of gas, and does so without obtaining an economic advantage therefrom, the huge investment of capital funds in the project will not return the benefits expected by the South Australian community?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I suggest that the honourable member look at some figures recently published, as a result of investigations in Melbourne, concerning the advantages that will be achieved in South Australia by our project. In fact, we shall be able to maintain a competitive cost advantage here. I am confident that shortly we shall be able to conclude negotiations that will demonstrate that fact.

Mr. HEASLIP: In his reply to my question yesterday, the Premier said:

Very advantageous offers have been made to bulk consumers in other States to come to South Australia, enabling industrial expansion here.

If the Premier or the Government intends to make these advantageous offers (I take it that this would mean electricity at a cheaper rate) to industries outside the State, this would result in unfair competition with existing industries in South Australia. Can the Premier say how large an industry in South Australia must be before it qualifies for the advantageous offers that are evidently to be made to companies in other States in an effort to entice them to South Australia?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The advantageous offers to which I referred were advantageous offers relating to industrial development in South Australia, and they have been made previously. It is not necessary for a company to be entirely outside South Australia to obtain such offers. In fact, some of these offers have been made to companies already established in South Australia that intend to build new plants. As to what the qualifications in this matter specifically are and as to how large a company has to be, I am reminded of a remark made in the House of Representatives on one occasion. A certain honourable member asked the Speaker, "How low, Mr. Speaker, do I have to bow?" The

Speaker replied, "I do not know how low the honourable member can get."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yesterday the Premier answered a series of questions concerning negotiations between the producers and particularly the Electricity Trust over the supply of natural gas in this State, and in the course of those answers he disclosed that in his anxiety for a speedy agreement to be reached (which we all share, of course) he or the Government intended to intervene in some way. Will he say in what way it is intended that the Government should intervene which will not prejudice either of the parties to the negotiations?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Mr. Speaker, I intend to talk to both sides.

WANNAMANA TANK.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Has the Minister of Works the information for which I asked on June 22 concerning the repair of the water tank in the hundred of Wannamana?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief states that the question of repairing the roof of the 500,000-gallon Mamblin tank has already been raised by the adjoining Ramblers golf club. Subsequent inquiries by the Regional Engineer showed that occupiers of two new houses in the area have recently drawn water from the tank, another settler uses about 200 gallons a week, and at times water has been carted to Wudinna Hospital. Because of the danger to children, fencing of the tank is now in hand. In a report on the condition of the tank roof, the Engineer for Water Supply states:

It is not possible to effectively repair the roof of the tank, which is of concrete and in a state of disintegration. The only sound approach would be its removal and the complete re-roofing of the tank with a steel, wood and iron roof to the standard normally used on water conservation supplies. An estimate prepared on this basis indicates that the likely cost involved would be of the order of \$9,200, an expenditure which would be very difficult to justify.

Having fenced the supply, it is felt that the risk to the public has been minimized, and with likely further damage to the roof lessened the roof may largely fulfil its function for some time yet. In the meantime, further inquiries could be made of the District Council of Le Hunte, the Ramblers golf club or any other party to see whether anyone is interested in taking over control by entering into an agreement to lease the tank. I might add that the Water Conservation Committee, after considering the whole matter, recommended resumption of the tank and this was subsequently approved. If, however, there is any interest shown in leasing the supply and satisfactory arrangements can be made, the committee would be prepared to reconsider the matter of resumption.

FOOT-ROT.

Mr. RODDA: I understand there has been a flare-up of foot-rot in Western Australia, although some property owners have brought the disease under control. Fears have been expressed that a more virulent form of the disease has developed. In view of the success of the eradication programme conducted in this State and the low number of properties now under quarantine, can the Minister of Agriculture say whether it is intended to enforce the provisions of the Act to require the slaughter of diseased sheep and to provide for the owners of properties to be informed when a neighbour's property is placed under quarantine because of foot-rot?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I greatly appreciate the honourable member's laudatory remarks about the department's actions regarding foot-rot. As he has raised the matter again, I will obtain a report and let him have it.

SWIMMING POOL.

Mr. COUMBE: Did the Premier have discussions last week with the Lord Mayor and members of the Adelaide City Council about the establishment of a swimming pool in the north park lands near Prospect? If this conference was held, can he say whether any final decision was reached about the project so that we can get on with the establishment of this large swimming centre in Adelaide?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I had a conference with the Lord Mayor and representatives of the Adelaide City Council. They put to me a new proposition on the subject of a swimming centre in the north park lands, and that is currently being examined. This will involve work by the Public Buildings Department. As soon as the examination has been completed, I will take the matter to Cabinet for a decision. Therefore, I hope that we may be able to get a decision shortly.

RED SCALE.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I understand that the Minister of Agriculture has received a petition from Loxton citrus growers about the area not being continued to be declared a red scale district. Has the Minister reached a decision on the request contained in that petition?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Although I have received petitions on the matter, I have not reached a final decision.

NARACOORTE BUILDINGS.

Mr. RODDA: Agriculture Department staff at Naracoorte are extremely crowded in the leased premises they occupy. Further, Lands Department officers and other public servants occupy leased properties at Naracoorte. Therefore, can the Minister of Works say whether the Government has any plans for purchasing land and erecting a block of Government offices at Naracoorte?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am not aware that Government officers are working in crowded conditions at Naracoorte. I have no knowledge of any plans to build a Government office block there.

HIGHWAYS BUILDING.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Has the Minister of Lands obtained a reply from the Minister of Roads to my recent question whether the expenditure on the new Highways building would qualify, under the Commonwealth Act, for the purpose of a matching grant?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague reports that the expenditure incurred in the duplication of the Highways administrative building will not be regarded by the Commonwealth Government as road expenditure for the purpose of determining this State's additional matching grant under the provisions of the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act, 1964. However, the expected expenditure on road-works from State funds during the period of construction of the building will be sufficient for South Australia to qualify for the full matching grant.

HIGHBURY SEWERAGE.

Mrs. BYRNE: After the Engineering and Water Supply Department had sent correspondence to residents of Beckman Avenue, Highbury, asking that an easement of 12ft. be granted to provide sewerage at the rear of the blocks concerned, on May 3 I wrote to the Minister of Works suggesting an alternative proposal. Can the Minister now inform me of the result of the investigation made?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Following the representations made by the honourable member, the Director and Engineer-in-Chief has informed me that departmental officers conferred with officers of the Tea Tree Gully District Council, who advised that the council no longer required the drainage easement at the rear of properties in Mitchell Avenue. As there will be no difficulty in transferring the

proposed sewer to this easement, the department will now negotiate with the council to take over the easement and with the Mitchell Avenue landowners for the easement rights. This will, of course, eliminate the original proposal to acquire sewerage easements through the Beckman Avenue properties.

CRUDE OIL.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about the supply of crude oil to the Port Stanvac refinery?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I told the honourable member yesterday that I had the reply available, but I am sorry that I do not seem to have it at the moment. As soon as I can find it, I will give it to the honourable member.

SCHOOL WINDOWS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: During the debate on the Supplementary Estimates I asked the Minister of Education whether he was satisfied still that school windows did not need to be cleaned, but when he replied on several other matters he did not reply to that particular question. I waited until he presented his report, which he did yesterday, and I diligently scanned that report to see whether there was any clue to his attitude on the matter in it, but I can find no mention of this topic in the report, although it has been one of considerable public interest in the past 12 months. As many months have now elapsed since his decision that school windows need not be cleaned; as, so far as I am aware, no arrangements have been made by him or by his department for their cleaning; and as we are now past the middle of the year and into winter, is the Minister of Education still satisfied that windows at the schools do not need to be cleaned?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: So far I have received no evidence that the windows do need cleaning. As a matter of fact, it is because it does not seem to be a matter of such great importance as the honourable member would try to lead us to think that it is not included in the report. I am not sure whether I advised the honourable member of this before, but I believe I have mentioned that in the many schools I have visited the subject has not been raised by representatives of the parents' committees with whom I discuss all sorts of school questions, and I am satisfied that the education of our children is not suffering on account of our policy in this direction, whereas we are saving \$240,000 a year.

NAILSWORTH SCHOOLS.

Mr. COUMBE: I have previously by way of questions and correspondence requested the Minister of Education to investigate the possibility of providing more accommodation at the Nailsworth schools, of which there are three on an area of only a few acres. When I last made a request on this matter in February the Minister told me that certain properties were for sale and that negotiations were proceeding with a view to purchase. Will he kindly obtain a report for me indicating what progress has been made since February and what properties can be purchased to increase the size of this very congested area?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to obtain as much information as I can for the honourable member. However, if we are negotiating for the purchase of a property it is sometimes not advisable in the public interest to advertise all the details.

GRAIN STOCKS.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Has the Minister of Agriculture a report for me about grain stocks on Eyre Peninsula for possible use as stock feed?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The present stocks of barley held on Eyre Peninsula amount to over 500,000 bushels of No. 2 grade and about 21,000 bushels of feed barley. These stocks will be held until there is a clear indication of seasonal prospects. It is understood that the Australian Wheat Board is holding considerable stocks of wheat, including "off-grade" grain on Eyre Peninsula.

SUPERANNUATION.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In May of this year I was approached by a constituent who had just retired from a Government department. That person is, of course, now receiving superannuation. He retired on March 29 of this year, and on April 20 a marginal award increase was gazetted and made retrospective to February 6, so that he retired on one date and subsequently an increase was gazetted and made retrospective to a date before his retirement. Had he not retired this would have entitled him to an increase in superannuation, as the Premier will understand. However, he has not received an increase in superannuation, because of the gazettal after the date of his retirement. He approached me and I took the matter up with the Premier's predecessor (Hon. Frank Walsh), who examined it and replied to me on May 26, enclosing a copy of the report from the

Manager and Secretary of the Superannuation Fund Board. This merely said that because of an opinion given some years ago by the Crown Solicitor it was not possible for the payment to be made. In view of the obvious unfairness of this mere chance in the date of gazettal of the increase, my constituent misses out on the part of the superannuation payment that he would otherwise be entitled to receive. Therefore, will the Premier look at this matter himself, now that he has come into office, with a view to correcting what is, as I say, an unfair situation?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will examine the matter.

WINNS ROAD.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Last week I asked the Minister of Lands whether he would be kind enough to take up with the Minister of Roads the question of the future of Winns Road at Blackwood. Yesterday he told me that he had an answer to my question, but unfortunately I did not get an opportunity to ask it then. Will he now give the answer to that question?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Unfortunately, when the honourable member asked, I think, six or seven questions yesterday but did not see fit to ask this particular question (although I had notified him that I had the answer with me) I did not see fit to carry the answer in my bag today. However, I shall see whether I can obtain it for the honourable member.

JUVENILE COURT.

Mr. HALL: In view of the recent publicity about the publication of evidence given in the Juvenile Court, can the Premier say whether the Government intends to go ahead during this session with the Evidence Act Amendment Bill, which it introduced during a previous session?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader will have seen the Governor's Deputy's Speech. There will not be time during this session to deal with the amendments to the Evidence Act.

TEACHERS' INSURANCE.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Last week I asked the Minister of Education a question about the possibility of insurance payments being deducted from teachers' salaries. The Minister has been kind enough to inform me today that he has an answer and I consider that I should ask him to give it, in view of the responses from two other Ministers today. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes. I appreciate the honourable member's asking me the question, in view of the fact that I had

told him that I had a reply. I remind him that about, I think, a week ago I told him that I had an answer to a question that he had asked, but I rather fancy that he did not ask the question because the answer did not suit him.

When the honourable member provided me with the name of the company concerned, I ascertained that this company had made inquiries of the Education Department a few weeks ago and was advised to address any application it wished to make to the Chief Secretary, the authority to permit insurance premiums to be collected by deductions from paysheets. The company concerned is not included in the present approved list, and I understand that no application has yet been received in the Chief Secretary's Office.

TORRENS PARK ROADS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have frequently travelled up the Old Belair Road at Torrens Park. The junctions of the Old Belair Road with Muggs Hill Road (Thomas Mugg was the first schoolmaster there) and of Muggs Hill Road with Blythewood Road are most dangerous, especially because of the volume of traffic.

Mr. Hurst: Question!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Don't be so absolutely absurd! Is the fellow mad?

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must ask his question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am going to ask it, Mr. Speaker. In view of the dangerous nature of these two junctions, which are about 100 yards apart, and in view of the suggestions I have heard that plans are afoot to improve this particular area, will the Minister of Lands be kind enough to ask his colleague the Minister of Roads to furnish him with details of what is proposed and when it is proposed to do the work?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: CLOUD SEEDING

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture): I ask leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: This statement arises from a question asked by the Leader of the Opposition last week about cloud seeding, when he said that I had given little attention to this matter. I want to prove to him and to the House that I and my department have given much attention to

the matter. Questions have also been asked by the member for Frome (Mr. Casey), the member for Ridley (Hon. T. C. Stott), and the member for Angas (Hon. B. H. Teusner) and all the questions have received much attention. In addition, before the questions were asked, the department had been active in this regard. I wish to comment further, particularly in regard to the question asked by the member for Ridley.

The correspondence referred to was from Mr. J. J. Saddleir. It paints a completely misleading picture of what happened in the north-western area of Victoria on June 9 and June 10. It is true that valuable falls of rain were recorded at 9 a.m. on June 10, as follows:

	Points.
Mildura	40
Swan Hill	65
Ouyen	79
Berriwillock	52
Kerang	28
Echuca	76
Charlton	64

However, it is quite incorrect to say that cloud seeding operations were carried out in the area on June 9. No seeding at all was done on that day. This information has been obtained from the Department of Agriculture in Melbourne. Cloud seeding operations were carried out on June 10—after the above falls had been recorded. It should also be noted that the nearest point to Mildura that was seeded was about 80 miles downwind. The above centres recorded only small falls after seeding took place on June 10. The highest falls subsequent to seeding were 70 points at Seymour and 50 at Benalla—centres that are a considerable distance from the seeding area.

It is unfortunate that misinformation of this kind is being circulated at a time when all men on the land are ready to seize anything that may be of help to them. While it is not possible to point to any specific result of cloud seeding, it must be pointed out again that the almost complete absence of suitable clouds in Victoria, namely, clouds of sufficient height and low enough temperature, has seriously limited cloud seeding activities this year. In regard to the rain in Perth, referred to by the member for Angas (Hon. B. H. Teusner), it is understood from an officer of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization that the cloud seeding project in Western Australia has the object of increasing rainfall in the reservoir catchment area east of the Darling Ranges. It would not be expected to influence Perth rainfall at all.

The letter I wrote to the member for Ridley (Hon. T. C. Stott) which I said last Thursday I would quote reads as follows:

1. Suitable aircraft: The main requirements are high rate of climb, high ceiling (about 20,000ft.), maximum cruising speed of about 180 to 200 knots, ability to tolerate prolonged icing conditions and capability of carrying a load of some 800 lb. for periods of up to four hours a flight, two flights a day. There are light twin-engined aircraft in Australia which, while not regarded as being ideal, are satisfactory.

2. Cloud-seeding equipment: The actual "seeding" operation consists of releasing inside or just underneath the clouds to be seeded a mass of silver iodide particles. These are produced by a generator which burns a solution of silver and sodium iodide in acetone. This quite sophisticated equipment has been developed by C.S.I.R.O.

3. Trained personnel: Quite apart from a competent pilot and the necessary general organization of cloud-seeding activities, the operation depends very largely on the work of the cloud-seeding officer. This officer "lives on the job", and it is his responsibility to examine all likely-looking clouds, to decide whether or not seeding is justified and, if so, to supervise the seeding operation. This includes the navigation of the aircraft, the choice of height to fly and the operation of the generator. This is a demanding task which cannot be undertaken by anyone who has not received the necessary specialized training.

4. Ancillary equipment: This includes special radio and navigational aids and oxygen equipment. The chief limiting factors preventing a cloud-seeding operation in South Australia this year are the non-availability of cloud-seeding equipment and of trained personnel. Steps to remedy these deficiencies were not attempted earlier because it was the opinion of the specialists in C.S.I.R.O. (based on earlier trials in South Australia) that the prospects for successful cloud-seeding in this State were poor. Earlier this year the Chief of the Division of Radiophysics indicated that there had been a change of opinion in this matter and he suggested that consideration might be given to carrying out a cloud-seeding project in 1968, if the results of 1967 trials in Victoria again were promising. The decision has now been made, regardless of what results might be achieved in Victoria, to embark on such a project. It is apparent, therefore, that no reasonable opportunity has been lost to enter this field as speedily as possible.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on the motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 4. Page 351.)

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): I support the motion and join other members in conveying my expressions of loyalty and congratulations to those who merit them, including you, Mr. Speaker. I also express my sympathy to the families and friends of deceased members. It

is usually expected that members, during this debate, will make at least a fleeting reference to His Excellency's Speech, in order to link up with Standing Orders and to conform to custom, and I am afraid that on this occasion my reference cannot be other than fleeting.

I listened intently to His Excellency reading the Speech prepared very carefully for this occasion by the Government. I have some knowledge at first hand of the slump in certain industries and of the extent of unemployment and I wanted to find out what plans the Government had for improving this position and what announcements were to be made about positive action to remedy this position. However, as I said the other day, I listened in vain, as did many guests in the gallery. Also, hundreds of people outside wanted to read in the newspaper on the next day what the Government was doing to help those having difficulty in industry or in gaining employment. I suggest that many of these are former Labor supporters.

We ask ourselves what was in the Speech. We had to wade through padding as far as paragraph 9 before coming to any matter of substance. I am not casting a reflection about rural and other matters dealt with in the preceding paragraphs, but I am referring to getting down to the question of what the Government intends to do. I, being one who has followed with much interest the mining exploration in this State, was pleased to read of the increase in mineral production. Both the output and the value of that output were records. I commend the work undertaken by both the Department of Mines and the private companies concerned.

It is interesting to read of the development that is taking place in mining fields throughout Australia today, such as in north Queensland, in Western Australia and in Tasmania. Examples are Mount Tom Price, the Hammersley Ranges, and the iron ore deposits in Tasmania. Unfortunately, it seems that South Australia does not enjoy rich mineral deposits, with the exception of those being exploited at present, whereas new discoveries are being made in other parts of Australia. As I have said before, I should like more emphasis placed on the activities of the Mines Department in this State so that the department would be able to undertake a more intensive search for minerals. I understand that interesting developments in regard to copper have been announced and I consider that the department, which has equipment and capable staff, ought to be given as much encouragement as

possible to find and develop resources for the benefit of the State.

Fortunately, we have in South Australia a great connection with the mining industry in Australia through Australian Mineral Development Laboratories at Parkside. That organization does a great service to the industry and I hope that the suggestions that have been made, including those made last year, will bear fruit. Last week, when the Premier was replying to Opposition criticism, he accused members on this side of the House of knocking South Australia. It is quickly and patently clear from my place in the House that the Premier is very sensitive on this point and does not appear to be able to take criticism of himself. The Opposition intends to continue criticizing actions of the Government that it thinks are not in the best interests of this State. To many people it appears that the Government itself is knocking South Australia, so it is the duty of this Opposition to point out to the people just where the policies of the present Labor Government have brought us.

It is interesting to recall that it is only some eight short months since the last Commonwealth elections for the House of Representatives, which resulted in a landslide victory for the Liberals. The people of Australia on that occasion voted in a most dramatic way because they had had enough of the Labor leaders and that Party's outmoded ideas. Why was it that throughout Australia there was a rise in the national vote against Labor? Further, why was it in South Australia, and only in South Australia, that there was double this rate of rise? I read in the paper shortly after the Commonwealth election that many Labor leaders in this State and officers in the Trades Hall, including Mr. Virgo, were trying to think up excuses to explain away this reverse. The main reason for this was that the people of South Australia for the first time for many years had experienced a Labor Government in office, so they showed at the polls their resentment of this Government's administration. This resentment, I say seriously, is growing day by day against the present Government because of, on the one hand, its action regarding legislation and, on the other hand, its inaction regarding industry. So we saw in the House last week and the previous week the reaction of the Government.

The new Premier since the very day he came to office has adopted a scheme of tactics. He appears to have launched a two-pronged attack on the Opposition, plainly designed to cover up his administration's shortcomings and

divert attention from his problems. It is patently clear to us on this side of the House the way these attacks are forming up. The first one was a personal attack on Sir Thomas Playford and his integrity as the Treasurer of this State for many years. I do not think the present Treasurer will get very far with that line. The second one was to blame the Commonwealth Government for all that had gone wrong in this State. Of course, that latter remark was made in this House by the Premier; also, it was made outside the House, it was repeated on television and radio, and it has been contained in pamphlets circulated in various electoral districts of this State by the Labor Party. They are saying this continually. In fact, in this debate the Premier's faithful acolytes sitting behind him have, one after the other, repeated this theme, even as recently as last night. It is apparent that the message has gone out for everybody in the Labor Party to take every possible opportunity of saying, "Blame the Commonwealth". Referring to the speeches already made by members of the Government Party in this debate, I listened last night to the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) who on this occasion really excelled himself, though I believe that, regrettably, he brought this debate down to one of the lowest levels I have ever known in the 11 or 12 years I have been in this House. I regret his remarks on this same theme.

The Labor Government, and the Premier in particular, when blaming the Commonwealth Government, are silent about what that Government is spending in South Australia. I need not elaborate that. It is significant (I emphasize this) to recall that this criticism or this hymn of hate did not commence until after South Australia had secured Commonwealth financial assistance for its natural gas pipeline. At that time, members will recall, we were asking the Commonwealth Government to assist us with grants to help us establish that natural gas pipeline. Not a word of criticism was heard until that point. But, the moment the Commonwealth Treasury said, "Right; we will help you in this", the criticism started in earnest; but the Premier is completely silent on these other funds coming from the Commonwealth. One particular aspect of Commonwealth activities on which the Premier is completely silent affects the Minister of Education. I know that that Minister appreciates what the Commonwealth is doing in this regard. Leaving aside the normal grants (amounting to millions of dollars) that

the Commonwealth makes for education and to help the universities and the Institute of Technology, the Commonwealth Government has given total funds towards the building of many tertiary education institutions in this State, and it proposes to finance fully the present building at the Roseworthy Agricultural College. In other words, the whole of the funds required there will come from the Commonwealth. Further, it proposes to finance entirely the building of the new Northern Teachers College at Elizabeth, but not a word has been said about this help.

