

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Wednesday, July 23, 1952.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Walter Duncan) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: HON. SIR WALLACE SANDFORD.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE moved—

That three weeks' leave of absence be granted to the Hon. Sir Wallace Sandford on account of absence from the State.

Motion carried.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

(Continued from July 22. Page 49.)

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—In his speech His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor referred to the passing of our late beloved King and to the accession to the Throne of our devoted Queen, Elizabeth II. Both the mover and the seconder of the motion spoke most ably as regards the loss the State and Commonwealth sustained by the death of His Majesty and again in having a Queen as head of the British Empire. Members of the Opposition heartily support those remarks. The seconder of the motion, Mr. Melrose, also referred to the departure from South Australia of Sir Willoughby and Lady Norrie. I also pay a tribute to the former Vice-regal couple. In his speech, His Excellency mentioned the death of the former member for Gawler, Mr. L. S. Duncan, and our sympathy is extended to those he left behind. I pay a tribute to the work he accomplished as a member of the State Parliament.

I add my congratulations to the Speaker of the House of Assembly, Sir Robert Nicholls, who has been selected to represent the South Australian Parliament at the forthcoming Empire Parliamentary conference to be held at Ottawa. I am sure that he has been chosen because he will so ably represent this State. I listened yesterday to two most entertaining speeches, both of which were interesting, informative, constructive and well delivered. That is borne out by the fact that rapt attention was paid to the addresses and it was well merited. I congratulate both the mover and the seconder on their contributions to the debate.

It is unusual for the Government to ask men of such high legal training and business ability to move and second this motion. I say that with great respect to members who have acquitted themselves so admirably in the past

when called upon to undertake similar duties. What struck me most was that two of the boys of the old brigade united themselves to stand solidly behind the Government during a time of storm and stress in an endeavour to delay the sinking of the ship of State. I feel, however, that the compliments handed out to the Government for its socialistic legislation were unjustified. I compliment both Mr. Cudmore and Mr. Melrose, not only for their oratory, but for their loyalty.

Mr. Cudmore delivered an excellent speech dealing with the most important matter of education. I am not well enough versed to offer any criticism, but I assure him that it was one of the best speeches he has delivered here. My honourable friend, who seconded the motion, also made an admirable contribution. The matters he introduced will give members something to think about. Not only did he refer to the humane side of the country's activities, but, as usual, made several suggestions in the interests not only of those he represents but of the State. I say in all seriousness and without any hesitation that it was a pleasure to listen to the valuable contributions of these two gentlemen. Of course, I would not be expected to agree with all they said.

This debate affords members an opportunity to express their opinions concerning many matters. There is no legislation before us but we will have opportunities of discussing various matters when they are introduced. I sympathize with our Ministry because this State has progressed considerably during the course of the years and it is hard to ask six men to carry such burdens and responsibilities, particularly when some carry on under difficulties. On June 25 I asked a question regarding the curtailment of public works which was referred to in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech but the Chief Secretary did not appear to regard the position seriously. As representatives of the people we should view the matter seriously. I knew, when asking my question, that instructions had been given to certain Government departments to curtail their expenditure by 33½ per cent. When, during the session, we ask for information we are entitled to receive it. I sought information concerning the discovery of radium but was by-passed, but the information appeared in the press the next day. There was no mention of the proposed marine fibre industry at Port Broughton in His Excellency's Speech, but we read in the press an alleged statement by the Premier at Canberra concerning this important industry. We

also read of the proposed atomic pile site at Backy Bay, which I know as Fitzgerald Bay, so named after a late representative of the House of Assembly. We are entitled to know about these matters before they are made public, as that is in the interests of the prestige and dignity of Parliament.

