

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Tuesday, July 29, 1952.

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

QUESTIONS.**UNDESIRABLE BOOKS FOR CHILDREN.**

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (on notice)—

1. Is it the Government's intention to establish a Children's Book Censorship Board in this State similar to the Film Censorship Board in order to prohibit undesirable children's publications being sold in South Australia?

2. Is it the Government's intention to extend free lending library services for children in both State and private schools.

The Hon. R. J. RUDALL—The replies are:—

1. At the last Premiers' Conference the State Premiers agreed to confer on the question of taking uniform action to prevent the publication of undesirable literature. The New South Wales Premier will convene the meeting for this purpose.

2. In regard to the children in State schools, there is a library service operating which adequately meets the position, and it is understood that many of the private schools have library services for their own children. There is also a free lending library service for children in operation at the Public Library, which is available to the children of the whole State. The number of names on the borrowers' register of children in the metropolitan area is 3,881, and books to the number of 45,210 were lent last year. In the country service there are on the borrowers' roll 7,785 children, and the books lent to children last year were 70,872. In addition to this, boxes of books are sent to country schools; 466 schools received these boxes last year, and the number of books in these boxes was 20,474.

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT.

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY (on notice)—Does the Government intend to introduce a system of payment for agistment to enable settlers in Category III., who are reliant on departmental contracts for sustenance, to have some return from stock before being charged for agistment?

The Hon. R. J. RUDALL—It is considered that the present system is satisfactory and that no undue hardship is suffered by allottees who obtain agistment from the department.

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY (on notice)—Does the Government intend to endorse service-men's leases with the recent concession of the right of freehold after 10 years?

The Hon. R. J. RUDALL—The matter is under consideration.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

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

(Continued from July 24. Page 102.)

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Central No. 1)—I join with other speakers in expressing my sincere regret at the sudden and lamented death of His Majesty King George VI. I also pay a tribute to our recent Governor, Sir Willoughby and Lady Norrie, and wholeheartedly endorse what others have said regarding them, for during the years they occupied their high office in South Australia their whole life, both public and private, was an exemplification of the British way of life. I wish them the greatest success in their new office in the sister dominion of New Zealand.

It may be fitting that I should make some practical remarks regarding the character of our British Constitution, for at a time when our Parliamentary system of Government is being assailed by those who subscribe to a policy of dictatorship and the atheistic way of life I think it would be appropriate, particularly upon this motion, to express my own and the views of the members of the Australian Labor Party on their attitude towards the Monarchy. As members know, the British Monarchy is a limited one, but it is a co-ordinated authority of the Estates of the Realm which, under the title of Queen, Lords and Commons, has contributed so greatly to the prosperity of the British Empire, and with the maintenance of which, I believe, that prosperity is bound up. Since the settlement of the British Constitution over 200 years ago England has never experienced a revolution although there has been no country in which there has been so continuous and such considerable change. Members may ask why? My reply is that the wisdom of our forebears placed the prize of supreme power outside the sphere of human passions. Whatever the struggles of Parties, whatever the strife of factions, whatever excitement and exaltation there has been in the public mind, there has always been something in the British Empire around which all classes and Parties could rally, representing the

majesty of the law and the administration of justice involving, at the same time, the security for every man's rights. That is symbolized in the British Monarchy.

I need only take members' minds back to the period of World Wars I. and II. when people in every part of the far-flung British Empire rallied to the cause which was theirs. That can be mainly attributed to the three fundamental principles that I have mentioned. It may be said "It is through the British Empire that the British way of life and our Parliamentary institutions function." It has been said, too, by those who subscribe to the dictatorship system of government that the British Empire is decadent and that the British people are decadent, but in no country in the world do we find the same protection that is afforded to members of the British Commonwealth of Nations because the Monarchy represents the majesty of the law and the rights, privileges and protection of the human race and its subjects.

We should be proud of the fact that it is through these institutions that we are permitted to govern ourselves and meet, as we are assembled here this afternoon, to pass laws affecting our economic and social life without any fear of a firing squad or a concentration camp. We believe in freedom which our forebears have established and it is our responsibility to see that that freedom is maintained. I might be charged this afternoon with introducing politics into this debate, but these institutions were established for the purpose of discussing politics. The Leader of the Liberal Party has often twitted me by asking, "What are we here for; only to discuss politics?" I do not want to be charged with introducing politics because this is the place where politics should be discussed and I intend to discuss them today.