The Commonwealth is also providing all the funds (not on a subsidy basis but all the funds) for the new technical colleges being built at both Port Augusta and Whyalla. Also, it has repaid to the State a large proportion of the money spent on the new building recently completed for the Radio and Electrical Trades School near Kilkenny. It will also pay for the new trades school at Laurel Park. I mention those things, which are new ventures by the Commonwealth Government, to point out that in regard to buildings these projects alone will amount to more than the suggested or alleged decrease in the Commonwealth building to which members on the other side of this House have drawn attention. What is happening is that for political reasons, and for political reasons alone, the Government chooses or has chosen to ignore these substantial funds being spent here. Very little publicity is being given to the fact that the Commonwealth is paying for these things. One of them is in your district, Mr. Speaker. I know you appreciate the foundation of that institution in your area. I emphasize that this is over and above the normal university and Institute of Technology building grants on a subsidy basis. My question earlier today to the Minister of Education was germane, insofar as the Commonwealth has announced a 40 per cent increase this year, from \$82,000,000 to \$115,000,000 throughout Australia, which is a substantial grant. We do not hear a word from the State Government in that regard or any publicity or propaganda for Party political purposes.

I turn now to the part of His Excellency's Speech dealing with finance. I assure honourable members that I shall not refer to the figures that have been manipulated, as they have been handled by other speakers before me. I shall not weary the House with repetition. Rather, I shall refer to one particular phrase in the Speech dealing with finance, appearing in paragraph 37, which is as follows:

The continued low level of economic activity throughout Australia has affected adversely a wide section of industry in South Australia and this has had secondary effects in reducing Government revenues.

The Premier, in effect, said that the position in South Australia was caused by reduced business activity throughout the remainder of Australia. This argument is the basis for his excuses in this connection. If this condition applies should we take his premise seriously? Is it true? It is pertinent for Opposition members to query his statement, because every State except South Australia seems to be expanding. This statement calls for close examination. Let us examine the housing industry. It is an Australia-wide industry reflecting sharply the activities and prosperity in any one or more of the States, and it affects a large section of the community because it is a basic industry. With this industry as an example we can obtain a fair cross-section of conditions in Australia today.

In South Australia there has been a dramatic reduction in the number of housing approvals and completions, with unemployment in the housing trades. These changes show a marked contrast to the national level and, incidentally they have occurred in the last two years, the period during which the Labor Government has been in office. The position should be compared on a national basis to emphasize the flimsy pretext the Premier used in His Excellency's Speech, which stated that this State's downturn was due to Australia-wide conditions.

I should like to quote from the June, 1967, official publication of the Economic Research Committee of the Housing Industry Association of Australia, which pictures the position in the building industry in each State. It seems that throughout the Commonwealth, except in South Australia, this industry is flourishing. In Western Australia and Tasmania shortages in skilled labour and materials are already occurring. Western Australia is trying to recruit labour from overseas and from other States, especially for the carpentry and bricklaying trades.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: It is getting some from here.

Mr. COUMBE: Of course. So that my facts will be correct, I quote from this publication which, when discussing State levels and rate of dwelling commencements, states:

In Victoria and N.S.W. the increase may be about 6 per cent to 7 per cent and in Queensland slightly less (3 per cent to 4 per cent). Commencements in South Australia in

1967 are likely to be 25 per cent below 1966; in Tasmania 20 per cent above; and in W.A. 15 per cent above.

In Tasmania these figures have been affected by the extraordinary position resulting from the recent fires, because much reconstruction is necessary. On page 6, the publication states:

N.S.W. activity up: the improvement in dwelling construction in New South Wales during the December quarter 1966 has continued, with approvals and commencements well above those of the same period last year. The rise in commencements was particularly strong in flats.

Victoria buoyant: The increase in orders in Victoria for the December quarter 1966 has levelled off recently. Commencements have increased strongly however, reflecting the big increase in orders late in 1966. Builders generally reported expectations of a 5 per cent to 10 per cent rise in activity from 1966 levels.

Queensland variable: the number of building permits issued in Queensland increased slightly in 1967 as against those of the same period 12 months ago, and commencements rose by about 8 per cent. The increase in housing approvals was better, and housing commencements considerably better, than in flats. Completions were about 10 per cent higher than in the March quarter 1966.

Slump in S.A.: the position in South Australia has continued to deteriorate as predicted in earlier surveys. The number of new houses and flats commenced in the March quarter 1967 was 2,000 as against 2,600 in the March quarter 1966. Figures for completions were 2,245 as against 2,719. Approvals for the first 4 months of 1967 were 2,119 as against 2,963 in the same period of 1966.

These figures present a very depressing picture and recent approvals suggest most difficult conditions for the future. Private builders are very pessimistic about prospects, because finance is very scarce. This situation is in direct contrast to better results and prospects in the other States. The decline in housing construction in South Australia, which will obviously worsen, has affected the whole economy. Employment has fallen in building and construction by nearly 2,000 men (8 per cent) and production of building materials and fittings has fallen markedly.

Boom in W.A.: approvals and commencements have increased strongly in Western Australia this year, confirming the trends reported in earlier surveys. The recent increase has been almost entirely in flats which are now rising rapidly. Western Australia, which had previously built far fewer homes than South Australia, appears likely to exceed the latter's building rate in 1967. Builders expect nearly 20 per cent more dwellings to be commenced in W.A. this year than in 1966, and there is a big demand for rental and low-cost homes.

I receive no enjoyment from reading these statistics, especially those showing South Australia in a bad light. I do it deliberately to

show the Government and the people of South Australia that the position in this State has deteriorated so markedly, rapidly, and suddenly, and to highlight the premise of the Premier when he said that conditions here were not good because conditions in other States were bad. If the Premier had been honest and had said that they were bad here because of the policies that had been put into operation, we would have believed it. We cannot go along with what the Premier is blaming on the other States. The retail sales and indices of business activity in the other States confirm my contention.

Further to this subject of housing, last week I asked the Minister of Housing, on notice, how many Housing Trust houses and flats were vacant. The answer was that 517 were vacant. I was aghast when I heard this figure, because I regarded this seriously. Never in the history of South Australia have we had so many vacant Housing Trust houses: it is an all-time record. The answer I received stated that most of these vacant houses were at Elizabeth and Smithfield Plains.

It has also been suggested in some quarters (I read it in the newspapers) that the number could be greater; somebody said that the number could be tripled because of the number of Housing Trust houses that are being left unfinished. However, be that as it may, I am dealing now with figures officially given by the Minister. The number of vacant Housing Trust houses is 517 and, apart from the sociological aspect, at a conservative estimate this represents an investment to the State of over \$4,000,000, which is lying idle, and an annual interest payment of \$200,000. This great sum will have a direct bearing upon the rentals that tenants will be called upon to pay in the future.

All members of this House (not only metropolitan members but also country members) have for years had to go along on behalf of constituents to make representations to the Housing Trust in an effort to obtain a Housing Trust allocation, and they have had to wait for years and years in some cases to get a prospective tenant into a house—yet suddenly we find that we have this number of vacant houses!

Many people still want houses, and a number of the houses wanted are of the rental-purchase type, but people simply do not have the money to pay a deposit, or they are not prepared to go as far as Smithfield, or they cannot find the necessary money for rent. Some of these houses are the \$100-deposit type.

I am very much concerned about this figure of 517 houses. Never before in the history of South Australia have we had so many vacant Housing Trust houses, and I would be the first to be delighted if every house were filled tomorrow. This position has occurred only since we have had a Labor Government in office in this State.

Let us go a little further into this subject of the building industry, which is made up of many trades, organizations and suppliers. Probably one of the most basic commodities in any house building project is bricks. There are brickmakers in many areas: the Minister of Works represents one such area; there are brickmakers at Golden Grove in the District of Barossa; there are brickmakers in the District of Angas, and in other parts of the metropolitan area and the country.

I did some research on this subject, because bricks are such a basic commodity, and their manufacturers used to employ many men. The Commonwealth Statistician's publication *Monthly Bulletin of Production Statistics* shows, not what the Premier would have us believe but that brick production has increased all over Australia except in this State. National production is up, but production is down in South Australia. This shows that bricks are being bought for industrial building requirements, and factories are being built. Industrialists could do this only if their businesses were expanding and flourishing. (I recall now that there is a brickyard in your district, Mr. Speaker.)

South Australia normally produces over 10 per cent of the Commonwealth total bricks, because traditionally a larger proportion of solid-construction houses is built in South Australia than in the other States because of our shortage of timber. The industry in South Australia has been greatly modernized over recent years, and it is conservatively estimated that there has been a capital expenditure of over \$10,000,000 in this industry by various private companies. Due to the current slump in the building industry, the employment rate in brickyards has unfortunately shown a dramatic drop. Compared with January 1, 1965 (when employment was running at a high level because of a steady demand for bricks for houses), on June 16, 1967, the number of dismissals from brickyards in this State has been 273 in two years; in other words, 30 per cent of the previous work force has been dismissed from South Australian brickyards, and all because of this slump in the building industry. This

is a fairly serious statement; I am giving the official figures. I am reliably informed that, if this trend continues over the next few months, more men will be put off, unfortunately. Further, some smaller brickyards run by individuals and small private companies will be forced to close down altogether.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: There has been a large accumulation of bricks.

Mr. COUNBE: Stocks have been built up because the brick manufacturer, through lack of orders, has kept his men on as long as possible by building up stocks of bricks. In fact, I have official figures to illustrate this. The following table shows the sales of bricks over the corresponding period:

November, 1964 . . .	12,700,000 bricks a year
November, 1965 . . .	10,600,000 bricks a year
November, 1966 . . .	9,800,000 bricks a year

At June, 1967, sales were running at the annual rate of only 8,400,000 bricks a year. This shows a dramatic drop of 33 per cent in output. The member for Angas referred to stocks of bricks, and I can give figures on this subject. If members go to any brickyard they will have a job to get into it because bricks are stacked everywhere—even on roadways and paths. The stocks of bricks at grass represent an interesting comparison: at December 31, 1964, only 1,930,000 bricks were held at grass in South Australia (because at that time vast quantities of bricks were being sent out on orders). However, at June 16, 1967, almost 14,000,000 were at grass. That indicates the fact that brickmakers have tried to retain staff for as long as possible, having manufactured the bricks and put them out at grass.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: They have continued manufacturing a normal year's supply.

Mr. COUNBE: The record output of bricks in December, 1964, was 12,700,000. Even if the building industry were to resume at full bore right at this moment, more than a full year's supply of bricks would be in stock. It gives me no joy to refer to this situation but, in the light of the Premier's contention, it must be emphasized. I agree entirely with the comments made by the member for West Torrens (Mr. Broomhill) on solid-construction houses as against brick-veneer houses. I agree, too, that in some localities, because of the suspect nature of the soil, brick-veneer houses must be constructed. However, wherever possible, I believe that solid-construction houses should be built: they last better, look better, and are instrumental in

providing more local employment. In addition, in reply to a question I asked of the former Premier (Hon. Frank Walsh) last session, I was informed that the construction of brick-veneer houses did not result in a saving.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: That's right, but it does in regard to maintenance.

Mr. COUNBE: I was referring to building, and the reply given to me indicated that there was no saving in cost through building houses of brick-veneer. I entirely agree with the member for West Torrens that wherever possible the Housing Trust, and certainly private builders, should engage in erecting solid-construction houses. I imagine that much less maintenance is necessary on a brick house than on one of brick veneer.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: That does not apply where the house is built on unreliable ground.

Mr. COUNBE: Under certain conditions, brick-veneer houses must be built. I have been referring to the point on which the Premier hangs his whole financial argument, namely, that South Australia is suffering from the depressed conditions (as he alleges) being experienced in other States. I suggest that that is a fallacious argument and that the conditions from which we are suffering today have not arisen from conditions being experienced in other parts of Australia which, indeed, seem to be booming. I suggest that South Australia's present conditions are the result of the follies and policies of the State Labor Government. Indeed, I repeat that present conditions have arisen only over the last two years and, of course, over that period the State has been administered (I will not say "governed") by a Labor Government.

Mr. Ryan: It will be the same Government after the next election.

Mr. COUNBE: The people at the last Commonwealth election did not think so. We witnessed twice as heavy a poll in South Australia against the Labor Party as the poll on the basis of the national total, simply because the people at the 1965 State election, having elected a Labor Government, had lived in this State long enough to find out how wrong they had been in putting the Labor Government into office. At the first possible chance, the people were able to indicate their resentment.

Mr. Broomhill: What happened in New South Wales and Victoria?

Mr. COUNBE: The Victorian position has been mentioned previously, but I point out that Sir Henry Bolte's Government was recently returned.

Mr. Langley: With the aid of another Party.

Mr. COUMBE: People are often quick to find an excuse. Indeed, just after the last Commonwealth election, Labor members were trying to explain away the heavy defeat and trying to ascertain why Labor's Commonwealth representation in this State had been decimated. We now have eight Liberal and three Labor members in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Jennings: You aren't counting Jonesey as one, are you?

Mr. COUMBE: I point out that the member for Enfield is referring to his Commonwealth member; the honourable member is an elector of the State District of Torrens, as well as of the Commonwealth District of Adelaide. Much has been said about industrial development and expansion. The Premier, after his election to office (on which election, incidentally, I congratulate him) made some extremely interesting announcements. Indeed, some announcements he has made since then have been even more interesting. I would welcome any action on industrial development. Indeed, I shall be most intrigued to see how the Premier's suggestions work out. His announcements are completely opposite to the attitude of the previous Labor Government led by the Hon. Frank Walsh. Members on this side suggested similar action in regard to industrial expansion by way of a motion last year. However, our suggestions were opposed on that occasion. Why was not the action that is now proposed taken previously? I point out that the Premier is now saying exactly what we said 12 months ago. Why do we now have the sudden change of a principle in which the previous Administration believed? Last year when we emphasized the need to create a special department to attract industry to the State the then Premier said that we were wrong: everything in his department (especially the section relating to industrial development) was going along nicely.

However, the present Premier has said that things are not going along so nicely, and that we must double the industry section of the Premier's Department. What we need in this State (and what we said we needed last year) is a well-staffed department under a particular Minister, with an experienced and outstanding director who has an industrial background and the confidence of industry and commerce. I am sure that, if such a department were set up, many of the Premier's suggestions could be implemented. What about the advisory committee for industry that was suggested by the Leader of the Opposition only two weeks ago?

Industrialists immediately said that they would be happy to co-operate with the Government; they desired to come on to such a committee and help in South Australia's development. What has happened to this idea? We have not heard a word about it. Is that because it was not a suggestion that the Premier was able to think of, or is it because it was a suggestion our Leader made? Today the Leader has given notice of a motion on these lines so that a debate can ensue on this matter. Another matter that is dealt with in passing in His Excellency's Speech is that of natural gas. Why has a delay occurred; why are no rigs drilling now at Moomba or Gidgealpa; and why is no further exploration taking place to develop the reserves at that field?

Parliamentary Paper 102, which was laid on the table of this House on November 17, 1966, deals with the submission to the Commonwealth Government from South Australia in respect of finance for a natural gas pipeline. The paper is an official publication, and I assume that the comments made in it are the official views of the Government. At page 1 of the document appears the following:

Whilst the availability of 600 billion cubic feet of deliverable reserves is almost certainly adequate for a viable project, it does appear that to give complete assurance of economic exploitation all planning should be based upon the deliverability of at least 750 billion cubic feet of gas, but retaining maximum flexibility in planning so as to permit subsequent adjustments to provide for handling much greater quantities. The producers accordingly will be expected to proceed forthwith to further development drilling, and it is intended not to commit any extensive funds for the pipeline, by actual calling of tenders, until sufficient drilling is completed to confirm deliverability of at least 750 billion cubic feet. This stage should be reached by January, 1967.

Yesterday, a question was asked of the Premier on this matter by the member for Onkaparinga. The Premier replied that in Gidgealpa there are deliverable reserves (this means proven reserves) of 460 billion cubic feet and at Moomba 170 billion cubic feet, making a total of 630 billion cubic feet, and he said that the project was to proceed.

Why this sudden change of figures? I express concern at this, because the 750 billion cubic feet was the official submission by the South Australian Government to the Commonwealth for funds. The Commonwealth Government made funds available to South Australia to proceed with this project, but I repeat that no funds will be committed to the project, by tendering, until reserves of at least 750

billion cubic feet are confirmed. The Premier said that he was going ahead with 630 billion cubic feet, and that this would be done by further drilling to prove the position. I should have thought that it would have been in the interests of this or any other Government to get on as quickly as possible with the exploration work to prove further reserves in the area. I should have thought this would have been a prime move by any Government: to ensure that these further reserves were there. This stage should have been reached by January, 1967. It is now July, 1967, however, and this drilling has not been proceeded with. Unfortunately, the last hole drilled was not up to expectations; the output from it was a little disappointing. I should like the Government to proceed with this exploration and developmental work as quickly as possible, so the State can be assured of these further supplies. What has happened since the House last met? Parliament passed a Bill that set up the authority to construct and operate the pipeline. Members of the pipeline authority have been named, and the authority has met. The day before the first meeting of the authority the Government published a notice in the *Government Gazette* proclaiming the route of the pipeline, so the authority could not make any recommendations to the Government as to the route of the pipeline.

It is now 12 months since the first negotiations were conducted between the producers and the larger consumers. (By the "larger consumers" I mean the Electricity Trust, the South Australian Gas Company, and some large private concerns.) Up to the present, the trust has not signed. I do not wish to get into this argument: it has been canvassed fully by previous speakers and in questions asked yesterday and today. However, whereas in the official document it is stated that gas would be delivered to Adelaide or the city gate by January, 1969, it cannot possibly be here until about June or July, 1969, because even if everything goes right and tenders are let for the construction of the treatment plant to be installed by the producers at the field, it is estimated that it will take 23 months from the time of letting tenders until the treatment plant has been completed: that will mean about July, 1969, at the earliest.

I understand that the gas could be used in Adelaide as soon as it is made available, whether or not the trust signs the agreement at this time. The Government is depending on the trust for the bulk of the demand. I suggest to the Government that this delay

should be ended, and that it should get on with the job of seeing that further exploration work is done at the field to ensure that these extra reserves exist.

There are three small matters in my own district on which I should like to see progress. The swimming centre, referred to earlier, is to be constructed in the north park lands. It was first suggested by Sir Thomas Playford and later supported by the Hon. Frank Walsh, and I am pleased to see that the present Premier has had discussions with the Lord Mayor and members of the Adelaide City Council on this matter. This project should be proceeded with.

The subject of metropolitan drainage interests many members of this House. I have heard some metropolitan members refer to this subject, which has been bandied around for three or four years. I can recall that Sir Thomas Playford, when Premier, said that a metropolitan drainage authority should be set up. This matter was subsequently dropped, but I am pleased to see that the Minister of Local Government is to call the mayors and chairmen of the metropolitan and near-metropolitan councils into consultation on July 21, to see whether some scheme can be worked out. The festival hall is to be built at North Adelaide, which is a part of the city of Adelaide, under the auspices of the Adelaide City Council. I have had the pleasure and honour of being a member of the Lord Mayor's Cultural Committee, which has been planning this hall since it was first mooted. Later you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, were added to that committee after the Festival Hall (City of Adelaide) Bill had been passed by this House. Recent discussions have shown that Carclew, North Adelaide, is an ideal site for this type of hall. Also, it is ideally situated for transport and car parking; in fact, no other area in the city of Adelaide has more space for car parking than will be available at this site. Furthermore, the aspect and outlook from the hall will be truly remarkable. The hall will be capable of being seen from a long distance, and its patrons will enjoy a splendid outlook.

It was also considered whether this should be a multi-purpose hall or a single-purpose hall. As members have learned from press articles, it is now to be a single-purpose hall, because other places are available in Adelaide for some of the performing arts which some people thought would have to use this hall. A rough design has been drawn and everything is ready to go except for that one essential

and always pressing ingredient—finance. We know what the City Council and the State Government are prepared to pay, and the Commonwealth Government is currently considering the matter. The balance must be provided by the public of South Australia. The other day somebody suggested that the balance should be raised through a lottery, but I do not think money should be raised in that way, as it was in Sydney, because we would be competing against our own State lottery. I do not think a lottery is the answer; I am sure that if an adequate public appeal is made the people of South Australia (knowing that this is a South Australian venture, not just a city venture) will provide finance. However, finance has to be provided fairly quickly, because we are not getting anywhere while Victoria is getting closer and closer to the completion of its cultural centre on St. Kilda Road.

Mr. Rodda: And what a building it is!

Mr. CUMBE: Yes, I appeal to all concerned, including the public, to get behind, both formally and financially, the City Council, the cultural committee and those responsible for the promotion of the hall so that it can be commenced and so that in South Australia we can have a hall worthy of the true traditions of a festival city and a festival State.

Mr. CURREN (Chaffey): I support the motion so ably moved and seconded by the member for Wallaroo and the member for Unley. I commend them for their speeches, both of which provided much food for thought. I join with other members in expressing condolences to the families of the Hon. R. S. Richards, the Hon. Dudley Octoman and Mr. Goldney, former members of this Parliament who died recently. Of the three, I knew only Dudley Octoman, for whom I had great respect. From what I have been told of the others, they were members of a high standard and much respected citizens of the State. I congratulate the Premier on attaining his high office. I am sure the good government of South Australia will be continued under his leadership as it was carried on in the last two years under the able leadership of the Hon. Frank Walsh.