I noticed in the press recently that the Federal Returning Officer announced that 50 men were to be employed for four months in revising electoral rolls. I inquired whether any attempt would be made to secure additional names for the Legislative Council roll and was told that everything possible would be done within the limits of the electoral office authority. The reply to my question yesterday reveals that since the last State election 10,004 names have been added to the House of Assembly rolls. Additions to the Legislative Council rolls total 6,453, made up of 2,504 additions in Central No. 1, 3,110 in Central No. 2, 839 in Southern, 12 fewer in Midland, and 271 fewer in Northern. It is time we had compulsory enrolment and compulsory voting for the Legislative Council.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—Surely if a person's name was on the roll he would vote?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Then why did you compel electors for the House of Assembly to enrol and vote? In reply to a question the Attorney-General said that it was the duty of those entitled to enroll to see that their names were on the roll. Why is it not their responsibility in this case? If we make it compulsory in one instance we should in another, because it is so misleading. I guarantee that nearly every man one approached today would say that his name was on the Legislative Council roll because he honestly believed it to be there. Mr. Cudmore referred to the 40-hour week. He and others who think that are entitled to their opinion. I grant their sincerity, but let us examine the position and face up to facts so that we may do what is in the best interests of this great Commonwealth. I have previously advocated one authority for the fixing of wages, hours, and conditions of employment and prices, and in the absence of anything better I still do so. The present system is not a success. The latest cost of living increase of 13s. a week which will come into effect from the first pay period in August was not calculated upon all the price increases that have taken place because they do not come within the purview of the quarterly adjustment. We are therefore handicapped from the outset.

The Hon. W. W. Robinson—Some prices have been reduced.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—What are they?

The Hon. W. W. Robinson—Eggs, by 6d. a dozen.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—That is only one example compared with the many increases. We find ourselves in a very awkward situation and increased production is not the answer.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—It is very important.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Important, but not the whole solution. Let us be guided by history. Over-production results in unemployment as the position in the textile industry today clearly demonstrates, and that is only one. Again, may I ask how many people actually work a 40-hour week? Overtime has been worked continuously since the adoption of the 40-hour week in order to step up production. It is true that this has involved the payment of penalty rates to workers, but the employer has received his share in the shape of increased profits. What has happened in the past could well occur again. I do not agree with everything that has happened in the industrial field. We all should do our best, but I am here to defend the men who have been unfairly criticized, not so much by members of the Legislature as by certain other interests who have not considered all the facts. I have been a member of the Waterside Workers' Federation for 40 years and of the Federated Mill Employees Union for longer than that and I meet these and other workers who are just as decent and honest citizens as we are. Many have a fear of unemployment and I hope some solution can be found to obviate it. Let us all work together in the interests of the State to ensure its continued prosperity.

Much has been said about the slow turn-round of ships and there may be good reason for some of the complaints, but is there any reason why one section of the community should be singled out for blame. The obstacle to opening the books of the Waterside Workers' Federation for added membership was the fear of unemployment. In Melbourne 1,700 men have been paid attendance money day after day because no work has been available and a similar position exists in Port Adelaide. These men are as much interested in the welfare of this country as we are and therefore while I will tell them when I think they are in the wrong I will defend them when they are right. I am refuting many of the criticisms of honourable workers. Is there any difference between the attitude adopted by these men and that of the farmer who refuses to put his land under cultivation, about which I shall have more to say later? I am not criticizing them for not doing that.

I am merely endeavouring to show that we must take stock of ourselves before we criticize the other fellow.

What is the position as regards the cost of living? Since 1939 the overall food prices have increased in Adelaide by 174.7 per cent, rent by 14.3, clothing by 261.8 and miscellaneous by 97.1 per cent. Federal Ministers' statements that inflation has been checked are all moonshine. In December, 1950, the South Australian basic wage was £7 18s. Seven quarterly adjustments have been made since, totalling £3 6s., bringing the South Australian basic wage to £11 4s. today.

The Hon. E. Anthony—Were all those adjustments warranted?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I have sufficient confidence in the Arbitration Court to accept its decisions whether they are for or against me. The basic wage is lower in Perth, Hobart and Brisbane, which is the lowest, £10 13s. a week. The wage in Melbourne is the same as in Adelaide. The Sydney rate is £11 15s.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—There is a Labor Government in Queensland which controls prices.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Prices should be under national control. I am certain that nobody would like to live under conditions which apply in other countries.