During remarks by some members the Chifley Government came in for criticism. I believe in Parliamentary government and in the Party system. It has stood the test of time and has established itself as the noblest system in the world for free peoples. I do not deny the right of any member to criticize the Government or the Party of which I am a member, but I still claim the right to criticize and offer, so far as I am able, constructive criticism in connection with the Party which may be in power. Having conceded these points, politics should be played on a fair plane. Those who charged the late Chiefly Labor Government with having expended too much and run riot

with the taxpayers' money are not conversant with the whole of the facts.

I am forcibly reminded this afternoon that the State Government is of the same political complexion as that of the Menzies Government. Although the Menzies Government might term itself a Liberal Country Party the State Government in South Australia is the Liberal and Country League and whenever there has been a Federal poll, whether by way of a Federal election or referendum, we have always found—and find today—members of the Liberal and Country League supporting the Liberal Party led by the Prime Minister, the Honourable R. G. Menzies. In consequence, I think I might be permitted to refer to the last Federal general elections held in December, 1949.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—That was not the last election.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—No. There was a double dissolution election in 1951. During the 1949 election campaign the then Leader of the Liberal Party, Mr. Menzies, said:—

Our plans for reducing the inflationary cost of living were also stressed. This is probably the most worrying problem confronting the housewife today—the problem of getting a little more value out of the Labor-Socialist pound. Statisticians conservatively allow that the pound of 1939 is now worth only 12s. 2d. in "buying" power. But the average Australian housewife knows only too well that it would be nearer to the mark to say it is worth only 10s. . . . While encouraging production to the full our Government will hold itself ready to pay price subsidies in appropriate cases; particularly in respect of items affecting the cost of living of basic wage earners.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—What paper are you quoting from?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—The *Women's Weekly* of September 10, 1949. On the left is a photograph of the Prime Minister, the Right Honourable R. G. Menzies, and on the right a photograph of the Right Honourable Dr. H. V. Evatt. That election was fought on the Socialist issue. They went so far as to run an advertisement in the *Brisbane Truth* of April 22, 1951. It stated:—

Behind Chifley stands Evatt . . . behind Evatt stands Communism . . . behind Communism stands chaos . . . what Labor promises . . . that's what I'm afraid of. That was signed "Double Dissolution Dan."

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—What about coming back to South Australia?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I am. In view of the statement made by our Premier that

the Commonwealth Government not only governs our economic lives but our social lives because of Loan moneys not being conceded to this State on an equitable basis—

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Mr. Cudmore started off with Cambridge and Oxford.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I do not deny that. I recall the old saying of a man having acquired the Oxford manner and the Cambridge drawl. I do not impute any sinister motives to any member in this House or to the Government. The Labor Party will always give credit where it is due and will compliment the Government on actions which have been in the interests of the community. The last Federal election can be classed as a farce, a sham and a fraud—a political fraud. Because of the weight of propaganda and the barrage of publicity that was disseminated over the radio, the people voted out the Labor Government which placed the finances of this country on a solid economic foundation which the present Federal Government has dissipated. In support of my contentions I quote from the March-April issue of the *Victorian Institute of Public Affairs Review*. An article refers to the economic drift which has taken place since Mr. Menzies took control of the Commonwealth Government, and states:—

The policy of import restriction announced by the Federal Government on March 8, is the most far-reaching economic measure (excluding war-time) taken in this country since the depression of the early 30's. The frighteningly rapid depletion of our overseas balances over the last few months had suggested that some degree of quantitative import control would be unavoidable. But the extent and severity of the restrictions surprised everyone. The effect of the Government's decision is to reduce imports from an estimated £1,100 million for the current financial year, 1951-52, to possibly between £500 million and £600 million for the year 1952-53—a cut of about 50 per cent in value, and, if import prices continue to rise, by more than 50 per cent in quantity.

The Hon. R. J. Rudall—Do you agree that the import restrictions were justified?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Yes, in some instances, but they were imposed 12 months too late. When the present Government came into power they put no restrictions on luxury imports and, concerning that, the article continues:—

A large range of goods considered the least essential will be cut by 80 per cent below the value imported in 1950-51. These include motor cars, washing machines, textiles, and clothing, cigarettes and tobacco, whisky, china and glassware, cement.

When the Labor Government was in power there was an overall economic control of imports, but after Mr. Menzies took control luxury goods flooded the country and the spiral of inflation has been accentuated to such an extent that restrictions have been placed not only on luxury goods but on essential goods.

The Hon. L. H. Densley—Do you suggest that the importing of these goods has added to inflation?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Yes, and I again quote my authority:—

Whatever one may think about the import cuts—and there is no doubt that they represent a near economic tragedy for this country—in view of the position that had arisen, the Commonwealth Government was compelled to take immediate corrective action.