In the past two years, members of the Ministry have performed a remarkable job in continuing, and in many cases improving, the work of the departments under their control. I am sure that in the remaining few months of the 38th Parliament their good work will be continued and will bear fruit (and grain I hope) for the benefit of the citizens of South Australia. I have not been greatly impressed

by the many speeches made by Opposition members since the commencement of the session. Although I am not greatly musical, I should class their efforts as being like the "Anvil Chorus"—the knockers doing everything possible to destroy confidence in South Australia. Members opposite never miss an opportunity to carry on what they consider to be the good work. I believe the people of South Australia have confidence in the present Government and that we, as members of the Government Party, can be proud of the achievements that have been ours in the short period in which we have been in office.

Paragraph 5 of the Governor's Deputy's Speech gives a brief summary of the valuable research and extension work being done by officers of the Agriculture Department. I am particularly interested in all aspects of the research being undertaken at the Loxton Research Centre in the fields of fertilizer trials, irrigation research, weedicide trials and, most importantly, in the work being done by Mr. Noel Richardson, an entomologist, to obtain suitable means of biological control of orchard pests, his main research being concentrated on red scale control and eradication methods. I believe the work being done by this capable officer will be of inestimable value to all citrus growers in South Australia, including me. As I have some red scale on my property, I know what a pest it is and what economic loss it causes to growers unfortunate enough to have it on their trees. Reference is made in paragraph 5 to the reason for the light crop of navel oranges this year. Opinions vary amongst growers about the prime cause of the considerable shedding of small oranges in November last year. The principal cause is considered by most growers to be the few days of extreme heat that occurred in late October, but a variety of other reasons have been given, namely, water salinity, overhead sprinklers, differing cultural practices, and so on. I will not express an opinion on what I consider to be the cause, because I am one of the fortunate (or good) growers, having had a reasonably good citrus crop this year.

I support the remarks of the member for Barossa (Mrs. Byrne) regarding the Roseworthy Agricultural College. I am most interested in and support her suggestion that a course in practical agriculture be established to provide training principally for primary producers' sons who wish to continue in that field of activity. Much discussion has taken place in recent years on the steps necessary to establish a horticultural college at Loxton in conjunction with the research centre already there.

This suggestion of the member for Barossa could well be a beginning for the fruitgrowing section of such a college. I now wish to refer to a field day that I attended on May 25 last at the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization research station, at Merbein in Victoria. This field day, on recent vine research, was organized by the Australian Dried Fruits Association. The research being done at this station at Merbein and at the viticultural research station in the Barossa Valley is of considerable importance.

The trials conducted at Merbein were centred mainly on sultanas. From the addresses given by the research officers it is quite apparent that the work they are doing will increase production quite markedly without adding to the costs of production: the cost of water and fertilizer and such other costs. These trials, known as clonal selection trials, consist merely of selecting the best vine that can be found and then breeding a line of vines from it. Some of the trials indicate that a 50 per cent increase in production can be attained by that process of breeding from these clonal selections.

I was particularly interested at this field day by the address given by a Mr. Rives, a visiting viticultural research scientist from France and one of the leading authorities in France on this subject. Following his address, one of the growers present asked him what increase in production he expected from his clonal selection trials, and he came up to the microphone and replied, "I don't expect; I get 100 per cent increase in production". When a research officer can stand up and say without fear of contradiction that he gets 100 per cent increase in production by this one process alone, that is of interest not only to the fruit-growers who will benefit when this is put into operation but to the State as a whole.

Mr. Quirke: Did he say anything about the method of the bud selection?

Mr. CURREN: An address was given by Mr. A. J. Antcliff, of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization's research centre at Merbein. I have a little booklet here dealing with selection and breeding and the work generally being done there. The opening paragraph in that booklet is as follows:

Results from sultana selection trials continue to confirm that there are differences between sultana vines which are maintained in vines propagated from them and that in selecting vines for high yield it is necessary to find the high yielding vines on any block rather than to take any vines on a high yielding block.

The research officers go for the best possible vine and breed from that. I know that similar work to that being done at Merbein is being carried on at the viticultural research centre in the Barossa Valley by Mr. H. W. Tulloch, who also gave an address at the field day to which I have just referred. A great deal of work is also being done through root stock trials to obtain root stocks that are resistant to nematodes. Work is being done on virus resistant stocks, too. This work will be of immense benefit to growers. The work being done in South Australia by Mr. Tulloch has been concentrated on wine grape varieties. This will also be of great benefit to the wine grapegrowing industry in South Australia, which represents about 80 per cent of the total Australian industry.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: Have you seen the book written by Mr. Boehm?

Mr. CURREN: I have heard of it, but I have not had time to read it. Paragraph 8 of His Excellency's Speech refers to the work of the Lands Department under the able administration of the present Minister, following the good work of previous Ministers of Lands. As the major portion of my district is served by this department in the supply of irrigation water and drainage works, this paragraph is of particular interest to me. I am constantly in touch with the Minister and his officers on the many problems that arise from time to time. It is our aim to improve water services to the highest possible level, and in this respect a great deal of work has been carried out in the past two years. The replacement of a considerable length of channelling with pipeline and the concrete lining of several miles of earth channel has been completed in the Ral Ral Division of the Chaffey irrigation area. At Berri, a section of the 120ft. channel has been piped, and the town water supply has been greatly improved by the installation of new pipes. Plans are well advanced for another elevated tank at Berri North, and it is hoped soon to find a builder for the surface storage tank for which tenders were recently called. Unfortunately, no tenders were received.

Regarding the town water supply at Barmera, I have recently suggested to the Minister of Lands and Irrigation that a new pump be installed at Cobdogla with a pipeline direct to the surface storage tank in the town of Barmera in order to give an adequate service to this rapidly expanding town for many years to come. On the way to Barmera,

water could be supplied to all properties adjacent to the Sturt Highway that now rely on individual storages filled from irrigation channels. I feel sure that this proposal will be investigated during this year.

I now wish to refer to the Irrigation Act, which the Minister of Lands and Irrigation administers, and to draw attention to the fact, which will be known by most honourable members, that there is under the Act a 50-acre limit to individual holdings in the areas under the control of the Minister. In view of the economics of the industry at present, I believe that the 50-acre limit should be increased to about 75 or 100 acres. This would give growers who might be able to buy the extra areas a better chance to spread their capital costs and work their equipment much more efficiently.

The question that is of considerable importance in my district, as it is in many other areas of the State, is that of Murray River water and its salinity. As honourable members know, last March the Government suspended the issue of any further water diversion licences and set up an inter-departmental committee to inquire into this question. As the Minister of Works pointed out in reply to a question this afternoon, that report is still being considered by Cabinet. This question of water supply and water salinity has been the subject of much comment in my district, and some of that comment has been quite uninformed, particularly that over a radio station by one woman commentator who apparently considers that she has all the knowledge necessary to pass comments on all subjects under the sun, including Government policy.

The River Murray Commission, which was set up many years ago to control water supplies from the river, has done a remarkably good job and has done its best to prevent pollution of the river in South Australia. Unfortunately, by failing to ensure that drainage effluent is not discharged directly into the river, steps are not being taken to minimize pollution in Victoria. I have previously asked that the commission be requested to take action about the practices in other States whereby saline water is discharged directly into the Murray River or into a tributary flowing into it. The Federal Council of the Australian Dried Fruits Association is concerned about Murray River salinity and at its annual conference, which was held early in November last, passed this resolution:

That Federal council requests the Commonwealth Government to set up a committee of

inquiry of engineers, plant growth specialists and practical irrigationists, with an independent chairman, to investigate, report on, and suggest remedial action for the problem of salinity in the waters of the Murray River and its tributaries.

I consider that all growers fully support that recommendation and I hope that the Commonwealth Government and the Governments of the three States concerned will set up that committee so that something practical can be done about what is a major problem.

Questions have been asked during the past two weeks about irrigation evaporation basins and I remind the member for Gumeracha (Sir Thomas Playford), who asked several questions, particularly in connection with the basin to be constructed by the Renmark Irrigation Trust, that most of the present evaporation basins were apparently approved by his Government. The evaporation basin at Renmark, which is owned by the Renmark Irrigation Trust and which is known as the block E basin, was breached last year at a critical period and much saline water was discharged through Ral Ral Creek into the main stream. The evaporation basin is separated from that creek by an embankment that is only a few yards wide at the top, although it is wider at the bottom, naturally. It is a simple matter for any person, without thinking of the consequences, to breach that embankment and allow this water to go into the irrigation stream. The Renmark Irrigation Trust is extremely concerned about this and is siting the new evaporation basin so that there will be little danger of contamination of the river.

I once again indicate my support of the proposal to build the Chowilla dam. I know that the proposal is supported by all honourable members and by everyone in South Australia who is interested in our water supply. We wish the Minister of Works every success in his negotiations with the other State Ministers. Bound up with water supply availability are the present economics of the industry and the apparent lack of markets in recent years until the Citrus Organization Committee was set up. Citrus plantings have expanded in recent years and at present Australia has 52,000 acres of bearing trees and 22,000 acres of trees not yet in production. In South Australia 10,000 acres are in production and 8,500 acres not yet bearing. That indicates what can happen to the citrus industry in the next few years if the committee does not find new markets and ensure that our fruit is sold at an economic price so that the growers can make a living.

At present there is a slight over-production of many items, particularly canning fruits, citrus, wine grapes (although not so much this year), and dried fruits, of which about 80 per cent must be exported. There is no control over the plantings of private irrigators. I recently wrote to all grower organizations requesting their views on the need for legislation to control the expansion of irrigation plantings in South Australia. I have not yet received any official replies but I know that individual growers engaged in the types of production that I have mentioned are extremely concerned. Growers told me that any move in this direction would meet with the complete approval of a majority of individual growers, particularly those in group irrigation schemes such as operate in the Renmark Irrigation Trust area and in the Berri, Cobdogla and Barmera irrigation areas.

An organization ought to be set up to evaluate the economics of the various industries and to give information to the Government so that recommendations can be backed by legislation. In the Murrumbidgee irrigation area an organization known as the Irrigation Research and Extension Committee was set up many years ago. It has functioned efficiently, for the betterment of all the irrigation industries in the Murrumbidgee irrigation area, to such good effect that the committee's operations have been duplicated in 12 other area organizations of a similar nature in various parts of New South Wales. We in South Australia could benefit greatly if such an organization was set up here. Recently, there has been formed in the irrigation areas of the Upper Murray an organization (from the combined Murray Citrus Growers Association, Australian Dried Fruits Association, Canning Fruitgrowers Association, Wine and Grapegrowers Council of South Australia and Vegetable Growers Association) known as the River Districts Irrigation Industries Advisory Committee. This could be the forerunner of an organization such as the committee I have just mentioned.

I now wish to refer briefly to some trials of pasture crops conducted at a place called Markaranka, near Morgan. I referred to this in my speech during the debate on the Address in Reply in 1964. These trials with these broad acres and irrigation plantings have been continued, and an extensive report has recently been compiled by three officers of the South Australian Agriculture Department—Mr. Boyce, Mr. Judd and Mr. Potter. It is interesting to note that, of all the fodder crops, hybrid grain sorghum, hybrid corn, soya bean, etc., used in the trials, the most promising was hybrid grain

sorghum. The report states that there are good market prospects for the considerable quantity that could be produced on the river flats, which could be irrigated at small cost because of the low elevation. There is also in this report a table of the areas that could be used for this purpose. These river flat terraces cover 36,000 acres. I am not advocating that all of that area be used at present: all I am doing now is trying to impress on the House the need for a diversification of the economy of the river districts, and hybrid grain sorghum, hybrid corn and forage crops of this nature, such as Sudax, offer good prospects of being the means of achieving this.

Following these trials, I have suggested to the Minister of Agriculture that now could be the time when this trial work could be expanded a little in the form of a pilot farm to carry on the work on a larger scale, and thus prove its worth. I ask that that point be considered. I realize that the further diversion of water from the Murray would not be approved at the moment but we hope to have the report of that committee available shortly so that we shall know where we are going and what we can do. However, irrespective of what the report says, I believe it is a responsibility of all the citizens of the State to ensure that the waters available are used to the best possible economic advantage.

Paragraph 31 of His Excellency's Speech states that the Prices Act was re-enacted last year. The Premier indicated this afternoon that tomorrow he would ask for leave to introduce a Bill to again re-enact this legislation. The amendment passed by this House early in 1966 to permit the fixing of minimum prices for wine grapes has been of extreme value to the industry, not only economically but also in bringing to the wine grapegrowing industry and to the winemaking industry a degree of stability and confidence not achieved at any time in the past. The order by the Prices Commissioner last year fixing for the first time grape prices was issued early in December. That was greatly appreciated by the grapegrowers and their leaders who in the past had had to haggle with their immediate opponents, the representatives of the Wine and Brandy Producers Association, on prices for the current vintage. The prices recommended by the Prices Commissioner had, until two years ago, always been issued far too late, when the vintage was in many cases already under way, so that the growers' representatives were negotiating in extremely disadvantageous circumstances. That single act of amending the Prices Act has been of

such benefit to the grapegrowing industry that it now faces the future with much more confidence than it faced the future with in past years. It is gratifying to me and to the Government to know that one of the problem primary industries in South Australia has been stabilized to a considerable degree.

Mr. Burdon: Now we have an enlightened Government.

Mr. McAnaney: Can price control be handled by this Act only?

Mr. CURREN: Unless a special Act is introduced, the Prices Act is the only legislation that can do it. I was speaking about the benefits to the State that have been achieved by continuing the Prices Act, especially by the amendment passed by this Government.

Mr. McAnaney: Does it give the cost of production to grapegrowers?

Mr. CURREN: Figures prepared by the wine grapegrowers' representative prove conclusively that the prices previously offered by the winemakers were considerably below the cost of production. The minimum price, now fixed by an order of the Prices Commissioner, is much nearer the cost of production. Because of the increase in wages granted by awards, and the increase in fertilizer and other costs, I believe that the Prices Commissioner will listen to the argument of the grapegrowers, and that further increases in grape prices will be made next year. Under the price-fixing system grapegrowers have more opportunity to receive an amount equivalent to the cost of production than they have had under the previous system of an annual haggle with winemakers.

Mr. McAnaney: Do you think so?

Mr. CURREN: In the past the honourable member for Stirling did not support price control and would take away from grapegrowers in his district the benefits that were given to them by the Labor Government.

Mr. McAnaney: Isn't there a greater demand?

Mr. CURREN: Benefits have been obtained by people in my district through the actions of the Labor Party.

Mr. Burdon: People other than those in your district also appreciate the efforts made on their behalf by this Government.

Mr. CURREN: I appreciate that timely interjection. To indicate that many people appreciate the work I do in my district, I shall quote from a testimonial that I received

from an unusual source. This letter is signed by the Commonwealth member for the District of Angas who, Opposition members will agree, is sagacious, intelligent, and able, and a man with great perception. The testimonial addressed to me is as follows:

Dear Reg, I am not in the habit of taking up State matters, but in this instance it seemed that perhaps I could make a better case to the Minister. From now on the problem is yours, but if a satisfactory decision is made I would appreciate it if you would let me know. Contrary to many of the State districts I visit I do not seem to receive many State queries in Chaffey. This is no doubt due to your effective coverage. Yours sincerely, Geoff.

Mr. Burdon: That is disappointing to the member for Light!

Mr. CURREN: That letter indicates to Opposition members that there are people as well as those in Chaffey who appreciate my efforts. Apart from that excellent testimonial, I believe that the Labor Government can look back on two years of great achievements for South Australia. We are proud of what we have done and can look forward with confidence to the future.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): This will probably be the last occasion on which I speak in the Address in Reply debate. If, for a few moments, I speak about the period during which I was a member of this Parliament, I do not apologize. I believe that what happens in the future is determined by what has happened in the past. I was privileged to be elected a member of this Parliament in 1933. The State had just passed through the worst depression in its history, with about 30 per cent of the total number of people unemployed. The Premier's Plan, introduced as a result of advice from oversea financiers, caused a tremendous upheaval in the political Parties, particularly the Labor Party.

In that Parliament members of the Liberal Party sat on one side and on the other side was a Labor Party divided into three branches: the Australian Labor Party, the Parliamentary Labor Party, and another offshoot from the District of Adelaide known as the Lang Labor Party, which consisted of three members. I think the Leader of that Party was Mr. Doug Bardolph. The first reason for this was that for a considerable number of years the State Governments had been financially irresponsible. Prior to 1928 no restrictions were placed on State Governments with regard to their going to the loan market; they went individually and on a competitive basis.

Interest rates were rising steeply and money was being spent on projects that were economically unsound. At the same time, unfortunately, Australia was confronted with a drastic fall in the prices of primary products. So, on the one hand, every type of primary product was being produced unprofitably and, on the other hand, we were confronted with very high Government charges (particularly interest charges), which had occurred because of all sorts of unwise spending.

The position in South Australia was even worse than that in the other States, with the possible exception of Western Australia, because we then had an economy that was purely and simply a primary-producing economy. Indeed, we were so self-satisfied that we prided ourselves on this. We said, and this was the typical attitude here, "We don't want protection; we don't want secondary industry. Primary producers have to face up to world prices; we want to compete on a world basis". No attempt was made to secure secondary industry for this State, and so we were entirely dependent on primary industry. Consequently in the field of public finance, we had enormous deficits; 20,000 people who were born in South Australia migrated from this State each year because there were no opportunities here.

We have come a long way since then; for many years South Australia has had probably the best intake of migrants and people from the other States, with the result that our population has grown more rapidly than that of the other States, with possibly one exception. This, of course, has led to problems, but the fact remains that today we have a balanced economy; we do not now entirely depend on primary production and, what is probably even more important, the vagaries of the weather. Secondary industry in South Australia is equal to the best in the Commonwealth. The quality of our secondary industries, from the viewpoints of production, output per man, management, or any other aspect, is equal to anything in the Commonwealth.

I now come to something that is even more important: the lack of confidence felt here in 1933 has been completely dispelled, and today we go forward as a progressive community that shows initiative and confidence. So, I believe that over the period I have been privileged to serve in this place I have seen a complete revolution in this State's prospects.

I say at the outset that, although we shall undoubtedly have problems from time to time in the future, I have the utmost faith that

this State will go forward. Despite what has happened to South Australia's development in the immediate past, I believe that this State will progressively go forward. The fact that problems will be experienced does not contradict the fact that there is no reason on earth why this State should not enjoy full employment, improved living and housing standards, improved educational standards and improved opportunities. Of course, this depends on every person playing his part. In this way we will be able to serve not only Australia but also other countries less developed than we are.

I now turn to what I believe are the major problems that confront us at present, and I shall be very glad if I can say anything that proves helpful in solving these problems. For many years South Australia suffered because it was on the rim of the development that took place in Australia. Initially, all settlement took place along the eastern coastline. I remember, when I was suggesting to an industrialist that he come to South Australia, that the immediate reaction indicated that he thought he was being invited to some outlandish place that he had never heard of. Fortunately, this position has greatly changed.

Today, we see massive development in Western Australia, where there is enormous potential, because of its great mineral wealth. Western Australia is fast becoming one of the richest States in the Commonwealth as a result of the wise decisions that have been made. I believe that this development has been caused by massive support from the Commonwealth Government and by the very rich mineral deposits which have been found in Western Australia and for which there is a ready and permanent market. So, instead of being on the outskirts of development, South Australia is gradually assuming the position of being in the centre of development. However, there is one weakness that I see in our present position: we are very vulnerable to transportation costs to the other States. In this respect, however, having received some support from the Commonwealth Government, we have now reached the stage where work on a standard gauge railway from Port Pirie to Broken Hill is well advanced. As further work must still be undertaken, I believe it is urgent that we reach agreement on the Silverton Tramway Company's section of the line. However, when the line is completed, we must bear in mind that our large industries will still not be connected to the uniform gauge.

I venture to say that there will be a marked tendency for fast express trains running between Sydney and Perth to stop in South

Australia sufficiently long only to pick up refreshments. I am afraid that that is all we shall see of those trains unless we take steps to link up with the system. Indeed, unless we take such steps I believe that we will lose the opportunity to attract the type of development that Western Australia is at present attracting. The lack of such steps will perpetuate a disability that our industries are at present suffering because of their isolation from the standard gauge railway. It is all very well to say that goods can be transferred from one train to another at a cost lower than that of constructing a railway line, but that is not the complete story. I point out that once commodities (many of which are subject to damage in transit) are transferred, all sorts of packing problems arise. Unless manufacturers can place high-quality produce into their own trucks and send them straight through to a particular destination, the packing expenses are considerable.

In his Speech the Governor's Deputy said that satisfactory progress was being made on standardizing the railway gauge between Port Pirie and Broken Hill, but it is disappointing that progress has not been made on connecting our secondary industries with the network extending from Perth to Brisbane. Such a link-up would provide a fillip to our employment situation and would improve the outlook of the community as a whole. I point out that this work can be undertaken without any cost at all to the South Australian Government. Under the agreement that has already been ratified by the State and Commonwealth Governments, the Commonwealth has undertaken to provide the money for standardizing our railway gauges. It is not even a question of the State's having to contribute a share of the cost, for under the agreement the Commonwealth provides even the small share that the State would otherwise have to contribute. It is therefore a matter of investigation rather than assisting physically. As a result of such work, our industries would receive a more favourable opportunity to compete with markets both in the Eastern States and in Western Australia. Indeed, in regard to the Western Australian market it would place South Australia in a box seat, for we are already supplying to that State a considerable quantity of our factory production.

Every member knows that over the years a network of water mains has been established in South Australia and, indeed, I am pleased to see that the present Minister of Works has continued this policy. Probably 95 per cent of

South Australia's total population is served with water from a Government main. As a result of the laying of about 11,000 miles of trunk mains in South Australia, we have been able to develop our rural industries in places where such development could not have occurred otherwise. We have been able to develop secondary industry in places such as Whyalla which, in regard to its natural water supply, is practically one of the most impossible places in the world for such development. This all means, of course, that our water supplies depend ultimately on water from the Murray River. Members know that South Australia itself has no permanently running river of any consequence. When experiencing a dry season three or four years ago, we were confronted with the position that not less than 85 per cent of the State's population depended on pumped water. Although I hope that such will not be the case, I point out that a similar position could arise again soon.