The Hon. E. Anthony—The cost of living is much greater in England today, where there are no controls.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—During the last quarter increases have been higher than ever. There might be special reasons for that; I cannot say. The figure for Adelaide is 5.8 per cent as against 2.9 per cent in Brisbane. In many cases, captains of industry in South Australia are advocating increased working hours and a lower basic wage, thereby reducing the standard of living. I do not say that we have too high a standard of living in South Australia; in fact, I would like to see it further improved. Certain members may say we should increase production. If that is the cure there should not be much difficulty about it. Notwithstanding the clamour today for a 44-hour week, as mentioned by Mr. Cudmore, employers have not done too badly under 40 hours.

The Hon. E. Anthony—The "bosses" as you call them.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Industry generally has not done too badly. I shall not refer to any particular company as I might be doing it an injustice. Notwithstanding what has been said about the basic wage and a 40-hour week business interests appear to be quite happy,

according to balance-sheets and reports. I realize the position as much as Mr. Anthony does. I have no desire to see unemployment and will do my best to prevent it in every possible way, although the Federal Government has got itself into a mess. Every member here who is opposed to the Labor Party must accept some responsibility for it.

The Hon. E. Anthony—These increases are no reflection on the Federal Government.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—The Federal Government took office in order to put value back into the pound and to reduce taxation, but where have we got? People today are faced with the spectre of unemployment. For instance, fewer people are now employed in Government departments than has been the case for a long time. Many men are leaving and their places are not being filled. That is not the fault of the individual or of the Premier; it is the fault of the Federal Government.

The Hon. E. Anthony—I do not think there would be any difference, no matter what Government was in power.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—Do you favour reducing Government departments wherever possible or do you want everybody to be a Government servant?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—After next March or April, if the honourable member will direct his question to the Labor Party, he will get a reply. No Government likes dismissing men, but we cannot get a rabbit out of the hat if it is not there. All sorts of promises were made to the people. Australia and all State Governments have to face up to something that they have not had to confront for years. If we make suggestions they should be considered. Members of the Labor Party are here to put their views and if they are wrong they should be proved wrong. Mr. Anthony is well aware of the Labor Party's policy. It wants to put in a Government which will do the things that have been promised.

We have lost Mr. Chifley, but I know that, if an election were held tomorrow, notwithstanding what has been said about the two men who would stand for the Prime Ministership—Dr. Evatt and Mr. Menzies—Dr. Evatt would win. We did not have the unemployment under Labor administration that we have today. The State is "broke" because the Federal Government has failed to honour its promises. The Labor Party never made the promises that the Menzies Government has made. If it had it would be criticized. I realize that we are not getting anywhere by these quarterly

adjustments of the basic wage. I do not know whether any members think that the position will be met by increased production. How will the textile workers get on if production is increased? Textile mills are producing more today under existing working conditions than people care to buy.

I turn now to the question of wheat. I know that some members here have forgotten more about the wheat industry than I know, but as a metropolitan representative I take an interest in all matters appertaining to the State. I give a high priority to the work of the man on the land. Some primary producers refuse to increase production because of high taxation and because they cannot get a sufficient return.

The Hon. R. R. Wilson—Do you think they have really stopped producing?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—According to reports they have. There is a big drop in acreages sown to wheat.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—What about rain-fall?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I may have many disabilities but my eyesight is good and I know that compared with last year our rain-fall is down $3\frac{1}{2}$ in.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—Are you trying to argue that the rain has not affected the sowings?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—They have not sown their crops because of the conditions prevailing.

The Hon. L. H. Densley—I think you will find the position is different by the end of this month.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I hope so, but I can only go on the statements made by the people concerned. Their refusal to sow crops is not in the interests of the country, and they are adopting a wrong attitude. Parliament should encourage the man on the land, because if the man in the city is worthy of his hire so is the man on the land. I will always advocate good conditions for those who try to assist the country. According to statements a further decrease in the areas sown to wheat is indicated for 1952-53 and for the first time the total area for barley and oats will exceed that sown to wheat. The whole thing is wrong.

The Hon. L. H. Densley—Why?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Because wheat is more important and ensures work for a large number of men in manufacturing industries. It supplies the poultry, dairying, pig and other industries.