The corrective action was too late. The country was flooded with luxury goods and the Government dissipated the funds built up overseas by the previous Chifley Labor Government.

The Hon. F. T. Perry—That is wrong.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—It is not, and I will quote further.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—Did the Government build up funds overseas?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Yes. The article states:—

The bald facts can be briefly stated. At the end of the 1950-51 financial year, London funds stood at the record figure of £845 million. On the face of it we were entitled to feel that our position was reasonably secure against any adverse movement in our trade position. But six months later, by December, 1951, overseas balances had declined alarmingly to £544 million.

Had it not been for the fiscal and economic policy pursued by the Chifley Labor Government it would not have been able to make a free gift of over £25,000,000 to assist Great Britain over the hurdle imposed upon it by the International Financial Agreement.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—There are no funds at all; it is merely credit.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—That is only splitting straws because it is well-known that no money passes hands and that it is merely a debit and credit account. The article continues:—

A curious feature of the crisis, and one of which the general public are quite unaware, is the manner in which our overseas balances were built up from £208 million in June, 1946, to £843 million five years later in June, 1951.

The Hon. L. H. Densley—Still under a Labor Government?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—No, but the bulk of this reserve was built

up in pursuance of the policy enunciated by the Labor Government. A large sum of money has been brought here by migrants but, notwithstanding that, many people, both here and outside, believe we are on the eve of an economic recession. This magazine goes on to say:—

At the same time on the other side of the capital ledger we paid off overseas debts to the tune of £81,000,00.

We must be fair when criticizing Governments and, if a Government is pursuing a policy in the interests of all sections of the Australian people, it should be supported. That cannot be said of the Menzies Government. We have demonstrated that in this Chamber when four Labor representatives voted with two Ministers of a Government not of their political complexion in support of legislation considered by the Australian Labor Party to be in the interests of the people. However, that does not apply in Federal politics unless a Labor Government is in control. This has been amply demonstrated at meetings of the Loan Council. When those meetings were presided over by the late revered Ben Chifley South Australia progressed. Our own Premier has stated publicly that he never had occasion to assail publicly the then Prime Minister as he has assailed the present Prime Minister, Mr. Menzies, on the cutting down of loan expenditure in South Australia. All the recent developmental work in this State, such as opening up of the Leigh Creek coal-fields and expansion of our railways, has been done, through this Parliament, with moneys granted by the Chifley Government.

The Hon. E. Anthony—That is all moonshine.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I am simply giving facts which will shine out like a silver lining around the dark clouds hovering over us under a Government led by the Honourable R. G. Menzies, and to which my friend subscribes. The review to which I referred continued:—

The truth is that the Australian balance of payments crisis is something deep-rooted in the instability and weakness of the Australian economy and it is likely to be with us until those instabilities and weakness have been eradicated.

Labor says that the only way to eradicate them is to oust the present Government and return to the Treasury benches a Government imbued with an Australian sentiment, such as characterized the Curtin and Chifley Governments in the war and post-war years. I think I have shown that with a continuance of the

Menzies Government we are heading for a depression, but with a change of Government—

The Hon. E. Anthony—We will all be in it.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—We will all be in it from the prosperity angle, for Australia will then take its place with other members of the British Commonwealth and play its part in the development of the British Empire. In the financial restrictions placed on South Australia and other States we are a victim of the International Agreement. Members opposite may say that it was signed by a Labor Government and I do not deny it, but I remind them that it was signed in order to assist Great Britain and to enable her to survive the economic blizzard which swept the British Isles on the termination of war. Protective provisions were embodied in the agreement at the behest of the then Prime Minister, J. B. Chifley. I say, therefore, that this slide down the economic hill can be attributed mainly to the ineptitude of the Federal Government and its lack of policy in the interests of the Australian nation; to the leadership of that Government and those members of the Liberal and Country League who support it in the Federal Parliament.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—Is the honourable member standing at the next Federal elections?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I am quite happy to be with my honourable friend in the Legislative Council. In 1950, 12 months after the defeat of the Federal Labor Government, the tenth security loan was floated on terms and conditions laid down by the Labor Government, and this is what the *Advertiser* had to say on August 26, 1950:—

The £50,000,000 tenth security loan has been over-subscribed by £34,000,000, the Federal Treasurer, Sir Arthur Fadden, said last night. Some subscriptions had still to come to hand but excess moneys will be retained by the Government.