What, in fact, are our water resources? They boil down simply to one thing—the Murray River. The few catchment areas that have been developed in the Adelaide Hills, and one that is in the process of development, are relatively small: indeed, for irrigation purposes they are insignificant and, in a dry season, uncertain. I read with some concern only this week a statement by the Minister that pumping had had to be commenced in the dead of winter. Therefore, if the State is to progress, if our industries are to be assured of development, and if the State is to carry an increased population, it is imperative that we have a water supply on which we can depend. We must have an assured water supply. Although I have said that our water supply is derived basically from the Murray River, I point out that statistics reveal that the Murray River itself is affected by drought conditions. I have not checked the figures recently, but I think that in 17 of the 67 years since Federation the State would have been subjected to periods of restriction except for the catchments that have been established. The Murray River can be subjected to two dry seasons—and that has happened. Another element that is even more important to this State is that its rights, as defined in the River Murray Waters Agreement, are very limited. This State is entitled to 1,250,000 acre-feet a year. In other words, Victoria and New South Wales have entered into a binding agreement that they will release this quantity of water into South Australia each year.

That quantity is spread over a period of 12 months. Half of it is lost through evaporation, which cannot be prevented, so from the point of view of usage of water our rights give an effective water supply of about 700,000 acre-feet a year. That is not the full story, because the agreement provides that, if there is not sufficient water to go around, the three States must take a pro rata reduction. Under the pro rata reduction, if there is insufficient water the River Murray Commission shall declare a period of restriction, in which case this State's share is reduced to one-third of the quantity released from the Hume dam and Lake Victoria. Such a declaration could make our allocation insufficient to supply our basic requirements.

All of the tributaries of the Murray River are still under the complete control of New South Wales and Victoria: South Australia has no rights to them in times of restriction. Because of this, more and more diversions are taking place: in round figures, during the last 20 years the average quantity of water that came down the Murray was 9,000,000 acre-feet. In the next 20 years the quantity of water that will come down the Murray, taking into account the diversions that may take place, could be reduced to 6,000,000 acre-feet. The diversions are continuing.

One of the most urgent things that this Parliament can consider is getting on as quickly as possible with the only thing that can help us in this predicament—the Chowilla dam. The dam has been approved by the Governments of the Commonwealth, New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia. The costs of the dam have increased very steeply on the original estimate: they are high, but this project is something that South Australia cannot possibly afford to have go wrong. The agreement has been ratified, and the position cannot be allowed to deteriorate. I had reports in my possession when I was Premier (no doubt the Minister has them today) that indicated that we must have water as quickly as possible, but by 1970 at the latest.

To meet the position, the Governments of Victoria and South Australia entered into an agreement (which is still in existence) with the New South Wales Government whereby they are paying to the New South Wales Government a portion of the cost of establishing the big water storage at Lake Menindee, and in return for that the New South Wales Government agreed to release certain amounts of water to South Australia until 1970. This matter is vital to us not only from the point

of view of water supply but also to maintain the quality of water necessary for our irrigation settlements. We have seen this year that the quality of the water can deteriorate very rapidly and, to ensure that there is enough water to provide some circulation in the river, there must not be any delay in connection with the Chowilla dam, as this could be fatal to the State.

The other matter I wish to speak about is the finances of the State. I shall speak about them not from the point of view of any individual project that we should or should not have entered into, but from the point of view of the financial relationship between the States and the Commonwealth. I have some knowledge of what takes place at Canberra at Loan Council meetings and Premiers' Conferences, and I have sufficient age behind me to remember some of the problems associated with the period before uniform taxation and the Financial Agreement. When the Federation of Australian States was first formed it was contemplated that the Commonwealth Government Budget would be remarkably small and that the Commonwealth Government would have surpluses. It was provided in the Commonwealth Constitution that the surpluses should be paid to the States and that the Commonwealth for 10 years and for such further period as the Commonwealth Parliament considered necessary would pay to the States \$2.50 a head of population from the amounts that it collected in excise and tariffs—secondary taxation. That position continued for some time. Regarding the excess revenue of the Commonwealth, difficulty quickly arose because the Commonwealth, by the simple expedient of paying its surplus into a trust fund to provide for some contingency in the future, established that it did not have a surplus. Therefore, the Commonwealth's surplus did not become available to the States. The States contested this and the court's decision was that the Commonwealth's payment into a suspense account was legitimate.

During the period from 1900 to 1928, the States' position deteriorated steadily. As I have said, they borrowed money overseas at extravagant interest rates. I think Mr. Lang went on the market offering interest rates of 7½ per cent and 8 per cent. In an effort to control the States, particularly regarding competitive borrowing, the Commonwealth Government submitted a proposal to set up the Loan Council: this was ratified by referendum and is now part of the Commonwealth Constitution. The deal the Commonwealth

made was that it would no longer pay the States the \$2.50 per capita with regard to secondary taxation, but that it would take over and be responsible for the whole of the States' debts at that time. Also, no State or the Commonwealth could raise money except with the approval of the Loan Council. As it was established, the Loan Council consisted of the Treasurers of the six States, the Commonwealth Treasurer (as Chairman) and the Prime Minister (as a member).

I think it is wise for members to remember the functions of the Loan Council. When it meets it has two main decisions to make. First, it must decide how much money can be raised at a reasonable rate of interest to meet the requirements of the Commonwealth and the States for Loan moneys. In other words, it has to decide the overall programme. The Commonwealth does not have to submit defence requirements, which are excluded from all consideration. The programme does not have to be decided unanimously. If the Commonwealth can get the support of two of the States, it can decide the programme. Under the agreement, the Commonwealth has two votes and each of the States voting with it has a vote; therefore, with its casting vote, the Commonwealth can defeat the votes of the other States. That has been the position for many years. This system was unsatisfactory to the States because, even when the programme was decided upon, the States still did not know whether they would get the money; this depended on whether the Loan Council was successful in its raising of public money.

At a private meeting held before the first Loan Council meeting I attended, the States decided to cut themselves a piece of the cake. The meeting was called by the Premier of New South Wales, who provided the supper and, as a junior member of the council, I was elected tally keeper and clerk. All the Premiers put down what they wanted and the total came to \$99,000,000. The Victorian Premier (Mr. Dunstan, as he then was) said that he would take the extra \$1,000,000 to make it a round figure. The next day we served a demand on the Prime Minister (Mr. Lyons) for \$100,000,000. He said that he supported us and would see the Chairman of the Reserve Bank about it. When he came back the next morning, he said that things were bad and that the Chairman of the Reserve Bank had said that it would be no good our trying to get more than \$38,000,000. After three days, we had jacked up the Reserve Bank to

\$46,000,000, and that was the total sum of Loan moneys raised from the whole Commonwealth in that year. If I remember correctly, South Australia's share was about \$3,000,000. At that time we had had two or three Governments that did not believe in borrowing money, and we did not have a quota. That procedure applied until comparatively recently, when the States challenged the Commonwealth's domination of the Loan Council. Speaking from memory, I think the Commonwealth Government wanted the figure to be \$360,000,000 and the States wanted it to be \$500,000,000. On that occasion we did not have anybody selling out on us, so there was a unanimous vote by the States for \$500,000,000.

The Commonwealth Government had said that it would support only \$360,000,000, and there was a showdown. This was very interesting, because within three months the Commonwealth had summoned another Loan Council meeting. In the interim it had discussed the matter. Actually, the guaranteed payments that are now a feature of Loan Council work arose from a suggestion by me to some Commonwealth officers. Those officers wanted to know how much money it would be necessary to have to get a majority, and I said I could get a majority for \$460,000,000, provided I got my share of it. We quibbled about it for a long time, but finally it was more or less agreed that they would recommend to the Commonwealth an amount of \$455,000,000 as a guarantee. Frankly, we could not spend it, and we did not spend it, and the following year we had to come back again to about \$390,000,000. This is important, because it shows that, provided the States are unanimous, the Loan Council is controlled not by the Commonwealth but by the States?

Mr. Ryan: Have they ever been unanimous since?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: There is no doubt at all that when it comes to a showdown public opinion is behind the State Governments. If there is an argument between the Government in Canberra and the Government in South Australia, whether it be a Liberal Government or a Labor Government, the weight of press opinion will always be in favour of the State Government. It is a very interesting feature of our financial relationship with the Commonwealth that, provided the States are unanimous, they can have full control over the operations of the Loan Council, for they have six votes in a Council which has only eight votes altogether. We have seen in

the past (and I have participated in this function myself) the Premiers of the various States going off to Canberra with their flags flying. If they come back a bit disappointed it is usually because two or three States have made some deals.

Mr. Ryan: This goes on every year, doesn't it?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Either the States have not been unanimous or some have not been completely genuine in their stated requirements. On the other side of our financial transaction with the Commonwealth, again I believe that the States are in a much stronger position than they were prior to the introduction of uniform taxation. No State is compelled to forgo income tax if it does not wish to do so, and there is nothing to stop this Parliament from passing a law tomorrow to collect income tax in this State. The Commonwealth law merely says that if any State does not collect taxation the Commonwealth will give that State so much money. Uniform taxation has become a feature of the financial relationship between the Commonwealth and the States because the States have found it much easier to get money from the Commonwealth than to collect it themselves.

Let us be frank about this. South Australia opposed the introduction of uniform taxation and contested it as far as it could. However, I doubt very much whether any Government today in South Australia, Liberal or Labor, would contemplate for one moment going back to the position where we collected income tax ourselves and did not enjoy the contribution from the Commonwealth. Obviously, the State would be at a very great disadvantage if it did return to that position, because we would be paying not only our own taxation but also a part of the contributions that would be made by the Commonwealth to the other States. Be that as it may, the fact is that over the years the Premiers' Conferences have never seriously considered abandoning uniform taxation. The States have talked about it, and on occasions one State or another has threatened to do it, but always the State concerned has threatened in a half-hearted manner and has always left the door open so that it could bolt back again if there was any suggestion that the Commonwealth might accept that decision.

In my opinion, all this talk that we hear so frequently about the financial relationship of the Commonwealth and the States must be treated with very great reservation. Amongst

the Premiers of the various States we have always had some with shrewd heads who are always prepared to make a little bit of a deal. They do this by various methods of diplomacy, such as putting money under various headings of public works (for instance, for dams or something of that sort), but the fact still remains that there is always an undercurrent of "You scratch my back and I'll scratch yours." I am sure that the Minister occupying the Premier's seat at the moment (Hon. C. D. Hutchens) would agree with me.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: It's pretty obvious.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I put it to the Minister and to the Premier that if we are going to live in this world we have to exercise the same diplomatic sense as other States are exercising. I remember the late Hon. Sir Walter Duncan, who was a very astute politician, saying to me many years ago, "Tom, if you want to give a cat a kick you don't start by throwing stones at it; the best thing to do is to get a saucer of milk and get square on." What is the use of our alienating support from Canberra before we start? This is a business in which diplomacy gets many more dollars than does standing off at long range and condemning the Commonwealth Government as being the seat of all our troubles, because, frankly, the Commonwealth Government is not the seat of our troubles. The Commonwealth Government conducts its affairs efficiently, but there are always some pickings at Canberra for anyone who likes to get them. I have observed the conduct of one or two of the Premiers with much interest. I noticed that, in some way or other, Mr. Reece, the Premier of Tasmania, always seemed to have a joker up his sleeve. On this occasion he was able to release details of his Loan programme before he went to the Loan Council. Also, I have noticed that my friend Mr. Brand, who is one of the most amiable, capable and pleasant people in the world, has a way of visiting Canberra from time to time, and I cannot believe that he does not earn the cost of his fares for his trips. Sir Henry Bolte always does a deal behind the chair if he can.

Mr. Ryan: He is only running true to form.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am certain that he does and, to be frank, I would do one myself. However, the Commonwealth Government at present is not anti-South Australia. When I was the only Liberal Premier in Australia and we had Labor Governments in Canberra and in every other State, my good friend, the late Ben Chifley,

said at a Loan Council meeting; "We must look after old Tom. He is a bit of a rare one these days. We must see that he gets a good deal." Party politics do not matter at the Loan Council, but some very shrewd heads attend and they will pick up any money that is about.

I have said that the future of South Australia depends on our having not an antagonistic approach to the Commonwealth but an approach that, whatever our politics, we are going to live together, deal fairly and squarely, and expect some crumbs on the side for our trouble. We may call it a working commission. I now refer to an administrative problem of some importance. If we in South Australia are to maintain our industrial position, we have to do so on a competitive basis. We are a part of the Commonwealth of Australia and section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution makes trade, commerce and intercourse between the States absolutely free, so South Australia cannot have a false value about any of her undertakings. Whether we like it or not, we are tied to the Australian economy. Probably half of our industrial workers are registered in the Commonwealth Arbitration Court. If we are to make our way in the Australian economy we must adopt Australian standards, not make our own standards. If we go above the Australian standard on one item, we must go below that standard on another, or the balance is destroyed.

I consider that the Government's decision to provide an extra week's leave for all Government servants is wrong. The proposition was put to my Government on many occasions. It will embarrass our industries, because when one section of the people gets a privilege, a concession or a right, the people in other sections demand the same treatment. As soon as provision is made for four weeks' annual leave for Government workers, pressure will be put on all the industries in the State for a similar provision. That is not the end of the matter: this concession will be extremely expensive. The Premier spoke about the cost and, on more mature consideration or because further information was available to him, he made another statement. Finally, he said that it would cost, I think, \$1,750,000. He gave as a basis for that that the cost would be based on a staff increase of one in 45. There is no validity in those figures. The cost will be much more than that because employment will not increase to the full extent.

There will be a large increase in overtime payments. Extra payments are made at the rate of $1\frac{1}{2}$ times the ordinary rate or twice the

ordinary rate, depending on whether the extra work is performed at ordinary overtime rates or at penalty rates. However, if the additional cost is \$1,750,000, every person in South Australia will have to pay increased taxation of not less than \$1.50 and probably of \$2. The increased cost will be met by increased charges in our hospitals and universities, increased water rates or higher charges for Government services. The cost will be borne, in the main, by people who will not enjoy the privilege. One member said that this concession was being given by the Government, but that was completely wrong: the cost will be met by people with families, and the big families will be the hardest hit. The facts of life cannot be ignored. Taxation in this State must increase by between \$1.50 and \$2 at least for every man, woman and child in the State.

Is it considered that our public officers are in an adverse position compared with employees generally in the State? I have the utmost respect for our Public Service. When I came into this place uneducated, with no knowledge of public administration, I found that we had in South Australia a Public Service that could provide for the people elected to this Parliament and to the Government a quality of service unequalled anywhere else. So there is no criticism of the Public Service in what I am saying. I hope it has as good terms of employment as can be found anywhere else and that the Government is a good employer and sets an example, but there is surely no case for public officers in South Australia getting better terms than public officers in other States get. Half of the submissions for wage increases and better working conditions in South Australia are based upon comparisons with other States. If, for instance, the Education Department in New South Wales increases its payments to its officers, there is an immediate reaction in every other State, that that is a new standard to be considered. Therefore, is this Parliament of today in a position to call on the people of South Australia to pay an extra \$2 a head to give to one section of the community a concession which they themselves do not enjoy, which under the arbitration laws of the State we cannot give them, and which under the economic conditions of the State we cannot prescribe in this Parliament unless we close down our industries and send them willy-nilly to other States to establish?

One thing we have to guard against is the giving of sectional advantages. If this

Parliament can confine itself to making laws that will give advantages to all the people and will spread those advantages, this Parliament will be fulfilling its purpose; but, if we are to pick out little pressure groups and discriminate, we shall get into the unhappy position of providing class legislation which would have an undesirable reaction on this State. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I conclude by quoting, with regard to the future of this State, a few words of an eminent statesman. He does not live in our time but was recognized as a great statesman and a great historian. In the course of one of his essays he said this:

On what principle is it that, when we see nothing but improvement behind us, we expect nothing but deterioration before us?

Mr. CASEY (Frome): I have much pleasure in supporting the motion, so ably moved by the member for Wallaroo and seconded by the member for Unley. I join other members in this Chamber in paying my respects to the lately departed former members and extend to their families my deepest sympathy. To the wife and family of the late Dudley Octoman I extend my sincere sympathy. A sitting member in another place, he was well respected in the north of this State. His untimely death was a sad loss to the State to which he had devoted so many years of public service. I take this opportunity, too, of recording my appreciation of the work contributed to and on behalf of this State by the retiring members of this House. The Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Frank Walsh) became the Premier of South Australia by moulding the Labor Party into the effective force it is today. He was ably backed by every member of his Party and, while he was Premier and leader of this Party, I found him, as no doubt other members did, a most affable and congenial person in every respect. I respect the advice he gave me so readily on many occasions.

Of the members of the Opposition who are retiring, one figure of course stands out—the honourable member for Gumeracha, Sir Thomas Playford. Following Sir Thomas in this debate, I must say that he gave this House, from his point of view, much advice, some of which I agreed with and some of which I did not. Nevertheless, Sir Thomas to us (and by that I mean all members of this House) is indeed a lesson in politics. He was a great politician—nobody will deny that. He

was crafty and determined, but also approachable. I approached him on many occasions. I well remember that, when I first came into this House, I had a certain proposition to put to Sir Thomas. I made the necessary appointment and went along to his office in the Treasury buildings in King William Street. I felt at the time like a fish out of water, because I had heard that he was a very crafty gentleman.

Mr. Ryan: You still agree with that, though?

Mr. CASEY: Naturally. However, when the time came for me to be ushered into his office, I was treated just as I would have been treated anywhere else. I felt at home and was able to put my case to such an extent and in such a way that he acceded to my request. Whether or not he did this out of the kindness of his heart, I found him approachable in that respect.

Mr. Ryan: I expect it was something long overdue, was it?

Mr. CASEY: One could say that, because there are many things which, since being in Government, we have found to be overdue; but that does not alter the fact that Sir Thomas was most approachable. No doubt, he will long be remembered for the work he did in the interests, first of all of his Party and, secondly, of South Australia. He will be remembered in political circles for many years to come.

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

Mr. CASEY: Through you, Mr. Speaker, I extend to Sir Thomas and Lady Playford my best wishes for the future, and trust that they will enjoy the years ahead. I congratulate the other retiring Opposition members—the members for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip), Eyre (Mr. Bockelberg), Burra (Mr. Quirke), and Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon), although the latter's retirement may be doubtful—for their services to the State during their term of office, and wish them well in the years to come. It seems that with five members retiring the cream of the Opposition will be leaving this Chamber.

Mr. Quirke: There will be five more.

Mr. CASEY: I am speaking of the present members. The skim milk that is left does not seem to be a formidable force, and I should not like to guess how the South Australian Farmers Co-operative Union Ltd would classify the remainder—based on compositional quality and suitability for processing. I congratulate the Premier's Department on the work it has done and on what it intends to do in the future. I trust that my suggestion

of last year concerning the appointment of an industries development officer has not fallen on deaf ears. During the Address in Reply debate last year I said:

I think we can go further and appoint an officer, a person whom I would call an industries promotion officer, although he could be called an industries development officer. Such a man should be appointed, and he should have free rein throughout the State. This man would have committees, such as the Industries Development Committee, to which he could always refer. I understand that you, Mr. Speaker, have been a member of that committee for many years. No doubt that committee could supply this officer with much information about the State in general. I think he could visit the main towns in South Australia and so become absolutely conversant with the State as a whole and be able to negotiate on behalf of the Government with oversea manufacturers who wished to establish industries here.

Mr. Quirke: Fancy that poor chap visiting all the country towns.

Mr. CASEY: No reason exists why he should not do that: it would benefit such an officer to visit as many country towns as possible in order to get first-hand knowledge, rather than accept secondhand material from other people.

Mr. Quirke: He would be in the giggle house if he had to visit them all.

Mr. CASEY: Not at all. It has been done before, and this State needs such a practice to continue. Undoubtedly, the Premier's Department has considered this matter. This State relies on seasonal conditions, but unfortunately, at present the prospect of a good season is slim. Some parts of the State have had good falls over the past fortnight that have allowed seeding to commence in some areas. Let us hope that they will have follow-up rains in order to get some sort of crop this year. As things stand, the outlook is gloomy, but it is not absolutely hopeless, because over the years, when crops have been sown in this State as late as August, good average yields have been reaped.

Victoria, as well as this State, is faced with an adverse season; only 50 per cent of the Wimmera, which is a very large wheat producing area there, is under crop at present. In the Mallee district of Victoria only a very small percentage is under crop. So, this pattern appears to be general in the south and south-eastern sections of Australia at present. I know that the member for Ridley (Hon. T. C. Stott) is expounding a theory that adverse seasonal conditions are forcing farmers to sell their stock. We in South Australia, particularly those in the North, are accustomed to this sort of thing. It is regular practice for people in the North, when they can see the writing

on the wall, to get rid of their stock. Farmers in Gouger, the district represented by the Leader of the Opposition, are in very bad straits in regard to their holdings of stock. I know that in this last week there has been a tremendous movement of sheep to Western Australia. I understand that the stock agents are being run off their feet in that district. Many of these people still rely on their milking cows as a sideline; this will hit them very hard because 60 to 70 per cent of these have been given up in some instances. This type of thing is having an adverse effect, particularly in that district.

I was delighted to read in His Excellency's Speech of the progressive policy of this Government in connection with agriculture. Last year the Government, and particularly the Minister of Agriculture, was accused of not writing up agriculture as it should have been. This year the Minister has laid everything on the line, and I congratulate not only him but also the departmental officers on the way in which they have given this department a completely new outlook. First, I should like to refer to research into agriculture. Why is research so important? I think it is safe to say that it represents the quest for new ideas that will be beneficial not only to the people on the land but to people throughout the State. Almost every day we read of new discoveries in medicine and new ways of combating disease. Of course, even further research will be undertaken in this field. The Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization is continually undertaking research into the profitable, and Australia's main exportable, item of wool. Although we know that shrink-proof wool can now be obtained, how often do we observe elderly female shoppers choosing for their husbands a woollen garment, such as a singlet or a pair of socks, and saying to the sales assistant, "I had better take a half size larger because wool shrinks"? The public must be made fully aware of the fact that wool can now be made shrink-proof and has a wonderful range of uses.