The Hon. W. W. Robinson—Wheat should not be fed to pigs or cows.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I am not an authority on that. This year there were 1,530,000 acres sown to wheat as against 1,680,000 last year. The ceiling price for wheat under the International Agreement is 16s. 1d.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—What is your authority?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—The Statistician. When food is urgently required overseas and in Australia the man on the land should be encouraged. I refer members to the *Wheat Board Gazette* of June, 1952, issued by the Australian Wheat Board. In September, 1939, the price for wheat was 2s. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. a bushel but in September last year it was 19s. In May of this year it was 21s. 6d. Those prices are outside the agreement.

The Hon. W. W. Robinson—We are selling very little under that.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—And you will sell less next year because of the smaller crop. The position is getting serious. New South Wales will have little to export this season because of flood damage.

The Hon. L. H. Densley—Do you blame the Liberal Government for that?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—No, it is due to seasonal conditions. Unfortunately for some people statements were published in the press before the floods interfered. Probably it will be suggested that we should get the same price for wheat on our local markets as we receive overseas. If I thought that was right I might support such a suggestion but the price of a 2 lb. loaf of bread would be increased by about 4d.

The Hon. L. H. Densley—Which is not as much as it was increased because of the basic wage rises.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—With the prices obtaining today it cannot be suggested that wheat growing is non-payable. Prices will be higher next year because of the limited crop.

Many people have clamoured for a return to State taxation. They have had the stick lately and now are not so anxious for this reversion of policy. We would be worse off under State taxation. In 1941-42, the first year the Federal Government took over taxation, the reimbursement from the Federal Government was £2,819,000 and, with a special grant of £1,854,000, the total received was £4,673,000. That represented 31 per cent of State

revenue. In 1951-52 the total Commonwealth payments were £15,462,000, or three times the amount received in 1941-42. For the 12 months preceding the change to Federal taxation the surplus received was £1,250,000 but no attempt was made to reduce taxation and what happened then would happen in 1954 if we reverted to State taxation.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—When you say we would be worse off do you refer to the Government or the taxpayer?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—The taxpayer, because the Federal Government will take the first lump and we will get what is left.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—That is what happens now.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I believe we will be worse off.

The Lieutenant-Governor's Speech referred to building houses on farms from Port McDonnell to Thevenard. I do not know whether any farmers have applied for them, but if we want to encourage farm labour we should offer them the same treatment and inducement as we give metropolitan workers. Are they not entitled to it, for they have to pay taxation just as others do? If we would agree to extending the conditions of the Industrial Code and the Factory Act to them it would be an inducement to take up rural work.

The Hon. R. R. Wilson—We all support that.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Not by votes because amendments to the Industrial Code have been defeated in this and the other place. However, I am glad to be able to look forward to one extra vote this year. The Railways Department has been recruiting workers from another country and about 1,500 of a total of 2,000 have arrived. I am not against welcoming people into this country for our population must be increased, but I hope that preference will not be shown them to the detriment of our own people. Yesterday Mr. Cudmore referred to the Leigh Creek coalfield and said that when the enabling measure was first before the House some on his side opposed it because they thought it was uneconomic. I do not think that was the true reason. They opposed it because they thought it was too Socialistic.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—You had better read *Hansard* again.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I heard the honourable member and others when the measure was before us on the first occasion, and I know his policy.

The Hon. E. Anthony—The honourable member should not make sweeping statements.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—In what way?

The Hon. E. Anthony—That members opposed that legislation on Socialistic grounds.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Today some members are taking credit for a lot of our Socialistic ventures. Afforestation is another example. When I was a member of another place the Gunn Government experienced considerable opposition when it wanted to extend forestry operations, so it is useless to come along when these ventures have proved to be successful and try to claim credit for them.