Mr. Ryan: Aren't only special types shrink-proof?

Mr. CASEY: Most wool is now shrink-proof.

Mr. Ryan: Would there be much difference between the cost of an article that is treated this way and the cost of one that is not?

Mr. CASEY: I do not think so.

Mr. Quirke: Would the honourable member like to wear an all-wool singlet?

Mr. CASEY: I have often worn one, although one must select the time and place. Wool can now also be made moth-proof, which is advantageous particularly in respect of the carpet industry. Carpets are now often laid without a prior application of camphor.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: You must not lose sight of the fact that wool is also fire resistant.

Mr. CASEY: Of course it is, although that is one of its properties rather than the result of research.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: People do not realize that synthetic fabrics are highly inflammable.

Mr. CASEY: That is a big problem, which has led to research into the short time taken for synthetic materials to burn. Another advantage in wool nowadays is that it is able to have a permanent crease. No doubt many other discoveries will be made as a result of research into the uses of wool that will establish it as one of the consumer's most popular items in this competitive world. Even churches have had to adopt new ideas in searching for new answers to old problems. It is indeed gratifying to know that the Agriculture Department, and the Minister particularly, are interested in fostering research programmes that will benefit agriculture generally as well as the people directly concerned. Further, the department has made practical advances in providing departmental officers as instructors and consultants to schools in various parts of the State.

I refer now to an article that appeared in the *Northern Review*, a newspaper of a northern country town that enjoys a wide circulation. The article relates to an address delivered by the Leader of the Opposition to a Liberal Party convention. At the time, I understand the member for Rocky River did not intend to seek re-election. Of course, this town is in the district of the member for Burra who, for all I know, could have been at this meeting, but his name does not appear in the article. During the course of his address (which was fully reported in the *Northern Review*), the Leader said that the Government was broke. The Leader has said this so often that the phrase reminds me of a broken record that just keeps repeating something over and over again until somebody throws it away. He went on to say that the Government had done nothing for the primary producer. How many times have we heard that statement from the Opposition?

He accused the Labor Government of a lack of care in the basic activities of mining, agriculture and fisheries.

I should like to tell honourable members just what the Government has done about agriculture. I will not have time to list everything that the Government has done, but what I will say will give food for thought. When I answered the Leader's statement in the *Northern Review*, I pointed out things that the Government had done for the man on the land other than those to which I shall now refer. The following is a list of agricultural schools for primary producers organized by the Agriculture Department in country areas:

1. Dairy husbandry and management incorporating economics: held on four consecutive nights.

2. Pasture schools: held on three nights, one week apart, and including the following facets:

(a) suitable plants;

(b) establishment; and

(c) maintenance embracing grazing, fertilizers and insect control.

The schools are followed later by a half-day field day.

3. Sheep husbandry schools: of two days' duration and including:

(a) feeding;

(b) breeding; and

(c) management.

The schools include exercises in changing management practices to recapitulate the lessons taught.

4. Cereal diseases school: held on three nights, one week apart, and including advice on:

(a) causes;

(b) identification; and

(c) control.

5. Farm management schools: of two days' duration and including lectures and exercises in:

(a) farm planning (principles and exercises);

(b) using farm records;

(c) financial accounting and farm management;

(d) coping with uncertainty in farm planning;

(e) budgeting; and

(f) economics and farm machinery.

The schools follow farm management analysis projects undertaken by groups of over 25 farmers. Two years after the initial analysis the economics section of the department offers these schools. About 400 farmers are participating in the scheme.

6. Soil schools: extend for a period of six weeks with a meeting each week and including two half-day field excursions to look at soils and land use. The schools include addresses and demonstrations from soil formation to land use.

7. Wool handling courses: of one day's duration.

8. Shearing shed management courses: courses include how to handle sheep and shear

them, and some instruction is given in the initial stages of wool handling. Advanced shearing shed management courses follow where speed and accuracy in shearing is taught.

9. Crutching courses: instruction includes how to crutch sheep and care for machinery.

10. Shearing machine maintenance course: of one day's duration.

11. Rural youth stud tours: the following educational livestock tours are provided by the Agriculture Department for rural youth members only, although they are eligible to and do participate in the other schools mentioned:

- (1) merino sheep;
- (2) beef cattle;
- (3) British breeds of sheep; and
- (4) pigs.

The members included in the tours are subjected to addresses, demonstrations, and practice in the facets of the husbandry practiced by stud breeders. A meeting is included in each tour aimed at problem solving.

Those are some of the courses that have been extended by this Government through the Agriculture Department. I know that the rural youth movement has been operating for several years, but it is still going and is still being fostered by the department. The member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) is muttering over there: I cannot understand what he is saying. I suggest that he let me finish and then have his say afterwards. Mr. Speaker, I have a list of the schools and courses conducted by the Agriculture Department at various centres during 1966-67. The list shows the centres at which arrangements have already been made for these schools to be conducted during 1967-68. I ask leave to have this list incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT SCHOOLS AND COURSES.

	Held during 1966-67. Pending for 1967-68.	
Sheep husbandry schools	Keyneton Keith Millicent	Reedy Creek Mil Lel
Soil schools	Bordertown Hanson Wepowie Baroota	Snowtown Whitwarta Boooleroo Centre
Farm management schools	Cockaleecheie	Keith Curramulka Wirrega-Lowan Vale
Dairy schools	Murray Bridge Bordertown	Murray Bridge
Pasture schools	Boors Plains Gladstone Kalangadoo Meadows	Birdwood Allendale East Millicent-Beachport
Cereal diseases school	Koolunga	Petersville
Wool schools	Truro Koolunga Rosedale Murraytown Cockaleecheie Wirrulla Quorn Stockport	
Shearing shed management courses	Wirrulla Kelly Mount Cooper Jamestown Bute Milang Weavers Wanilla Wunkar Parilla Well	

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT SCHOOLS AND COURSES—continued.

Held during 1966-67. Pending for 1967-68.

Crutching courses	Mount Cooper
	Borrika
	Naracoorte
	Wanbi
	Wirrulla
	Kelly
	Jamestown Rural Youth
	Quorn
	Moonta
	Gladstone
	Parilla Well
	Bute
	Murraytown
	Wunkar
	Lock
	Minnipa
	Strathalbyn
	Victor Harbour
	Yeelanna
	Weavers
	Wanilla
	Lowbank
	Wilmington
	Lock
	Crystal Brook
	Blyth
	Tumby Bay

Mr. CASEY: This brings me now to the point that I made in this Chamber a short time ago, namely, the importance of economics in agriculture. More important still is the great need for agricultural economists. First and foremost, the agricultural economist should have an excellent university education. One of the main objects is to impart to the student an understanding of the economic system, how it operates and why it operates as it does. Emphasis is placed on market phenomena, the role of prices, wages, and profits in resource allocation, and the implications of change for resource use and income distribution. Doubtless, different economists have different approaches to specific problems. Nevertheless, regardless of the approach adopted, the agricultural economist is interested in and understands the problems as they relate to the many segments of agriculture and to the total economy. A leading writer on agricultural economics, Mr. L. L. Boger, stated these as the objectives of agricultural economics:

(a) To understand and describe the environment in which farm products are produced, distributed and consumed, including agriculture's social and political institutions, its physical and human resources and the relevant value preferences of its people;

(b) To refine and extend the principles of economics as they apply in the production, distribution and consumption of farm products;

(c) To analyse opportunities for fuller attainment of public and private objectives through changes in the use of scarce resources available for production, distribution and consumption of farm products.

Farmers today have to produce goods as economically as they can. They must get the maximum out of the machinery that they use and they must develop their pastures on an economic basis. If one farmer can get a good return from growing a particular crop on a particular type of soil but another farmer is not getting as good a return from a different crop grown on the same type of country, it pays the latter farmer to change and grow the crop that gives the better return.

Mr. Quirke: Not necessarily: it depends on the fertility of the soil.

Mr. CASEY: All these matters are taken into consideration by agricultural economists. The Governor's Deputy's Speech refers to the provision of a fourth year in the Diploma of Agriculture course at Roseworthy College, which will commence in 1968. That is a step in the right direction that can do nothing but benefit agriculture in this State in future years. In the short time that this Government

has been in office it has not been afraid to make changes or to seek new structures for new programmes, which is not always easy to do, because of opposition. We have dealt with the Licensing Act and the Planning and Development Act. A change has been made in relation to examinations conducted by the Public Examinations Board and certificates are now issued on a different basis. I shall deal later with the Underground Waters Preservation Act.

These are only some of the marked changes that this Government has brought about in the short time it has been in office. Legitimate questions about the advisability of making a change need to be raised unless the situation being changed is so bad that anything would be better than what was in existence. The second difficulty associated with major changes is the problem of discarding the old structure, programme or approach. To gain further appreciation from the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) who would undoubtedly take a text from St. Matthew if he was speaking on this matter of changes in the present patterns, let me quote from St. Matthew 9:16-17:

“And no one puts a piece of unshrunk cloth on an old garment, for the patch tears away from the garment, and a worse tear is made. Neither is new wine put into old wineskins; if it is, the skins burst, and the wine is spilled, and the skins are destroyed; but the new wine is put into fresh wineskins, and so both are preserved.”

I think the member for Burra would agree that that is so. The third difficulty that usually arises with any major change is that it is not the appropriate time to make the change. It is said, “Oh, yes, it is a good idea, but the time is not ripe”; it should, of course, be done later. But what happens then is that nothing is done. Lastly, there is the difficulty that people who advocate changes mean frequently that they are happy when the other fellow makes the change. They just sit back and say, “Oh, well, he has made the change so it is all right.” I congratulate the Government and the respective Ministers on the changes that have been made and have already benefited and will continue to benefit the whole community for many years to come.

Turning to His Excellency's Speech, I refer to the part dealing with the Crown Lands Act. Here is a typical example of the Government putting into effect a change—that of restricting the aggregation of more freehold property. This is a good idea, particularly in the South-East where we have a high potential but where

large tracts will never be used, at least not in my generation, because they are too large for the people purchasing them to handle effectively. For a start, this is bad economics. Then there is the National Parks Act, which will benefit greatly the generations to come. I am a firm believer in the preservation of our wild life.

Mr. Quirke: It was a good lead I gave.

Mr. CASEY: I think the member for Burra can have a feather in his cap for that; I do not deny him that privilege. Then, in education, we have seen a marked improvement in the numbers of schools and teachers forthcoming since this Government has been in office. This morning's *Advertiser* states that the Education Department full-time teachers at the end of last year numbered nearly 2,000 more than two years ago. That is a creditable figure over such a short period. Much credit for this should go to the Minister of Education (Hon. R. R. Loveday), a man dedicated to his job. I had the privilege of travelling with him in the North during his visits to schools in remote areas, where he appreciated the difficulties experienced by teachers and students. His visits were not confined to the North: he visited the eastern parts beyond the Murray River and also the West Coast. Not only did he visit his colleagues' districts but also those of Opposition members. The Minister is interested in all facets of education, departmental officers have gained confidence from his conduct, and he has moulded the department into something that will be a driving force in the future.

The member for Burra suggested that the previous Government was responsible for the sealing of the road to Broken Hill. So it was, but after how many years of representations by the people of the North? This was a long overdue project. I introduced to the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford, when he was Premier, a deputation comprising people from Broken Hill. It reminded him that, if he did not begin the road-building project, much of the traffic to and from Broken Hill would be lost to New South Wales and Victoria. At Easter the Broken Hill people would withdraw about \$500,000 from the banks to spend in Adelaide during the holidays. Goodness knows what the sum was at Christmas and at other holiday periods. Apparently, the previous Government could not appreciate the situation. The Labor Government has done its utmost to complete this road and, at present, a stretch of only 50 miles remains to be sealed between Broken Hill and Adelaide.

Mr. Ryan: When will it be sealed?

Mr. CASEY: By the end of 1968. I have seen hundreds of thousands of dollars wasted on road making in the North. A road is constructed to specifications set out by the Highways Department, but within a fortnight the road deteriorates to such a degree that another \$10,000 or \$20,000 is needed to return it to its original condition. Highways Department officers should realize that, because of extremely dry conditions in the northern areas, the earth dries into a fine powder, particularly when the road is used by heavy traffic. Unless something is done to bind the surface of the road, much money will have to be spent to return it to its original condition.

Mr. Jennings: Don't you call that bulldust?

Mr. CASEY: No, that is a different expression. From my experience, I suggest that the Highways Department should place a sand seal on roads that have been constructed and are to be sealed eventually. I mean that the Highways Department goes along and constructs a road, say, five miles long; the department forms it up and it is eventually ready for sealing at a time when the bitumen is considered to be running, usually in the hot weather. When this road is formed and ready for sealing, it is (under the present method) opened to traffic. I maintain that the department's heavy rolling equipment, grid rollers, vibrating rollers, and all the modern equipment available today are sufficient to consolidate a road, together, of course, with water, which is essential to consolidate the soil.

Once the road is formed it requires this sand seal in order to prevent the ground from deteriorating and virtually blowing away; this does happen. One has only to look at vehicles travelling at 50 to 60 miles an hour during a hot day on an unsealed road and to try to visualize the quantity of soil that is carried away by the wind: it must be fantastic. This is where the deterioration and the waste of money come in, in connection with road construction in the North, and no doubt it applies in other parts of the State. So, I sincerely hope (and I believe that the Highways Department is of the same opinion) that, when a road that is to be sealed soon is constructed, the Highways Department puts a sand seal on it to consolidate it.

I now turn to reports that have appeared in the newspapers over the last few days relating to children being admitted to agencies of the Totalizer Agency Board

throughout the State. I think I have a stake in T.A.B. in this State: I think I had something to do with it when it was first introduced here. I cannot understand the attitude of those who complain about children going into T.A.B. agencies accompanied by their parents.

Mr. Hughes: You are on dangerous ground now.

Mr. CASEY: No, I am not. The member for Wallaroo disagrees with me entirely on this subject. Let me point out to him that, if a mother goes down the street to do some shopping and she has a toddler of two or three years who is being carried in her arms or in a pusher, she will first go into the greengrocery. In most parts of the State today these greengroceries have lottery licences, and I know many women who enter them with their children to purchase a lottery ticket: I have seen them do it. They fill out the form and pay their 50c and receive their half of the ticket; they put it in their purse and go out. Nothing is said about this, but as soon as one mentions T.A.B., which is no different, because it is an establishment that looks very much like a bank—

Mr. Ryan: There is a big difference. You have a much smaller chance of backing a winner in a lottery than you have under T.A.B.

Mr. CASEY: I am talking about T.A.B. itself and its environment.

Mr. Lawn: The Act prohibits children from having a bet.

Mr. CASEY: Yes; it relates to people under 21 years. In fact, nobody under the age of 21 is permitted to drink in the front bar or saloon bar of a hotel. How does the environment of a T.A.B. agency differ from that of a place in which lottery tickets are sold? A person in each place merely writes on a slip of paper, passes it over the counter with his money, and receives a receipt or ticket, as the case may be. I hope the member for Wallaroo appreciates that point.

Mr. Ryan: What are you advocating?

Mr. CASEY: People should not make a fuss about children entering T.A.B. premises with their parents, because it is better that they remain in the custody of their parents than wait out on the street where anything can happen. I have read that some people liken T.A.B. agencies to the betting shops of the past but nothing is further from the truth. As I have previously said in the House, people in the old betting shops could bet on a race right up until it commenced; if they won, they could collect their dividends immediately after

the race; they could listen to their radios in order to obtain the results; and re-invest their winnings. T.A.B. agencies are totally different; people entering them will merely see the names of horses on sheets, which refer to the different States in which T.A.B. is functioning. Races are not broadcast, and winning investors do not receive dividends until the following day. It is wrong that parents should be asked to leave their children out on the street while they enter an agency to bet.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: Those people who object to children entering the premises also object to parents doing likewise.

Mr. CASEY: That is so. The environment of agencies cannot in any way be compared with that of the old betting shops. I hope the people who urge that children be prohibited from agencies will give the matter more thought.

Mr. Ryan: Do you think it is press sensationalism?

Mr. CASEY: Not in every case. Some of the people concerned may be genuine, but I am sure they have not fully studied the position.

Mr. Ryan: Would you think many of them have never been inside a T.A.B. agency?

Mr. CASEY: No doubt some of them have entered an agency out of curiosity, but many have probably never entered one. Unfortunately, many people make statements on subjects about which they know nothing and with which they have had no personal experience or contact.

Mr. Hughes: Would you say that that applied to the Social Reform Board?

Mr. CASEY: No; those people are experts in the field of social reform. I was not referring to them: I was talking in general terms. As an example of the type of person to whom I was referring, I will refer to a meeting about Aborigines I attended about four or five years ago. One of the loudest speakers at that meeting had been in Australia for only one month. That is the type of person to whom I was referring: the type of person who has no experience of what he is talking about and makes broad statements about things of which he knows nothing. With those remarks, I support the motion.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT (Ridley): With other members, I pay a tribute to those members who are retiring at the end of this session. They have been able to make valuable contribution to debates in the Chamber because of their vast knowledge of particular subjects. I will be sorry to see them leave, but of course that time comes for all of us. At present, the debates seem to be dominated by talk about

finance. The question seems to be whether the Government is doing the right thing in transferring some of its Loan moneys in an attempt to balance the Budget. The Opposition has tantalized the Government on this point, and the Premier has justified his action by saying, in effect, that Premiers of other States do the same thing. This afternoon the member for Gumeracha gave the history of the Financial Agreement, and what he said was a lesson for all members.

Those of us who have been members for many years will remember the events that led up to the making of the Financial Agreement. In 1927 this State had the Gunn Government. Soon after the Financial Agreement was reached, Australia experienced the depression, which was brought about by over-spending and the extremely dry years experienced in the Murray Mallee in 1927, 1928 and 1929, conditions similar to those at present being experienced. Everyone at that time was sincerely trying to get us out of the economic depression that had affected the world. Experts on finance came to Australia and told us that we could get out of the depression by tightening our belts and living within our incomes. We all learned a lesson from that false propaganda, because the less that is spent, the less employment there is and with less employment available there is less consumer money to go around. Thus the position becomes worse. The economist J. M. Keynes exploded that theory.

Therefore, I do not agree with the Government in its endeavour to balance the Budget because, in view of the economic down-turn in South Australia, I believe this is the wrong time to attempt to do this. I would not care if the Government had budgeted for a deficit in order to have extra money available to provide public works so that people could be put back in work. People want work so that they can earn money.

Mr. Heaslip: They must be able to get the work first.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Yes, and we are not going to encourage employment by cutting down on works. With the present down-turn of the economy in this State, we need a shot in the arm to get the economy back on its feet again, and we can get this by creating more work for the people. I represent a district which at present is in an unfortunate situation. Honourable members will realize, from the questions I have been asking the Government, how serious the position is at the moment. Like the Government and, I suppose,

every honourable member in this Chamber, I was hoping that before this we would have had bountiful rains to break the drought, but that is not the case and the position is getting worse every week.

The Premier has already told me in reply to a question that he has been receiving letters from people in financial distress. I, too, have received a number of letters from such people pointing out the desperate position in which they find themselves. A letter that I received only this evening is typical of a number that I have received today. The position is desperate because this year is not the only bad one that many of these people have had: some people in the northern part of the Murray Mallee have had no income at all for nearly three years. The letter I have here, which I shall read to illustrate the point I want to make, is typical of the letters I have received. It reads as follows:

I wish to put my case for some form of assistance due to the present prevailing conditions. I was employed by Mr. X for seven years and then share-farmed another owner's property for nine years. I was forced to seek new employment when the property was sold at a price well beyond my means. I am still share-farming. My eventual aim is to own a property. Last year I reaped 500 bags from 500 acres, of which I received half. Much of it was unsaleable grain.

Then he mentions how he injured his eye and had to go into hospital. He goes on to say:

I have my own plant which is debt-free but practically no capital left. I have endeavoured to find some form of temporary employment, but so far have been unsuccessful. If I could obtain employment our position would be considerably eased. Not being a landowner, it is impossible to procure assistance from the banks. I have always been a farmer and wish to continue, but unless we can obtain relief in some form or another I may be forced to sell my plant and move to a town or city where I could find employment. I am 34 years of age, and after 16 years of continuous farm employment feel I am reasonably experienced. I have a wife and two school-aged children to support. This year the crop prospects are nil, as are feed prospects, so we can run no sheep, and as they are our main income earners the outlook is very bleak indeed. My only income is from a few pigs for which I must buy feed, which leaves a very small profit margin. Our main expenses will be those needing ready cash, such as water rates, electricity, fuel and household. We have no outstanding debts, preferring to wait until we can pay for goods before acquiring them, but despite our efforts and economies not only are our hopes of eventually owning a property fading but we are faced with going into debt to live and not knowing how we will be able to pay our said debts, or perhaps not being able to obtain further credit.

He goes on to say that he hopes we can do something about it. I will forward this letter to the Premier. Of course, this person is a share farmer. I think members will realize the plight that these fellows are in. These are the people on behalf of whom I am making this special plea for the Government to try to find some avenue where they can find something to do. The Government has already said that it is trying to help, and I know that its action in this regard is bearing some results. Following the Government's requests to the banks to be a bit more liberal than they have been hitherto in trying to help these fellows, the reports I am receiving are that the banks are being a little more generous than they were, as are also the stock and station agents. That is good up to a point but, if we do not get rain, these people will have no work to do on their properties. In nearly every case their flocks have been reduced to breeding ewes. Some of the farmers have tip trucks and surely some Government works can be started, even if that involves going into a deficit, so that these men can earn money with which to buy fodder for their stock. Perhaps the Highways Department can carry out work that is projected for the next financial year.