The Hon. E. Anthony—A Minister of the honourable member's Party would have sold out our forests lock, stock and barrel.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Not all in the Labor Party are angels any more than all in the Liberal Party, but I am giving facts which cannot be disputed and *Hansard* supports me. Another thing I criticize is the Government's lack of foresight. I have always given the present Government all the credit to which it was entitled, but it has made a big mistake in endeavouring to do too much.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—What Government?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I am speaking as a member of the State Parliament. Too much has been attempted without the means to put it into practice. The Government ordered 5,000 tons of steel from Belgium at £113 a ton whereas any quantity is procurable in Australia today at £30. We cannot cancel the overseas contract because half of the steel is on the sea, but why did not the Government have the foresight to look ahead? Consider the South Para reservoir. The only part of that which will be completed for many years is the tunnel, the contract for which was let to an overseas firm. I agree with Mr. Cudmore that priority should be given the Mannum-Adelaide water main to meet the great and growing demands for water in the metropolitan area, but it amazes me to think that our hills district, with a rainfall of about 32in. a year, has insufficient supplies to maintain the pyrites industry at Nairne and that a spur line from the Mannum-Adelaide main will have to be constructed. The Public Works Standing Committee has submitted many reports on works of various kinds, and I am particularly sympathetic towards the Minister of Education. The demand for school accommodation is growing rapidly and I had hoped that Parliament would

give early consideration to this matter and support the Minister in providing the necessary schools. Many recommendations have been made by the committee for new schools, but with the shortage of funds we know it will be difficult to erect many of them. The committee has also made recommendations in respect of sewerage for country towns, or has the matter under consideration, in connection with Mount Gambier, Naracoorte, Bordertown, Gumeracha, Port Augusta, Port Pirie, Port Lincoln and others, but how far can we hope to proceed in view of the limited funds available? The electrification of the metropolitan railway lines has been spoken of for many years.

The Hon. E. Anthony—It is in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech again this year.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—It will be for many years. I see some things in it which were there before I became a member of this place; I hope they will not be there for as long as I remain. New hospitals have been recommended for Port Lincoln, Mount Gambier and other places but I hope that the Northfield Mental Hospital extensions in particular will be proceeded with, and in general that as many public works as possible will be put in hand in order to prevent unemployment.

I have offered several suggestions this afternoon, not in the shape of criticism, but as a member of a responsible Party in an endeavour to have some of its views put into operation for the purpose of helping the people of South Australia and the Commonwealth. I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY (Central No. 2).
I congratulate the mover and seconder and join with them in expressing my very great sympathy and sorrow in the passing of His late Majesty, King George VI. As the mover said, those of us who were privileged to see the late King at close quarters could not but reflect on the very serious and obvious decline in his health. We also join in the jubulations on the accession of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. to the Throne. Under a constitutional monarchy the monarch never dies, and in the present Queen Elizabeth many of us who saw her in London and looked upon her doing a wonderful job during the illness of her late father felt that the reign of Elizabeth II. would be as illustrious as that of her distinguished predecessor in Tudor times. I am sure that the minds of everybody today are focussed on the most extraordinary economic position in which

this country finds itself. Many people would not have thought that in the course of a few weeks the whole outlook would be completely changed.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Didn't your Party say it would put value back into the pound?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—I have refuted that statement on many occasions and later will quote the exact words of the Prime Minister in reply to statements made by members of the Labor Party. We have seen the position where private industry and Governments competed for all available labour in the country. I have said previously that Governments have been much too extravagant. There is no question that all Governments have been attempting to do far too much far too quickly. This position will never be rectified until we get back to the Constitution. By that I mean until we have restored to us the powers under which a Sovereign Government can properly function. The most important feature of that is the power to collect our own taxation, a power which was taken away from us. It was appealed against by this and other Governments, but the High Court held that it was constitutionally sound. The Commonwealth Financial Agreement of 1926 was another tragic mistake.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—It was your Government which brought it in.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—I know. It might have made mistakes, but those who do not make mistakes do not make much. I think Mr. Bardolph will agree that it was a tragic mistake for this country to join the Financial Agreement. It was no mistake, however, when we lost our taxing powers. It was a deliberate act by the Commonwealth Government. These powers were handed over by the States under duress. The Leader of the Opposition thinks that we will be worse off if our taxing powers are restored to us.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Wasn't a measure introduced here to give uniform taxing powers to the Commonwealth?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—After the thing was established; we had to do so. A return of State taxing powers will place the responsibility fair on the shoulders of those who are administering this country. If they have to raise taxation they will take more care in obtaining and spending the money so raised. The existing system is an open invitation to the Treasurers of all States to embark on a wild orgy of