All the oats held in silos in the South-East have been sold. There is a quantity in silos at Thevenard but that is committed. In fact, a ship is loading at Thevenard this week. The South-East is generally a favourable part of the State, but I have never seen Mount Gambier in such a bad state as it was in when I visited the area about 10 days ago. Many of the farmers in what is a 30in. rainfall area are getting down to their two years' fodder reserve, and some are running 3,000 sheep on about three acres. No fodder is available in the South-East for farmers in the northern Mallee, so where is the fodder to be obtained from? We must look to the Eastern States. I asked the Premier to request the Minister of Agriculture to set up a committee of officers with authority to try to procure fodder from the Eastern States. The Agriculture Departments in the other States would co-operate with our officers in inquiries about where fodder was available.

Mr. Quirke: Have other States any fodder?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Yes, some parts of the Eastern States, but the difficulty is to have it transported here. The present rates are absolutely prohibitive. It would be necessary to have it transported at a concessional rate. Even if it were transported by road in farmers' own trucks, the road tax of 5c a ton mile

should not apply, because this fodder would be used to feed starving stock.

This matter deserves favourable consideration, and the Premier has promised to place it before the Minister of Agriculture. The farmers in the district are so concerned that a meeting will be held at Karoonda on Friday night to discuss what can be done. It seems from information given to me in telephone calls since I returned to the House this evening that an extremely large number of farmers will attend that meeting. These people have already approached the banks and the position is so grim that the State Government will have to make a grant in order to keep them on the properties and to enable them to feed the breeding ewes that they have. These men are prepared to work and to use their tip trucks or utilities. I make a plea to the Government to do what it can. It should look at this matter from every possible angle, because, having occupied the Treasury benches for two years, it at least knows that the money it would spend in this regard would be repaid many times over once we got a break in the season and these men had a good season next year. This has happened previously in the Murray Mallee. It happened in 1927. In the 1930's, in the financial depression, many farmers grew terrific crops when the rains came in that area, but they did not make a recovery quickly enough because the price of wheat was only 12c a bushel. It was not only droughts that caused the trouble: it was getting a low price for wheat when they did grow it. Fortunately, that position will not be reached again, because of the wheat stabilization legislation. Whatever the Government puts into this project will be repaid many times from future income received.

I would not care if the Government went into a deficit this year. Although the Premier has said that he will reduce Consolidated Revenue and be able to balance the Budget this year, I want to add a word of warning, that I doubt whether the Government can do it because, if this drought continues, look at the loss of revenue from rail freight and grain that will occur. The main railway earnings have been from grain being transported all over the State and, if this dry weather continues, I cannot see the Government balancing its Budget. I do not care whether or not it does, but I should like to see some money injected into the economy to get these people back to work so that they can earn some money, which in turn will give the Government a better chance of balancing its Budget.

Mr. Heaslip: Now is not the time to talk about an extra week's holiday and holiday pay.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Although the member for Frome has said that people often say, "The time is not ripe for a change," surely this is not the right time, with this downturn in our economy, to give four or five weeks' leave. That will only aggravate the problem. Although it is true that the Government stated this in its policy speech, is this the time to do it, when people are struggling to get jobs? Although this proposal is at present confined to people in Government employ, naturally it will run through all avenues of employment.

Mr. Heaslip: It will go right through the State.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I know the Government made the promise, but it would be better dealt with later and not at this stage, when my district is in desperate straits; it needs money spent there to get people back to their work. Last year we had a record crop of 462,000,000 bushels of wheat. The Australian Wheat Board received 439,000,000 bushels. This is 92,000,000 bushels above the previous record of 1964-65. Naturally, now that we are having such a big crop, sales, too, reached a record 277,000,000 bushels as at June 30 of this year, the previous record being 267,000,000 bushels. We are approaching this problem in wheat production: because of the peculiar geographical situation of New South Wales and its railway system, with only two main outloading ports, New South Wales may finish up with about 40,000,000 bushels carry-over because insufficient shipping is available to get out all the wheat. Present indications are that New South Wales will produce another 100,000,000 bushels of wheat this year. If it does, and also has in its silos 40,000,000 bushels carry-over from this year, honourable members will appreciate the difficulty we shall have in ensuring that the New South Wales silos are clear when our wheat is coming in there. Two factors have led to this large increase in production in New South Wales. First, the payable price that growers have received for wheat because of the wheat stabilization plan and, secondly, the drop in wool prices. Many graziers in northern New South Wales, towards the border of Queensland, have ploughed land for the first time and others for the first time for many years, and they have grown up to 40 bushels an acre on land without using fertilizer.

How far can we go in increasing production of wheat? Can we sell it all? A different pattern in the selling of Australian wheat is emerging, as we are turning to the Asian countries instead of to those in Europe. Last season China purchased 123,000,000 bushels of wheat; other Asian countries 81,000,000; Europe, including the United Kingdom and Ireland, purchased a reduced quantity of 26,000,000; the Middle East bought 17,000,000; Africa, 15,000,000; South American countries, 9,000,000; India, 17,000,000; and Pakistan has already purchased 18,500,000 bushels. These figures show that our markets are changing, and that we have to turn more to the Asian countries to dispose of our large wheat production. Can we continue to sell record crops to Asian countries?

Russia has increased its production of wheat because of the new programme under the new regime. Under Mr. Khrushchev, insufficient incentive was provided for growers to produce crops, but they have learned the economic lesson and are growing more wheat. This year Russia had a surplus, the first for many years. How much of this surplus will be sold to China, offsetting our sales? This is a burning question. It is suggested that we should restrict wheat acreages, but I do not advocate that practice because it is a policy of despair. Millions of people in the world are starving today. We have sold wheat to Pakistan and India, and we contribute wheat to India through the Colombo Plan, in addition to a straightout grant. However, because of the drought in parts of India many people are starving.

We have to remember that the wheat surplus in Canada and America is the lowest for the last 30 years. Those countries, by building up better sales practices, have been able to sell their wheat, but with their lower surplus it seems to be the wrong time to advocate a reduction of acreage in Australia. However, it is a matter that must be considered. There is no point in growing wheat if it cannot be sold, but we must look to the Asian markets. People have said that we should not sell wheat to China. Why? We are not at war with that country. We probably heartily disagree with its policy, but many other countries sell wheat and other goods to China whilst disagreeing with its policies and its Government. So why should we refuse to sell wheat to China? China needs wheat, or it would not be buying it. If China could not buy wheat from Australia it would buy it somewhere else, and Australia would have to sell its wheat to a much less favourable market, and

that market would sell it back to China and make a profit. This seems a very short-sighted policy.

Nobody knows whether Russia will continue to produce large crops, but it will probably continue to increase its acreage. Whilst it has good seasons, it will produce big crops. Parts of Russia, like parts of Australia, experience severe droughts. I recall the old adage that nature has a way of straightening itself out; we may find that nature will come good in Australia, and we all sincerely hope that this will happen next year, especially in this State.

Bulk handling has been referred to during this debate by several members, and I shall take the matter a little further and bring it up to date. I have been supplied with some interesting figures by the General Manager of South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited, Mr. Sanders. The co-operative has now established 143 silos throughout South Australia involving a capital cost in excess of \$25,000,000. The 1967 silo construction programme is proceeding according to schedule. Additional bulk grain storage is being constructed at 16 locations, providing 6,250,000 bushels of bulk storage at a cost of about \$3,500,000. All of these silos are of the concrete vertical type and are as follows:

Terminals.	Bushels.
Port Lincoln	500,000
Port Pirie	1,000,000
Ardrrossan	1,200,000

The last figure relates to both bulk barley and bulk wheat.

Country silos.	Bushels.
Poochera	370,000
Tintinara	240,000
Peake	240,000
Coomandook	370,000
Roseworthy	240,000
Arno Bay	110,000
Cowell	150,000
Rudall	150,000
Darke Peak	240,000
Wirrulla	370,000
Wudinna	370,000
Cummins	370,000
Yaninee	240,000

It will be noted that 10 of these silos are being constructed on Eyre Peninsula.

Mr. Rodda: Appila is not in the list.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: No. It must be remembered that last season the greatest crop ever was harvested with deliveries being almost 50 per cent greater than the annual average delivery of grain on the West Coast.

It may be ironic that the additional storage of 3,000,000 bushels on Eyre Peninsula this

season will not be utilized, as crop prospects are gloomy. However, Eyre Peninsula is rapidly expanding with cereal production and, with rainfall during winter and spring in a normal year, could expect to produce 20,000,000 bushels of wheat in a season. Of the storages being constructed on Eyre Peninsula, space is being provided at Port Lincoln and Cummins for bulk barley and at Yaninee for 100,000 bushels of bulk oats.

I am pleased to note the statement of the Minister of Works on June 20 that the Government intends to spend about \$600,000 in 1967-68 on the Giles Point project. I am aware that the bulk handling co-operative has invited tenders for the 1,500,000-bushel silo and shore terminal facilities, and that tenders close on July 18.

Yorke Peninsula growers will very much appreciate the opportunity to deliver their wheat and barley in bulk to Giles Point and avoid the long haul that they have previously undertaken in delivering bulk grain distances of up to 70 miles from farm to the Ardrossan or Wallaroo terminal silos. True, growers delivering to Giles Point will be required to contribute 2.5c a bushel to assist in defraying the capital cost of the harbour works and the installation of the new jetty and conveyor belt ship loading system. However, the 2.5c contribution is small compared with the present average differential of up to about 10c a bushel applying on bagged grain deliveries to receival centres on southern Yorke Peninsula.

The co-operative has also decided to construct further cell storage for 1,000,000 bushels at Port Lincoln before the 1968-69 season's deliveries commence, as this is necessary to cope with expanding cereal production on Eyre Peninsula and pending the outcome of the investigation and report by the inter-departmental Government committee on an establishment of a super terminal at Port Lincoln, Port Neill or Arno Bay. Finance, of course, will play a part in other storage that the co-operative can contemplate erecting in 1968, as toll income is influenced by grain deliveries, which are subject to seasonal conditions; but a commitment has been given, following the visit of the Minister of Works with the full board of directors to Thevenard last April, that, provided the Public Works Committee investigates and reports favourably on the deepening of the channel in the Thevenard harbour and the Government agrees to harbour improvements at Thevenard, the co-operative will erect another 1,000,000-

bushel conventional concrete vertical silo at Thevenard.

The allocation of space for at least 200,000 bushels of oats in the new storage block will be welcomed by oatgrowers in the Thevenard region and boost oat production in that area. The co-operative has already taken steps to acquire further land for expansion at Thevenard, whilst provision of additional cell storage at the Wallaroo terminal must be considered having in mind the order of priority and the necessity to construct country silos simultaneously. Waterside workers at Wallaroo originally were strongly opposed to the introduction of bulk handling of grain at the port. I was invited by the Mayor of Wallaroo to address a big meeting of waterside workers, who were hostile to any proposition to install a bulk terminal at Wallaroo.

Indeed, I had been threatened that if I went to Wallaroo I would be thrown into the harbour. At the meeting six policemen were present, having been instructed to order out of the hall anybody who was disorderly. I said that I was at the meeting to explain to the waterside workers what they could expect in future. In fact, I told those present that if they did not agree to our installing the terminal at Wallaroo we would install one at Ardrossan. Consequently, the next time I was at Wallaroo I was given the red carpet treatment. It is gratifying to know that the member for Wallaroo has commended the co-operative for what it has done. In addition we now have the support of the waterside workers. I thank the honourable member for his contribution to the progress that has been made at Wallaroo in this regard.

Mr. Rodda: You have been the big white chief to Wallaroo!

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: It can be said without question that the bulk handling system has developed more speedily than ever envisaged and, with total storage for bulk grain in South Australia before the coming harvest of over 57,000,000 bushels, the co-operative has made tremendous progress. At the inception of the co-operative, annual average wheat deliveries were about 27,000,000 bushels and it was expected that the co-operative would provide storage for an average crop plus 25 per cent, taking capacity to, say, 35,000,000 bushels, whereas provision of storage for 57,000,000 bushels of bulk grain in just over 10 years clearly demonstrates the support the co-operative has received from Parliament, the grain-growers throughout the State,

and the marketing boards. I thank honourable members for the help they have given the co-operative. I think they all agree that it has been a marvellous company and has contributed greatly to the progress of South Australia. It is envisaged that the company will spend \$700,000 from the time the work is started at Giles Point until Christmas so that the terminal there can get under way. Although the company should be ready to operate there by about October, 1968, I do not think the work to be done by the Marine and Harbors Department will have been completed by then. However, the facilities that will have been provided by the co-operative can be used for storage until the department's work is completed. Then the wheat can be shipped out as soon as possible.

Notwithstanding all this expenditure, the growers' toll is now 5c a bushel. For people who are delivering grain, next year the company will commence to repay one-twelfth of the total aggregate of the tolls that have been contributed by the growers in 12 years under the system of revolving finance. The growers are looking forward to this repayment and it will certainly be made. The eventual position will be that when a farmer retires and hands over his farm to his son or sells it he will no longer pay tolls. In 12 years he will be paid out the total of the tolls he has paid in. Consequently, the bulk storage in South Australia is costing growers nothing at all. What a magnificent achievement for a company made up of the growers themselves. I suppose that at the beginning we had the support of over 90 per cent of the growers for this proposal. I was associated with it in the early stages (some people say as a driving force), and I believe we could never have implemented the scheme without the support of growers and of Parliament. I pay a tribute to those who were members of Parliament when the scheme was implemented. Everyone should be proud of the progress the company has made over the years. Of course, the growers will be pleased to know (it was announced in this morning's press) that another 10c a bushel will be paid on July 28 from No. 29 pool. That may mean that another 10c or 11c will be left in the pool later in the year.

The other day I asked the Minister of Agriculture a question about an investigation into chemical insecticides. Insecticides came into their own with the advent of D.D.T. which, at that time, was hailed as the be all and end all in the control of insects. In fact, it was

stated not long ago that the big increase in food production throughout the world in the last two decades had been brought about by the use of modern chemical pesticides. To put it mildly that is an over-statement. In fact, it verges on the ridiculous and gives no credit to the following:

(1) The plant breeder who has come up with many new varieties and strains of crop species with specially improved characteristics. In wheat alone, there are now varieties with improved yielding capacity, improved drought resistance and resistance to disease such as rust.

(2) The animal geneticist who has greatly increased the efficiency of meat-producing animals and, as in Northern Australia, bred tick resistance into cattle.

(3) The agricultural research workers, soil conservationists, etc. The discovery of the importance of, and use of, trace elements has improved pasture production alone tremendously. Better methods of soil husbandry has meant higher fertility and hence better crops;

(4) The man on the land who, through better and more efficient methods, has lifted his own individual capacity for food production;

(5) The agricultural implement manufacturers who, by producing bigger and more effective machines for tillage, seeding and harvesting operations, have added quite considerably to the world's production of food and fibres; and

(6) The teams of agriculturists who, under the auspices of world organizations and other groups, have helped greatly by giving modern technological advice to the more backward countries.

In actual fact, the extent to which modern chemicals have helped to increase production is open to doubt. One eminent American research worker, in an attempt to estimate the damage done to world crops, came to the conclusion that today, despite the claims made for the new insecticides, pests still take about the same toll of crops as they did 50 years ago, namely, about 10 per cent. This is also the figure accepted by the Food Agricultural Organization, although one worker states that when food storage is taken into account the figure would be nearer 30 per cent.

Whatever the actual percentage of loss may be, it is still considerable, and it is evident that without some measure of control losses probably would be astronomical. The subject then is of great importance, and it could well be that what is apparently the easiest and cheapest way of controlling pests is not necessarily the best or most economic one in the long run. The immediate present is, of course, important. The future is probably even more important, and it is from this long-term viewpoint that the study of pests and their control should be viewed.

For certain types of pests, such as lucerne flea, where a form of biological control has been instituted in the form of a predator, it should be realized that mounting numbers of the pest usually results in an increase in the numbers of the predator due to the increase in the food of the predator and the ease of capturing the prey. Such a state of affairs could well keep pest numbers within limits where damage is negligible and other control measures are not necessary. Spraying with a chemical could, for instance, have a more drastic effect on the predator than on the pest and could conceivably make the situation worse. A proper understanding of predator-prey relationships is quite an important factor in pest control, and one of which not a great deal is known at the moment. Mr. R. L. Rudd, in his recent book *Pesticides and the Living Landscape*, includes a section on this subject which, like the whole book, is excellent.

When thinking of pests among vertebrates, much the same is true. Foxes have a reputation as lamb killers. Whether this is deserved or not does not enter into the argument here, but foxes are also predators of rabbits and other rodents. Any reduction in the number of foxes could be reflected in an increased number of rabbits. Conversely, any reduction in rabbit numbers could result in greater lamb losses from foxes.

In the end we must decide what is to be the goal of our control measures. Is it to be total eradication of a species, or merely a reduction in the numbers to a level where any damage caused is of no importance? Total eradication is both extremely difficult and extremely costly, and except in special circumstances is probably not warranted. If it is desirable, however, a study of the life cycle of the pest will show the time when it is most vulnerable to attack, and this should be the time to institute operations. But even then, other aspects should be taken into consideration.

In his book, *The Great Extermination*, Professor A. J. Marshall tells of a property in North-Western Australia which now carries only 3,000 sheep but on which an estimated 30,000 kangaroos find sustenance. Previous high numbers of sheep ate out the plants on which sheep live and thus allowed the ingress of plants unsuitable as sheep forage. These plants are ideal for kangaroos and, with the water points established for the sheep, make the property ideal range for the kangaroos. There has been a suggestion that kangaroo meat, properly handled, could become a big

income earner for Australia. A good deal of the habits and breeding habits of the kangaroo are known and, with a little ingenuity and research, why would it not be possible to domesticate these animals? Dr. H. J. Frith, Chief of the Division of Wildlife Research, C.S.I.R.O., has done much work on the kangaroo, and it seems as though on a property such as the one mentioned, sheep and kangaroos could perhaps be run in conjunction.

Zoologists often admitted the danger to wildlife but seemed uninterested or unconcerned about public health aspects. Biologists, economists and medical men seemed to vary in their opinions. All in all, the actual position seemed obscure; that danger did exist appeared evident, but the extent of such danger could not be estimated. This was not surprising as actual knowledge on the subject was sparse and results of investigations appeared contradictory. The more one reads and studies up on the whole subject, the clearer it becomes that there is at least a possibility of danger to public health, wildlife, soil fertility (and hence crop yields) and even to man's eventual ability to satisfactorily control some pests at all. With all this in mind, it seems reasonable to suggest that there is some urgency to institute research work to discover just what the extent of this danger really is.

As has been mentioned, there always was a danger of secondary poisoning with the use of poisons. With the advent of chlorinated hydrocarbons, this danger at first seemed to be overcome—secondary poisoning did not appear to happen. This for the most part still remains true, but due to their persistence and cumulative build up in body tissues, what has been called delayed expression occurs. This is not exemplified by the death of some species which has eaten some form which has been killed by the poison.

Mr. Quirké: D.D.T. in milk?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: As I said the other day when asking a question, evidence of D.D.T. had been found in the bodies of seals and penguins at Antarctica. The D.D.T. flows into the rivers, then into the ocean and probably drifts to Antarctica. Doctor D. F. Waterhouse, Chief of the Entomology Division of C.S.I.R.O., said:

Instead of relying on the use of chemicals as heavily as we do at the moment, we should tackle pest control by the far superior approach of pest management—the manipulation of the environment of an insect pest or weed in a systematic attempt to turn the tables on it while still favouring beneficial species. Pest management may involve the strategic use of

chemicals where the advantages of this outweigh the disadvantages, but such measures are likely to involve increasingly selective chemicals. It is apparent from the statement made by the Minister of Agriculture in reply to a question I asked that at both State and Commonwealth levels Government is aware of the problems connected with the use of the chlorinated hydrocarbons, organo-phosphates and carbamates, etc., and are not apathetic to them, is amply demonstrated by many official statements, press releases, etc. The Commonwealth Government has either just appointed or is still in the process of appointing a Pesticide Co-ordinator. The Victorian State Government has appointed a committee of inquiry into the effects of pesticides. Several newspaper articles have lately shown that the S.A. Agriculture Department is worried about the position. I quote from an article which appeared in the *Advertiser* of May 11, 1967, under the heading "Pesticide contamination causing more concern":

All countries in the world were becoming increasingly aware of the possibility of pesticide residues being contained in foodstuffs, the Director of Agriculture (Mr. A. G. Strickland) said yesterday. Pesticides were used on many S.A. farms to control pest damage. Where livestock grazed on the treated pastures or crops, meat and dairy produce could become affected, he said. If residues built up in these products then serious opposition to their entry into overseas countries could be met. The insecticides causing most concern were the chlorinated hydrocarbons, especially dieldrin, D.D.T. and lindane. Mr. Strickland said that most of these had now been replaced by alternative chemicals in the Agriculture Department's latest recommendations, with which all farmers should become familiar before the autumn spraying season commenced.

Either the same day or the one following, another officer of the department made a similar announcement over the Australian Broadcasting Commission. This shows that the departments are studying the problem. A query was raised by some people who are not prepared to get into the public press about it, that to discuss this question too much in public may harm our export markets, if they know we are using too many pesticides and weedicides. I disagree with that view because I believe it shows are exporters that we are alive to the problem and are giving it full attention. Much more work and study should be done on this important subject. I trust the Government will not hamper the work by lack of funds in this regard.

I come to deal now with another matter causing some concern. Not enough is being said about it in the press. Although it is being

studied we are getting no news of it: I refer to containerization. To handle meat in containers will require each ship to be refrigerated, and this of course will involve enormous cost. In addition to this, however, the refrigeration of containers will virtually cause the conventional refrigerated ships to become redundant. This will, of course, mean a considerable writing off of assets to the various shipping companies, which in turn must reflect back into the overall calculations of returns on capital expended for containerization.