expenditure knowing that all they have to do is to go to the Commonwealth Government and ask it to meet it.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Aren't they spending money on developmental works?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—Of course. We need to pay some consideration to the money we have to spend. The difference between private and public finance is that a man who is financing his own business must consider where the money is to come from.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Are you implying that your Premier is reckless?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—I am not implying anything.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—You are implying that he is a spendthrift.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—The present system is a temptation to all Governments to embark on many schemes. They could have waited until there was sufficient money to do these things. Australia has a national burden of about £2,000 million. It is a huge sum for 8,000,000 people to face, only one-third of whom are producers. I have no lack of faith in the country; on the contrary I have every faith, but there is no reason why we should be prodigal in our expenditure. A huge volume of wealth lies untapped in this country. Australia will become a great country, but we must take stock of these things. I am afraid, however, that we have allowed them to get considerably out of hand.

Like Mr. Bardolph, I shall not introduce Party politics into this matter, because it greatly transcends Party politics. Every time the pound is depreciated it means that our savings are worth less. We must try to put this mythical value back into the pound. A statement has been frequently made that the Prime Minister said, in his policy speech, that he would put value back into the pound. I replied that the Prime Minister would not be so foolish as to make such a statement. No Prime Minister or Government can put value back into the pound. This is what Mr. Menzies said:—

The Statisticians will conservatively allow that the pound of 1939 is now only worth 12s. 2d. in purchasing power. But on the true cost of household requirements it would be nearer the mark to say that it is worth 10s. The greatest task, therefore, is to get value back into the pound, that is, to get prices down.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—When was that speech made?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—Just prior to the elections. It is what Mr. Menzies said in

his policy speech on the eve of the Liberal and Country League Government's victory over the Chifley Government.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Didn't he accept the responsibility of putting value back into the pound?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—He hoped to do so. It was the problem of the hour to put that value back—and still is. That responsibility rests with every man in the community. Increased production will make a valuable contribution towards it. We have been saying that there are too many pounds chasing too few goods. The solution is to get more goods, when we will have less pounds chasing more goods. We will never get prices down with the present situation, where two or three gentlemen, however distinguished they are, sitting in their ivory towers, play with statistics and produce these cost of living adjustments every quarter.

The Hon. A. A. Hoare—What is the cause of it?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—The 40-hour week was one of the first contributions, increased overtime and a general slowing down by all sections of the community.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—That statement is incorrect.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—No. There is a general slowing down right throughout industry. The employer is slowing down because there is no incentive for him to speed up and because of high taxation. He asks, "Why produce more, work harder and pay the money in taxation?" The worker says the same. It is of national importance that we should do something about it immediately. It is not a matter of Party politics but something which should concern the whole community. Mr. Galvin made the first contribution by being bold enough to refuse to increase marginal rates because it contributed to inflation.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Weren't you criticizing the Arbitration Court earlier this afternoon?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—I do not criticize the Arbitration Court. Its judgments are based on evidential grounds. Members of the community should co-operate to try and set the country on a better base. The Lieutenant-Governor's Speech referred to the need to increase production and to speed up work in primary industries. It is time we did our utmost to increase food production. We can produce the best wool in the world and great quantities of wheat and other produce that

will readily sell on the world market and which will bring dollars and pounds to the country. Not one of the products of secondary industry made in this country can be sold overseas. We can manufacture many things but we cannot sell them elsewhere. With our great industries it is wrong that we should have to import steel from Belgium and piping and galvanized iron from Japan.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—It was mismanagement obtaining steel from Belgium.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—There is something tragically wrong when we have to get piping and galvanized iron from a defeated country like Japan. Figures recently taken from the State statistics show that with a population of 723,526 the actual workers are 269,100, primary rural workers 43,100, secondary or factory workers 81,400 and those employed in tertiary industries like the Public Service 144,600. It is all out of balance. While I admire many of the Premier's virtues I think he has gone too far with the industrialization of South Australia. We are a primary-producing State and can profit as such.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Are you suggesting some people own too much land?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—I am not discussing that, but if they do I hope they are doing the best they can with it. We have too many secondary industries which require the application of a public service which costs a great deal of money. There is no limit to the world's wants and we can farm and produce its requirements.