We are not suggesting that containerization will not be of benefit in time to come, but it seems completely pointless that the greater percentage of persons concerned in shipping are rushing in to containerization, which at this point of time is something of a gamble, involving thousands of millions of dollars. It has been said that, should the principle of containerization prove a failure, Australia along with any other country must accept the losses involved. This is a most unfortunate and unrealistic way of looking at a system which could, if handled properly, give us many advantages. Surely as with all things, the introduction of containerization must be done gradually, allowing the industries concerned to feel their way, so that losses and expenditure are kept to a minimum should in fact the principle of containerization not work in all cases—and there are grave doubts amongst prominent ship-owners that this could be so. In respect to South Australia our duty is clear: to see that, in accepting the principle of containerization, it must be introduced on terms suitable to South Australia, and certainly not on the basis of containerization at any price.

Other matters which are of considerable importance and should exercise the mind of this Parliament concern, first, the effect of shipping freight containerization as it applies to South Australia, particularly in respect of wool and ment, and, secondly, the present overall position in which wool is placed in consideration of both oversea and local markets. Although a committee was formed in South Australia from various sections of industry and commerce, named the Container Consultative Council of South Australia, very little has been achieved to improve the overall situation facing South Australia in respect of the virtual loss of a terminal port. It would appear that Queensland through direct and forceful agitation will now receive a container terminal for other than United Kingdom and Continental trade, even though it was placed in the same position as South Australia in the original suggestion, as

terminal ports were to be constructed only at Sydney, Melbourne and Fremantle.

In recent weeks it has been announced that about \$13,000,000 will be required to handle wool in containerized form through high-density dumping methods. We should protest strongly, and to the Department of Trade in particular, that this suggested expenditure has virtually received departmental blessing without detailed consultations with the woolgrowing industry. During the session opportunities will be available to speak on other matters, as I understand the Government is to introduce 68 Bills. The Government should introduce immediately legislation to ensure that the 2.5c is authorized to be collected by the Wheat Board for Giles Point before the co-operative takes the project too far. There is not much to be done, but this collection cannot be made legally until Parliament passes the Bill.

An amendment is necessary to the Act controlling straying stock on roads. Some years ago the previous Chief Justice handed down a decision when the police prosecuted a farmer for this offence. The farmer's defence was that he had done everything possible to keep the stock within his fences and, on inspection, it was found that the fences were in good order. Damage had been caused to the motor vehicle in a collision with the stock. The Chief Justice dismissed the case. Some years later sheep belonging to a farmer between Kulpara and Maitland were involved in a collision with a motor car causing damage to it. The magistrate, after inspecting the property, was satisfied that the farmer had taken all reasonable and proper precautions to keep the sheep in his paddocks, and dismissed the case. He based his judgment on the precedent created by the Chief Justice in the earlier case. The police appealed, and after a hearing, Mr. Justice Chamberlain reversed the decision.

The farmer appealed to the High Court, which upheld the judgment of Mr. Justice Chamberlain. Because of these various judgments the situation is intolerable. A farmer may do everything possible to keep his stock within his property, but many things can happen to cause the sheep to escape on to the roads. This legislation needs amending to make the position clear. I have illustrated the differences between the opinions among judges, and Parliament should amend the Act. It should be a defence to the charge if a farmer has taken all proper precautions to

keep his stock within his property. I have spoken to the Premier about this matter and he has promised to consider it.

I congratulate the previous Attorney-General on being appointed Premier: he is showing initiative and drive in his office. However, I do not agree with all his proposals. Before balancing its Budget the Government should re-examine what it intends to do. I am worried about the drought, and hope that after the meeting on Friday further evidence will be available to the Government to present to the Commonwealth Government so that it may obtain a grant-in-aid for the stricken farmers in the Murray Mallee. I hope my plea on their behalf will not fall on deaf ears.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture): I support the motion, which was so ably moved by the member for Wallaroo and seconded by the member for Unley. I was pleased to see that on this occasion the Speech of the Governor's Deputy contained a good deal of reference to the department that I am pleased to administer. Previously there was criticism because the Government had not included very much about agriculture in the Governor's Speech. However, I think that this has been remedied this time.

I was also pleased that several members on both sides of the House have been complimentary in describing the department and its officers. I believe that such remarks are just, because in my work with these officers I have found them to be very dedicated people who are always anxious to be of service. I have frequently had requests from people for assistance. In fact, this afternoon a gentleman came to me for assistance and, after telephoning the appropriate officer, I referred him to the department, and I am sure that he received assistance. This is the common pattern throughout the department—zeal and enthusiasm for promoting agriculture and horticulture and for ensuring that the best is available to those who are producing food for the nation.

I should like to add my words to the expressions of sympathy that have been expressed by other members; I agree with these expressions. I say to those members who are retiring at the end of this session that I have enjoyed their company and I wish them well; I hope that they will live for a long time to enjoy the fruits of their retirement.

Regarding the speech of the member for Ridley, I should like to say that the Government has taken a good deal of note of his

representations, particularly with regard to the plight of his own district. It is evident that the farmers in the Murray Mallee are having a tough trot. When people are firmly entrenched and have been in a district for some years, possibly they do not need as much assistance as those to whom the honourable member has referred. We shall treat everyone on his merits; the honourable member will appreciate this. I have been happy with the representations made by the departmental officers who have gone to the banks to put the case clearly on behalf of these people.

Although the banking institutions and stock firms previously may have had some doubt about whether they would support a claim for increased money being made available, after representations had been made they were happy to do so. I trust that the people who control the purse strings will continue this policy. I am afraid that, if this drought continues, other districts will be affected. If that happens, people there will be treated on their merits and receive a sympathetic hearing. The fact that the barley and wheat boards are holding large reserves of grain in silos because of the drought is commendable. They have effectively appraised the situation, probably from past experiences, and they are now endeavouring to cope with the fodder position. The transporting of fodder is costly; certainly it would not be economical for people on the land. It is evident that grain is the better feed to conserve for the purpose, and it is gratifying to know that both boards have conserved large quantities of grain. Like other members, I hope and pray that the dry spell soon breaks and that the State will receive good rains. Nobody realizes more than those in Government that general rains at this stage are important not only to primary producers but also to every individual in the State. Obviously, when the farmer tightens his purse strings everyone else in the community is affected, as was discovered in New South Wales and Queensland two years ago. We cannot afford to have a dry year.

I was interested to hear the member for Ridley advocating a deficit. That is in complete contrast to criticisms levelled at the Government by some members opposite. Those criticisms have been unjust, because the deficit that occurred in 1965-66 was not our doing but was forced on us by circumstances. The honourable member also referred to lifting the road tax; as a result of a dry spell that continued in the north of Australia for 10 years, a request was made to the Government to lift the tax but

it was found that that was not possible under the existing legislation. However, I believe that it is possible to compensate people by some other means. I refer here to people transporting gift fodder to producers in affected areas, and assure the House that the Government will keep this in mind.

What the honourable member said about selling wheat overseas, particularly to Red China, reminded me of something that was advocated by the Labor Party at a conference in Tasmania some years ago. Indeed, I believe that what occurred led to the split in the Labor Party and to the formation of the Democratic Labor Party. Constant criticism was received from all sections of the community as a result of our advocating the selling of wheat to Red China. However, today that is the accepted thing, and it shows that Labor Party thinking is well ahead of the thinking of certain others.

Reference has been made in this debate to one particular problem child for which I am responsible, namely, the egg industry, which has exercised my mind considerably, particularly since I became Minister. Although receiving criticism, I have also received praise as a result of the implementation of the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities plan.

True, some people have tried to hop on the band wagon and obtain some political kudos in this regard. Indeed, one example of that occurred quite recently. Earlier in the debate the member for Alexandra (Hon. D. N. Brookman) referred to the matter, as also did the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn). The member for Alexandra referred to the Bill he introduced to provide for the election of producer members who, in the past, had been selected from a panel of names submitted to the Minister. I claim some credit for the introduction of that measure. A request was made by many producers in my district and in other parts of the State and a petition was presented to the House regarding legislation to allow producer members to be elected. It is interesting to note that on that occasion the petition forms were sent out to many people to get signatures. One lady, who has been most vociferous in her criticism of the C.E.M.A. plan because she is a free trader and believes in free trading, on that occasion refused to sign the petition or to ask anybody else who took eggs to her depot to sign it. However, now she and others interested in free trade are criticizing me for introducing legislation to stagger the producer-members' terms of office.

I admit that I introduced legislation into the House. However, at a meeting at Murray Bridge it was stated that I was responsible for all of this and that I had brought it about. However, as the member for Gumeracha said this afternoon, it is not the Government that does things: Parliament does them. This is most applicable in this case because, although the Government had the numbers in this House, it did not have them in another place; yet members of another place did not vote against this legislation when it was before Parliament.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: You are not denying responsibility, are you?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I introduced this legislation at the request of organizations. When responsible people representing an organization recommend something it is common practice for any Government to go along with them. On this occasion both the Red Comb and the poultry section of the Australian Primary Producers Union (as it then was) came to me with strong recommendations that I take the action I took. Therefore, the criticism levelled against me is not entirely deserved because the Opposition Party in the Upper House could have voted against this measure had it desired. It has also been stated that I did not allow a referendum to be held as was provided in legislation passed in this House in the last year of office of the former Government. I have been strongly criticized for not allowing a referendum. However, no other State Government nor the Commonwealth Government held a referendum.

Some people opposed to the scheme claimed that it was a socialistic move. However, I point out that throughout the Commonwealth there are only two Labor Governments, the rest being Liberal or Country Party Governments. Therefore, that line of thinking does not have much merit. I have made these points in relation to the remarks made by the member for Alexandra. C.E.M.A. has had two years of service to the industry. I believe a large measure of success has resulted in the stabilization of the industry. Interstate jealousies are disappearing, and members of State boards work in harmony for the improvement of the industry as a whole. Although mistakes might have been made, many of the problems associated with the marketing of eggs are being solved. Producers' opinions are being sought by the South Australian Egg Board. Meetings have been held, both in city and country areas, and board members are giving freely of their time in furthering the interests of the industry as a whole. We will make an

opportunity available to the people of South Australia interested in the poultry industry to attend a meeting at Murray Bridge soon to explain the matter.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Will that be a public meeting?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: It will be a meeting of producers. The only reason it will not be a public meeting is that we want to have a hall big enough to accommodate the people who will be invited to attend. I think it is only fair to make sure that the people directly interested in their industry have the first right to be present.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: That is the only reason, is it? You remember that the meeting you criticized was a public meeting.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: That is right, and that is the only reason so many people were there. A number of people who attended that meeting told me that they went along just to see the fun. I assure the honourable member that this will not be the case the next time, because a notice will be sent out to every producer who is paying the levy telling him that the meeting is to be held and that he is invited to attend.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: And no-one else will be able to attend?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: If there is enough room the doors will be opened afterwards, and the opportunity will be given for others to come in. The honourable member for Alexandra will be invited to come, and he will not get his invitation on a circular form, as I got mine. I wish to make a few references to the speech made by the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn), who seemed to think that I was a bit discourtous in not being present while he was speaking. Mr. Speaker, I sit in this House as often as any Minister and as often as most members, but there are times when it is necessary for me to attend to other things. At the time the member for Light was speaking I was interviewing a person who needed some help, and I thought it was important that I did so. It is remarkable that those who are loudest in their condemnation of the C.E.M.A. plan are those who have traded interstate for many years prior to the inception of the plan and have avoided contributing to equalization funds by way of egg levies. They were content to take advantage of the price structure as the result of orderly marketing under the various State boards. This gave them an advantage of 5d. a dozen by way of pool levy, and an upgrading of their eggs by the interstate operators, because their

grade standards were much lower than those observed by the boards. So much for the farm fresh eggs that have been peddled around Melbourne. It must hurt very much to contribute 6.6c a dozen (an average of 15 dozen a bird) to maintain C.E.M.A. and to have the advantage of a stabilized market with the higher net return.

This is the crux of the bitterness of the opponents of C.E.M.A. Yet without C.E.M.A. it would be the law of the jungle—the gospel of the free traders. Under this, the stronger ones live and the weaker go to the wall. The member for Light and his colleagues will remember the wheat, dried fruits, citrus and wine industries and the battles before those industries were stabilized. I ask any of those members to try to take away such a scheme from these people now and see how they get on. We must not fool ourselves: the interstate operators would not buy an egg if it meant a loss to them. Mr. Yoannidis will not be so keen to handle Mount Gambier producers' eggs when the Melbourne market becomes difficult. This week we have the spectacle of 400 cases being sent to Adelaide floors from Pinnaroo. Is this a sign that the edifice is cracking? It may be the turn of Mannum or Murray Bridge tomorrow. In the meantime, the board's agents have to maintain grading floors for the whim of these producers.

I draw the House's attention to the fact that this happened in 1961 when the interstate buyers stopped buying overnight without giving anybody the opportunity to know about it until it was too late. This flooded eggs into the Adelaide market. Under the Act it is compulsory for the board to accept every egg. Because of the unexpectedness of such an amount being added to the Adelaide market at the time, plus the fact that there was some unruly marketing taking place from the other States, it was just impossible to cope with the eggs. Prices as low as 10c a dozen were returned to the producers. This happened not only to those who had been sending eggs over the border without paying a levy but also to those who had been sincere and honest and stuck to the board all the time. Those people suffered as well. The people who today suggest that this should be a free and open go would not be so keen if this were to happen again.

Mr. Freebairn: When was this?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: In 1961. The member for Light has referred to the unstable conditions in the industry prior to the

Second World War and to the low prices that prevailed. It would pay many of those opposed to orderly marketing to reflect on whether they desired a return to similar conditions. It is rather interesting to note these net returns to producers over the last few years, despite the relatively low values for export:

	A dozen.
1964-65 (prior to C.E.M.A.)	32.92c
1965-66 (under C.E.M.A.) ..	35.47c
*1966-67	35.54c
*To week ended June 24, 1967.	

It can be seen that there has been an upward trend and certain advantage to those paying the levy. Admittedly, some export markets have yielded a return of about 18c a dozen for eggs used in the manufacture of pulp, but certainly not the 6c or 7c as referred to in the speech by the member for Light. On the egg in shell markets, greater returns have been received. For example, the total egg in shell pack for 1965-66 will average about 23.13c a dozen over all grades. This is on a buyer's market. Both C.E.M.A. and the State boards have persistently warned producers of the perils of over-production but, as long as it is a manageable surplus, net returns can remain reasonably attractive. By reason of the fact that C.E.M.A. has been successful (which has been sour grapes to the free traders) encouragement has been given to expansion within the industry. It is rather odd that those who condemn C.E.M.A. and the boards, and say these bodies are the cause of over-production, etc., are also in the front in respect of the increase of their flocks, thereby contributing substantially to the surplus. One prominent and vociferous producer in the South-East has increased his flock (on his own figures) by 50 per cent to 15,000 birds. Perhaps in many cases bird counts by inspectors have forced some producers to be more realistic.

The member for Light, in quoting most freely about the early days of the board, must surely remember the post-war years, and the cry for food. Under the Ministry of Food, long-term contracts were made with Australia and Britain was prepared to pay reasonable prices, which resulted in years of peak production. At the same time, she was paying hundreds of millions of pounds sterling in subsidies to encourage agriculture in order to be self-sufficient. It was a seller's market. Then came the collapse of the late 1950's and in 1961 the free traders were glad to have egg boards on which to dump their surplus. The amendment of the legislation to 250 birds kept for 13 prescribed days gave a

vote to many producers who previously had not been entitled to vote. The number of producers entitled to vote in the 1964 election was 607, and the number in each district was:

No. 1 district	181
No. 2 district	113
No. 3 district	313
Total	607

For the recent election 189 producers were entitled to vote in the No. 1 district. The figure for No. 3 district was 312. No figure was established for the No. 2 district, but it would be reasonable to assume that there would be an increase on the 1964 election, because of the change in the franchise.

Mr. Freebairn: Only minimal.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes, it is slight, but it is an increase. The Opposition must wish to forget the minimum of 3,000 dozen as the franchise for an Egg Board election. Perhaps this was deliberately planned to withhold a vote from the festering sore of traders in other States. Then they were against the board and the Government of the day. Today they are strange bedmates of the same members of the Opposition. Fortunately, many of the Opposition members realize the seriousness of the problems of the egg industry, and are endeavouring to solve them in a satisfactory manner. This applies particularly in the Legislative Council. The industry is going through a period of growing pains, and good sense and wise counsel will prevail.

The amended legislation in respect of the staggering of elections is sound, and any board of directors realizes that experience is an essential ingredient of any board. Experienced producer members were necessary at this time, particularly as a new Chairman had to be appointed to take the place of the late Chairman (Mr. C. Anderson). The amendment required a ballot to be drawn by the Governor to determine the order of retirement, and the member for District No. 1 was required to face the electors in March, 1967. This was asked for by two major grower organizations: Red Comb and the poultry section of the Australian Primary Producers Union. The Legislative Council accepted this. Although there was opposition here by the member for Light and some other members, in another place there were 16 members of the Liberal and Country League and four members of the Australian Labor Party. If it could have been tossed out, it would have been tossed out there, but this was an occasion when the Legislative Council

showed good sense. It realized that this was in the best interests of the industry. I give it full marks for this.

The member for Light referred to Tasmania and Queensland. As regards Tasmania, producers keeping more than 20 birds commercially are required to pay the levy. The honourable member said 50. This applies to all States. The honourable member asked me whether it applied to all States and I replied that to the best of my knowledge it did. I have since ascertained that it does. The honourable member must be confusing the Tasmanian State legislation applicable to State Board control and not in relation to C.E.M.A. As is the case with many of my opponents, the honourable member's knowledge of the industry is not complete. To my knowledge considerable numbers of farmers with up to 50 birds are exempt in South Australia, simply because they do not sell or barter eggs or, in other words, are not commercially engaged in the industry. Incidentally, of the 400 persons present at the Murray Bridge meeting not all by far were producers required to pay levy.

As regards the statement by the member for Light about Queensland (and the member for Alexandra mentioned this matter, too), I will again read the reply I gave the honourable member on that occasion when it was claimed that the remote areas of Queensland were exempt from hen levies. This is part of the report I read on June 22 of this year:

Regarding the remission of hen levies in remote areas of Queensland, on July 13, 1965, Mr. C. H. King, the Chairman of the South Queensland Egg Board, recommended that the applications from the various Northern Queensland producer organizations for exemption from hen levy be rejected. This recommendation was unanimously agreed to by C.E.M.A. On February 2, 1966, C.E.M.A. resolved:

That the Minister for Primary Industry be informed that C.E.M.A. having considered all available information (including the Nimmo report in respect of North Queensland) cannot see its way clear to recommending any departure from the council's previous recommendations in respect of exemption for remote areas.

It was subsequently learned that upon the representation by the Minister of Agriculture in Queensland the Minister for Primary Industry had approved of a payment of \$12,399, less 2½ per cent allowance, to the South Queensland board for the administration costs involved in the collection of a similar amount of hen levy from the producers concerned, as remission of hen levies to producers in Northern Queensland. This matter was again brought before the council on March 1, 1967, when it was resolved that the President of C.E.M.A. be requested to take this

matter up with the Minister for Primary Industry. It was perfectly clear that any grant by the remission of hen levies authorized by the Minister of Primary Industry in any area designated by a State Government would have to be funded from the normal grant to the board in that particular State, and would not be met from the C.E.M.A. central fund.

This is a different story from that of the member for Light, and it is contrary to what has been stated by members who claimed that people throughout Australia were not paying the hen levy. Obviously, this is not affecting the overall position of other States, because the levy is to be taken out of that State's reallocation from other C.E.M.A. funds. It could apply to any State under the legislation introduced by the Minister for Primary Industry. There are always two sides to every question and two types of people in any industry—those who favour orderly marketing and those who do not. Some people work in industries but do not wish to join a trade union, and some people are prepared to belong to a civilization or State without paying their just dues. People try to avoid paying income tax, but we should not condone this practice.

We must not, if we are honest, introduce politics when discussing an important industry. Rather we should ensure that the industry (that is, the principal producers) is protected. Some stock food producers are concerned at the attitude of those trying to get rid of the Egg Board and of the levy that should be paid. These people rely on full-time producers who purchase stock foods. In my district the firm of Noske Bros. employs many people because of the quantity of stock food they produce for full-time producers, not because of what they produce for people using this industry as a sideline. It has been claimed that a person with 200 fowls is a small producer, but he is not even a producer. If he relied for a living on the produce from 200 fowls he would starve to death.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Are you saying that he does not count?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I did not say that. He receives privileges, but he is not a full-time producer.

Mr. Freebairn: How many full-time producers are there?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: These people are, in the main, wheat and woolgrowers and make their living from those industries. I do not object to their keeping 20 or 200 fowls: it is a free country and they can do so. However, if they receive benefits they should pay their just dues.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: What is your attitude to the control of production if it is a free country?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: This matter has not been raised. It will be treated on its merits when it is considered. Apparently, people who favour orderly marketing for wheat and wool are trying to rob a full-time producer of his rights to an orderly marketing scheme.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): I support the motion, and regret that, at the opening of Parliament, His Excellency the Governor was unable to read the Speech setting out the Government's policy. This was his last opportunity to do so as Governor of this State, and we regret that he is at present in ill health. I also extend my sympathy to the families of members of this Parliament who have passed away since we last met. I did not know any of these members personally, except the Hon. Dudley Octoman. He was a very sincere and hard-working man, and a conscientious representative of his district. I served with him on the Advisory Board of Agriculture, and I learnt to know his worth as a man and as a citizen.

I also take this opportunity of congratulating you, Mr. Speaker, on the honour conferred on you. I have been in this House for nine years and I have come to appreciate your sincerity and your conscientious approach to any matter before the House; I think your honour was very well merited. I should also like to say that during the time that the former Premier (Hon. Frank Walsh) held that office, I was happy indeed with the way he dealt with all matters before the House and the way he treated members on this side. As Chairman of my Party I wrote on its behalf to Mr. Walsh on his retirement, expressing thanks for the friendship and co-operation he extended during his term of office. I also congratulate the members of the new Government. They still have time to settle in, and we shall prove their mettle before this session is over.

I was interested to note in His Excellency's Speech the heavy emphasis that was once again placed on agriculture. It is good that the Government recognizes the importance of agriculture to this State. True, the past season was a good one, except in certain areas, and it is most regrettable that those areas that suffered most last year are again in the grip of a drought at present. I realize that the member for the district has attempted to do something for them but it is a little late now to attempt to do the things that he has now undertaken.

I should like to concur with the Minister who has just resumed his seat that the wheat and barley boards have taken cognizance of the situation and I have discovered by way of question the quantity of barley currently held in stock in silos and in bags by the Barley Board. A quantity of 193,000 bushels of barley is held at Karoonda. We do not have to feed oats to sheep; we can feed barley to them, and at present prices it is a better feed. In 1944 we maintained our whole flock by feeding them wheat. We should remember that grain is available now.

I commend the respective boards for what they have done in reserving these supplies. I also point out, however, that they require the sympathy and understanding of other barley-growers. In withholding supplies against emergencies, they are withholding the supplies of growers who are awaiting payment. Barley-growers should remember that the board is doing this in the interests of the State, and they should approve the board's action in this emergency.

No-one holds the Agriculture Department in higher regard than I do. I trained with some of the leading members of the department, and I understand their worth. I know them personally and I realize their problems. We have heard much about what the department is doing, and we know that it wishes to do many things that it is unable to do. As I have said previously, there are too many chiefs and not enough Indians.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: I don't think that is quite correct.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I understand that it is. Although I am aware of the tremendous amount of work that has been undertaken in fundamental research, I point out that difficulty still exists in applying the results of that work.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: Quite a few moves have been made in this respect, as you know.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I am merely saying that that is the case.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: Quite a number of new appointments have been made.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes; and many officers have received promotion. However, it is difficult to ascertain what is happening in the hierarchy until one knows precisely what promotions and appointments have taken place.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The Minister's statement merely confirms that a problem exists.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: The problem existed before I became the Minister.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I am trying to be objective about the department. I am pointing out what has been the position for a long time. It is interesting to examine the department's finances and to see whence the department draws most of the money for the work it is undertaking. As a member of the Wheat Advisory Technical Committee, I am well aware of the sums of money that the department has received in respect of the Waite Agricultural Research Institute; in 1965-66 the sum was \$66,540; in 1966-67, \$71,457; and in 1967-68, \$74,160. These sums represent contributions made from a fund that has been accumulated as the result of a charge of $\frac{1}{4}$ c a bushel on all wheat delivered, and the sums have been matched on a \$1 for \$1 basis by the Commonwealth Government.

These sums form the basis of the work now being undertaken in pasture research, plant breeding, and farm management practice within the department. The Barley Board at present makes a donation, as also does the Maltsters and Brewers Board, and the Commonwealth Government matches those donations on an equal basis. Over the last three years about \$25,000 has been received by the department. In regard to research work, \$100,000 has been received by the department from barley and wheat farmers.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: From the producers themselves!

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes. I am grateful that the Auditor-General's Report for 1966 contains for the first time a detailed list of the industry funds that have been made available for agriculture in this State for the benefit of, and to be administered by, the department. In 1964-65 the sum amounted to \$403,847, and it was \$430,306 in 1965-66. I do not have the 1966-67 figures, but I point out that this is big money and that it is being provided not by the Government but by growers. Indeed, it would not be fitting if the Government did not make full use of this money. Although I approve of what is being undertaken by the department, I do not think sufficient is being done. Regrettably, irrespective of what is being made available by the Government for agriculture, little is left after grants made to the Waite Institute and grants for fruit fly control have been deducted. A change of thinking occurred in 1949 concerning the Waite Institute. I now quote the

following comments from page 2 of the 1948-49 report of the Waite Agricultural Research Institute:

During 1949 an agreement of far-reaching importance and both immediate and long-term significance was reached between the university and the Minister of Agriculture about the relative functions of the Waite Institute and the State Department of Agriculture. Since its inception the institute has provided certain scientific advisory services to the department, and these services will be continued. But the agreement affects profoundly both the institute and the department. Broadly it defines the work of the institute as fundamental research which aims to serve the needs of South Australian agriculture and that of the department as the advisory or extension work needed to promote the application of the results of such research in a practical way.

In 1949, a special Act was passed in order that money could be paid directly by the Government to the Waite Institute in order to assist it in its operations. I consider the Waite Institute today to be largely a department of the University of Adelaide. It is drawing substantial funds from the Government through the line "Minister of Agriculture—Miscellaneous". I wish to say a little more about this at the appropriate time.

The money being paid to the Waite Institute through the Agriculture Department forms a substantial proportion of the annual grant to the Minister of Agriculture. In fact, I think I am correct in saying that this sum was about \$1,040,000 last year—a substantial proportion of the money allocated to agriculture in this State. I believe some means might exist whereby some of this money could be made available to the Agriculture Department in order to carry out necessary applied research. We have been pouring money into fundamental research through the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization and through the university. We have a tremendous amount of knowledge in fundamental research but we are not putting the money into extension of the applied work to make this fund of information available to farmers. I believe this can be done through the department. As I have said, it is being done at present through the funds of the industry. The Government should apply a little more of its Budget to this work if it really wants to claim credit for the work done by the department in this State.

Regarding the other section of the Minister's department, the Roseworthy Agricultural College, as has been pointed out, this has

now been elevated to the tertiary field. This must have happened, because it now attracts Commonwealth money. All the laboratories, extra lecture rooms and plant breeding centres at Roseworthy have been provided directly from Commonwealth funds. I heartily approve of what has been done. From talks I had with Mr. Herriot over many years, I knew what he had in mind. I believe that in establishing a fourth-year course at Roseworthy he has established something most worthwhile. Not everybody wants to do a degree in agriculture, which is an academic degree today. Many people want a better knowledge of agriculture in order to apply it. I believe the particular course that has been revised at Roseworthy will train people to carry out this function of applied research and extension far more adequately than they were able to do in the past. However, this does leave a gap in that there is now no place where farmers' sons can get a more specialized agricultural education than that taught in agricultural high schools. The member for Barossa (Mrs. Byrne) referred to this and it has been referred to in another place. I believe the pilot course now developed at Urrbrae Agricultural High School should be extended. I think there should be several of these agricultural high schools scattered throughout the State teaching agriculture as a more specialized course from third-year secondary onwards. Although I would not like to condemn outright the present course being taught until I have seen more of it, I have always been rather sceptical of the proposals now being put into effect in trying to teach agriculture in area schools and high schools, for nearly all the academic information provided in the course is available to a student doing general science.

Agricultural science is not a recognized subject as such, and therefore I consider it is unwise to be spending substantial sums of money in developing this course. I stand to be corrected on this, but it is my present opinion. I would far prefer to see agricultural high schools, issuing a certificate of agriculture, established. Loxton is already making a plea for one. Struan in the South-East could even become surplus to the Social Welfare Department's requirements, and this would make an excellent site, for it is already equipped for such a high school. There might well be one at a place like Turretfield in the Lower North. This, I think, would cater for the three different categories of agriculture being taught or being required to be taught at an upper secondary level.

This is something I should like the Minister of Education to consider. I do not think it is a new suggestion, and indeed I do not claim any credit for it as a new suggestion. I believe Mr. Mander-Jones made some recommendations along these lines several years ago. I endorse this recommendation. I think that, now Roseworthy has been elevated to a higher status, this gap needs to be filled by some form of education of this sort.

That brings me to another aspect of agriculture, although along a slightly different line. I refer to water conservation. This afternoon we heard a very clear exposition of the situation regarding water supplies in South Australia. The member for Gumeracha (Sir Thomas Playford) drew upon a vast source of knowledge to outline the history of the River Murray Waters Agreement and of the Chowilla dam. We have an Act that is now being enforced to protect water supplies in certain areas. However, there are large areas of the State in which very little, if anything, is being done. I refer to the South-East, which is a unique area in that it has probably the largest area of high rainfall country in South Australia. It does not have sufficient fall to create a runoff in the form of rivers, but it does receive substantial additional flows of water from Victoria in addition to the rainfall that falls on the area, and this creates a problem.

The State first attempted to resolve this problem in about 1880, although very little was done effectively until the Royal Commission of 1924. That Royal Commission had to decide whether the drainage should proceed along what is known as the Moncrieffe system of drains (the numerical system referred to in the reports) or the Stewart system (the alphabetical system). The Commission ultimately recommended that the latter course be undertaken. The object of all this inquiry was to try to carry out a drainage scheme that would enable the South-East to become agriculturally free of water: in other words, so that it would grow cereal crops.

The whole concept of agriculture in the South-East has changed, particularly since 1947. Since 1947 the war service land settlement scheme and other development has cleared up large tracts of land on which the drains that were constructed earlier tipped out their water. Those tracts had been considered to be no-man's land. Drains were constructed in the Western Division and a substantial area was recovered and settled for soldier settlement, but we are now moving into the Eastern Division drainage and are proposing to spend much

money in conveying more of this water into the sea.

So far as I can ascertain, about 3,000 cusecs are flowing in these drains at peak flow. It adds up to millions of gallons of water that are being tipped out into the sea. The early reports draw attention to the fact that there is a fall of about 200ft. in 100 miles from the high ground around Mount Burr to the areas around Salt Creek and Alf's Flat, into which the normal drainage system took the water. Reedy Creek drained up to Salt Creek and then to the Coorong. Bakers Range drain and Eastern Division waters find their way up to Alf's Flat. There is no reason why that water cannot still go the same way. It would be impossible to consider diverting the Western Division water at this stage. So many major drains have been constructed that it would be undoing the work that has been done, but in respect of the Eastern Division some reconsideration should be given to this matter.

It is a long time since 1924, when these decisions were made, and no further consideration has been given to the policies relating to drainage since then, so far as I have been able to ascertain. The Mines Department officers complained that there was a complete lack of liaison between them and the engineers who carried out drainage. In other words, little has been done in the way of conserving water or thinking constructively about how water can be conserved in this vast area. It is high time a responsible committee was set up to examine this matter to see whether we can effectively use some of this water rather than tip it into the sea, particularly in view of the shortages of water that are likely to occur in South Australia in the next 20 years. As I have said before, large areas in County Cardwell rely entirely on floodwaters for the provision of stock water. Indeed, I am told (and I think correctly) that, if necessary, the South-Eastern drainage waters of the Eastern Division could be conducted into Lake Albert and from there into the water system of Lake Alexandrina. In other words, the South-Eastern water district could be connected to the Murray system.

Unfortunately, these drains do not flow every year, but in many years a tremendous volume of water could be conducted northwards and possibly effectively utilized in an area that now does not have ground water and to supplement areas where irrigation may be jeopardized by conservation policies that may become necessary in relation to areas such as

Lake Albert. I have already asked the Minister whether he would examine a matter affecting the Keppoch-Padthaway area, where it has been brought to my attention that excessive demands are being made on a water basin which is assumed to be limitless but which, in fact, could have limitations. This matter should be examined before people start paying substantial sums of money for land which they consider has an irrigation potential but which may not in the long term.

Mr. Casey: This is the same problem as that at Virginia.

Mr. NANKIVELL: It is slightly different. The aquifer at Virginia is fed from the slopes of the Mount Lofty Ranges and gets supplementary water from the Gawler and, I think, Light Rivers, and adjacent to those rivers the water is far better in quality than it is in the rest of the basin. But substantially that area is fed from the Mount Lofty Ranges. It is a pressure gradient holding the seawater out. As the water is drawn from the basin, the salt water moves in. The same problem could apply to Keppoch. Again, to the west of that area there is a salt water basin. In the Morambro Creek area, Victorian water is flooding the basin when it comes down in flood. There is probably a pressure gradient that is building up a basin in the Keppoch-Padthaway area. The capacity of that basin no-one knows, although its resources are being heavily taxed at present and will continue to be heavily taxed in the future.

I turn now to the possibilities of rain-making in South Australia. At present one or two aircraft are operating in Victoria. (I know that one operates from Horsham.) This work is financed generally by the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization and the Victorian Agriculture Department. Most members know the principle behind rain-making by cloud seeding. It is that we provide an artificial nucleus upon which water droplets will condense. First, we know they must be clouds of a certain type: super-cool clouds. We then seed into them and cause precipitation. There are two principal types of cloud. One is cumulus, the thunder cloud. These are seeded from the bottom with a mixture of silver iodide and acetone, which are burnt on special burners fixed under each wing of the aircraft and precipitation is expected within 20 to 30 minutes of seeding cumulus clouds.

The other form of cloud seeded is the stratus cloud, the one that comes over in a blanket. This is suitable provided its thick-

ness is half the distance between the cloud base and the ground: in other words, if the cloud base is 4,000ft., there must be a depth of 2,000ft. in that cloud if it is to be satisfactorily seeded. Also, the temperature at the top of the stratus cloud should be minus 5 degrees Centigrade. This method requires an aircraft to fly right through the cloud, so the planes used for this purpose must be structurally sound, with powerful dual engines, and they must be equipped for flying on instruments. Usually, after about two to three hours of seeding the stratus type of cloud, rain can be expected.

At present these planes are operating in Victoria but I am told by people interested in the effects of the rain in Victoria that they have discussed this matter with the people flying the aircraft and it would appear that the pilots could well seed these clouds in South Australia without affecting the rain being precipitated in Victoria. However, if they were seeded in South Australia, they might drop a substantial amount of their rain as they came across the area between the South Australian coast and that part of the Wimmera in Victoria which those aircraft are servicing. I understand that we are getting cloud formations, that the flying time is greater than that estimated by the Minister, and that the rain already made has been substantially more than the 19 points suggested by the Minister.

The cost of this operation is substantial, and may be one reason why the State Government has not proceeded with a similar project this year. According to my information, to maintain one aircraft for one month with one cloud-seeding officer costs about \$4,800 a month, or \$115,200 a year for two aircraft and an operator, which is the normal complement. Two aircraft are used in order to maintain a 24-hour watch and they are available every day of the week. I appreciate that the cost is substantial, but I understand that the Minister said that he would do something about this operation next year. As the aircraft is operating near the South Australian border at present will the Minister speak to the appropriate Minister in Victoria to ascertain whether flying can be done in South Australia, possibly nearer to the coast than to the border?

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: I shall be speaking to him next weekend.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I assure the Minister that if there is any way of making rain in that area by a co-operative effort of Victoria and South Australia with aircraft operating

from Horsham I, and the people in my district, will be grateful.

Mr. Tim Hughes (Chairman of the Aboriginal Lands Trust) is a practical man, and I have been most impressed by the reports I have received of the way he is going about his duties. The trust has visited Point McLeay and, as a result, one of its first constructive exercises is about to be undertaken there. Mr. Hughes has made it clear that no more than six families can expect to live on the area of Point McLeay. He has also made it clear that farming is not easy and that the people must stick it out 24 hours a day for seven days a week. A practical and successful farmer, he has suggested that this is the only way to succeed, and he has exhorted the people not to be under any misapprehension about the trust's policy on the use of this land by Aborigines. I understand that Point McLeay is being cleaned up, and there is substantial evidence to show that this is happening.

The present Superintendent, active and enterprising, knows what he is doing and, from my observations, he is carrying out his duties most efficiently. I understand that unmanned areas on the Coorong are to be disposed of, leased, or allocated in some way that will put them to effective use. Only the trust can do this without protests from outside people. Many people were apprehensive about whether the trust would function effectively, but I am satisfied that it is functioning well and that its members are competent and are conscientiously performing their duties. My attention has been drawn to one other matter by the member for Yorke Peninsula. At present there are only three members on the trust; no other members have been appointed from the other reserves, although provision is made in the Act for nine other members to be appointed. I draw attention to this because, in order for the board to have more representation and wider influence, other members should be appointed by the councils on these reserves as soon as possible. Otherwise, the trust will be composed of the Chairman, who is the Secretary of the department, and three other members. Provision is made, if the chairman is absent, for the members to elect an acting chairman from amongst themselves, and that chairman has a casting vote. So, it could well become a one-man band, as presently constituted.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: This was referred to earlier.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I understand that attention was drawn to this, but I repeat that

there could be a danger of this happening. I do not fear it at present but, unless additional members are appointed, it is a very real danger. In the meantime, I commend the board for what it is doing and I hope it continues to perform its duties as it has performed them in the past.

We have heard much about rail standardization and I am all for it. I concur with what was said this afternoon that, in connection with trade with Western Australia, it is important that we get an immediate link, otherwise South Australia will possibly be by-passed. Rail standardization will benefit Port Pirie because that city will be a centre for the train crews. It will also benefit Peterborough, which will be a centre for train crews and which will have workshops. But, from the viewpoint of South Australia as a whole, I am still a little apprehensive about its value.

I have been interested for a considerable time in the containerization of cargoes and its effect on the South Australian Railways. I have discussed this at great length over a long period with officers of the department. When I was in Melbourne some weeks ago I took the opportunity to study an exercise being carried out there by the Associated Steamships Company, which operates a container ship m.v. *Kooringa* between Port Melbourne and Fremantle. It is most fascinating, and I recommend that any member who is in Melbourne and who has the time should see how this is done. The load is pre-arranged in the warehouse. Every container is arranged in the warehouse while the ship is at sea, and the load is balanced and the ship's centre of gravity is known. When the ship comes in, the men immediately start transferring the cargo from the ship to the warehouse and from the warehouse to the ship, and they place the containers in their proper positions in the ship.

Mr. Ryan: That is only possible when the ship runs from one port to another.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes, but this ship is to come onto the Adelaide-Melbourne run.

Mr. Ryan: It has been on the run already.

Mr. NANKIVELL: It is not its normal run. There are two ships to be built at Whyalla on the completion of the oil rig, which has been sitting over two slipways. There are two 9,600-ton container ships to be built for the Eastern States and the Fremantle run, and m.v. *Kooringa* will come on to the Adelaide run. It was made clear to me that that ship would make substantial inroads into our railway cargo movement between Adelaide and Melbourne.

The m.v. *Kooringa* can handle, on a weekly cycle, 700,000 tons of cargo a year between Port Adelaide and Port Melbourne. That is a substantial tonnage by any standards, and that is one of the reasons why container ships can go only to a certain type of port. As honourable members may know, these ships must carry large tonnages; they cannot be expected to carry half cargoes.

I examined the possibility of whether, if we unloaded containers at Port Adelaide, it could become a central distributing point to other States. I was alarmed (and I shall not quote figures because I have been asked not to) at the fact that containers can be shipped from Port Adelaide to Port Melbourne at two-thirds of the cost a ton that the railways can carry at a cut rate. That will apply also to movement concerning Sydney.

Mr. Ryan: That does not bear out the ship-owners' argument that freight costs will rise.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I am not arguing about costly shipping rates; I am referring to a serious problem that must be examined. From discussions with railway officers, I have ascertained the tonnage rate for containers. Having also ascertained from the Associated Steamship Company its tonnage cost for containers, I again stress what substantial inroads a ship carrying 700,000 tons a year can make into our railways movement to Sydney. As the distance through Broken Hill is virtually the same as it is *via* Melbourne, more movements *via* Melbourne are possible. Therefore, there seems to be little value at present in railing *via* Broken Hill as opposed to Melbourne. There are two fast freights each night going to Melbourne, and five running between Melbourne and Sydney. Container cargo can be quickly moved through Melbourne without its being railed through Broken Hill.

I am concerned about the fact that when we move goods through New South Wales we do not fix the freight rate once we cross the New South Wales border. As has been previously pointed out in the House and, indeed, as the Premier himself has stated, 85 per cent of our goods must be shipped to other States for market. I can see no great advantage in the railways system of movement to the east, as opposed to the present system or any other system, unless we receive co-operation from the railways in regard to its freights. We do not wish industry in one State to be protected by freight differentials.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: That is why we want co-ordination of transport!

Mr. NANKIVELL: Co-ordination in this State will not affect Victoria or New South Wales, and that is why we need free road transport.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: With the co-ordination of transport that would be possible.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I have already experienced the effects of the different railway systems applying freight differentials in order to give preferential treatment to their goods. If we have to depend entirely on railway transport for this sort of movement we are at the mercy of the railway freights in the other States, and I do not like to think that we shall be placed at that disability.

I raise those points as a matter of interest. We have been accused of not doing any homework or constructive thinking. That is why I have raised these points about containerized shipping, the problem of the freights per ton with which we are going to be confronted, and also the possibilities of preferential rates being applied against us in order to reduce competition with products in this State in favour of industry in other States.

Possibly the Railways Department is operating as efficiently as it is permitted. We had a tremendous network of lines set up as developmental railway services. Perhaps it is high time that we tried to overcome the political implication associated with the railways. It is a fairly substantial political problem with which to deal because of the number of people concerned. However, I am sure we would be well advised to examine the possibility of duplicating profitable services and doing away with non-profitable services in order to put the department on a sound basis. We should do this rather than protect the system unduly. I believe the railway system should be protected as a State asset, but I wonder whether we should retain such a substantial asset in order to provide a transport service for the State. When the railway system was introduced there were no adequate roads, but today the position is different. What happened on Eyre Peninsula has proved conclusively that railways are not needed to transport bulk grain. I believe we could achieve consolidation of the railway system by perhaps dispensing with some of the services that exist and implementing road transport services instead. This would mean that the railway services left operating would be in a better position to pay their way than they would by any other means.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: That is co-ordination.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I do not consider that is co-ordination of transport. I am asking for consideration to be given to the retrenchment of railway services, not for co-ordination of the existing system. I believe we could think in terms of co-ordination far more efficiently if we had less railway services that were unprofitable and, in some large measure, unnecessary. These services are causing substantial drains on revenue to meet interest commitments. We have a dead weight, if ever there was a dead weight, and that is the

interest bills we have to meet on the moneys invested on unprofitable railway services. I believe this is an economy we might well consider, just as it was considered in Great Britain. Anything else that I could say in this debate I can leave until the debates on the Loan Estimates and the Budget. I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. RYAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.44 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, July 6, at 2 p.m.