The Hon. E. H. Edmonds—We must have a population.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—Yes, but we must keep our economy balanced. We have too many people in secondary industries and not sufficient on the land. I am concerned with the alarming drift of people from the country to the cities. It is no wonder when cities hold out such alluring attractions for workers. I have heard inducements and baits offered over the air for employees in certain industries. The attitude seems to be to take people from the land and leave the farmer and his son, if he has one, to carry on under great difficulties. The President of the New South Wales Graziers Association recently said:—

If our natural increase in population continues and with an additional 120,000 migrants yearly, by 1960 we will need to improve our wheat production of 1951-52 by 13,000,000 bush., meat by 238,000 tons and whole milk by 208,000,000 gal. If we do not improve our

average post-war production we will be importing vegetables, fruit, eggs and a great quantity of meat by 1960.

Since 1939, when our population was 599,000, the number of rural workers has increased by about 13,000 but the number engaged in secondary industries has increased fourfold. A great number are entering factories and the rural industries are being neglected.

The Hon. F. T. Perry—Factories make it easier for the man on the land.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—Yes, but we must retain a proper balance. Oliver Goldsmith said:—

Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates, and men decay.
There was an attraction to the cities in England and until recently there were few rural workers and farms fell into disuse and production fell. A great stimulus came from the Government and there is a slight return to the land and production is now increasing. We have that problem and, being advised, we should remedy the position.

Mr. Melrose referred to the acquisition of a building at Kent Town for mentally deficient children. I support his views and compliment the Minister of Education for his prompt and sympathetic consideration of a deputation led by myself 12 months ago. He has established this institution wherein the mentally deficient will be trained. The Government has also set up a small class for treating some portion of the deaf community. Perhaps we will be informed later that this is merely the beginning of the Government's recognition of its responsibility for educating not only the mentally deficient but the more handicapped children of our community. To date the Government has taken no cognizance of deaf children and has left their training to institutions like Townsend House and the Deaf Mission. Unfortunately, private charity is beginning to dry up. Those of us who are on committees find it difficult to maintain institutions which are affected by rising costs.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Do you suggest a lottery?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—No, I still have faith in human kindness, that people will do their best to help those less fortunate than themselves. That has always been the history of South Australia and I hope it will continue. Because of steep taxation the sources from which people contributed to these institutions are evaporating. The Government will have to amend the Education Act and take all these institutions under its control.

I was interested in Mr. Cudmore's remarks concerning the University. I was a student there for a number of years and spent some time on its council. I must differ with Mr. Cudmore in his reference to students who are attending the University for purposes other than obtaining degrees. In a young country the only hope for democracy is that it be an educated one. We must get as many as possible to our educational institutions. Many who attend the University to take a diploma may finally remain there for a degree. That is all to the good. I realize that these diploma classes sometimes clutter up the University and that much of the work might be done as well in another institution, but they are serving a good purpose. Many of the students are teachers—I suppose most of them—who are attending the University part-time with the idea of ultimately finishing their degree course, but with the immediate desire to improve their status in the Education Department. That is laudable and I do not think the honourable member will disagree with me on that. His own University, Oxford, is doing

quite a lot of that work. I visited it and had a good look around and I think he would find that conditions have altered considerably since he was there; students who would otherwise not be there are there today—students from all parts of the world. I think that, in contradistinction to what the honourable member said, every British university today receives a subsidy from the Government, as about £16,000,000 is distributed among them. Some of his statements were perfectly true regarding men who, in the old days, had time and leisure to study and take degrees, but who today find that they have to try to get a living and a university status at the same time. Our University is providing for that and I hope its doors will never be closed to students who are trying to improve their minds. I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 3.48 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, July 24, at 2 p.m.