Contrast that position with the failure of loans which have been floated by the Menzies Government and which have been under-subscribed, showing that the investing public has no confidence in the Government.

Now I come near home. I have always made it a point never to mention in this Chamber any individual by name because he has not the right to defend himself, but any member has the right to criticize a person holding a responsible position as chairman of a board which uses Government funds for carrying on any function in the economic life of the community. I think every member

will agree that there is ample evidence that the financial position of the Tramways Trust is most unsatisfactory. The position has reached such an acute stage that the Premier offered the councils three alternatives. The Leader of the Opposition in this place, supported by the Leader of the Opposition in the other place, and supported by the Australian Labor Party, advocated the setting up of a Transport Control Commission in order to place our transport services not upon a profitable but upon a payable basis. In yesterday's *News* I read that councils are haggling about the right of the Government even to suggest taking over the tramways, yet while under their jurisdiction the tramways lost £313,000 in 1950-51 and £529,000 in 1951-52, bringing the accumulated deficit, not counting various losses written off, to £1,332,000.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—Shortening sections will not overcome that.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—The trust did not attempt to evolve a plan but adopted short-cut methods. First it made an onslaught on the children of this State by raising the price of school passes in April, 1952, from 6s. 6d. to 9s. 4d. a month. It thus made a grab at the future generations of this State, for everyone who has reared children knows the sacrifices which have to be made by parents. Nevertheless, the trust had no compunction about making this grab because it knew there was a large traffic by virtue of the children being compelled to use this service in order to reach their schools. Furthermore, it was in a position to utilize trams which had taken the peak loading to the city to pick up the children on the return journey and thus was able to earn revenue both ways. The Labor Party says that the trust should be placed under a single, co-ordinating authority. It is a matter of Government policy whether it be under the control of the Minister of Railways. The fact remains that the Government must move quickly in order to stop the drift of £313,000 and make some effort to reduce the trust's colossal deficit of £1,332,000.

The Hon. R. R. Wilson—What do you suggest?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Labor suggests that the tramways should be placed under one single, co-ordinating authority.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe—What difference would that make?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—A lot. A similar state of affairs existed with the Abattoirs Board. I was a member of the Joint Parliamentary Select Committee which inquired

into the activities of that board. The committee recommended alterations to the Abattoirs Act and the placing of a representative of the employees on the board.

The Hon. F. T. Perry—Did that effect a cure?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—It provided a number of cures. Members of the Abattoirs Board agree that the employees' representative has been a most valuable asset, not only in taking the industrial claims of the men through their union direct to the board but also by working generally in the interests of the abattoirs. He is a most valuable acquisition. The same applies to the Tramways Trust. I say with great respect that for years a Czar was in control of the tramways.

The Hon. E. Anthony—That is a reflection on members of the board.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I cannot help it if the honourable member cares to place that interpretation on my remarks. The quicker the Government moves in this matter and takes off the gloves and says, "We are the custodians of public funds of the State" and establishes a single co-ordinating authority, as advocated by the Labor Party two or three years ago, the sooner will the present chaotic position be righted and our transport system placed on a payable basis.

The Hon. F. T. Perry—In New South Wales the tramways are controlled by the Railways Commissioner.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I am not dealing with the New South Wales railways. It is for the Government to determine whether the tramways will be placed under the Railways Commissioner. The present Commissioner is able and erudite in his work and I would have no compunction in allowing him to be the co-ordinating authority, but it is not my prerogative to decide that. I can only suggest.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe—If we do not have any more luck with our railways than with the tramways we will not be much better off.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—But the railways pay; it is the accumulated interest charge that causes the deficit. Concessional rates allowed by the railways make some railway lines unpayable. From a landholder's point of view they should always be looked upon as a developmental project. Members who say that the railways should pay should always remember that. Country people are entitled to the amenities enjoyed by those living in the city.

I listened with much interest to Mr. Cudmore's able discourse on the history of the Adelaide University and compliment him on his contribution to the debate. It is the first time I can recall that any University representative in this Chamber has given members such a satisfactory history of the Mitchell era. I agree with his remarks about part-time students if he means that the University should not be made a centre for part-time socialites who take up one subject and became very active in University social life. It is not the centre for that type of work. If a person has a diploma or degree and desires to take up a subject in another faculty he should be permitted to do so.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—The person to whom you refer would not have matriculated.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—No. It is not right that people who have not matriculated should be allowed to take up one subject. The University should not allow these people who have not matriculated to take up one subject merely to enjoy social advantages. The Vice-Chancellor, Mr. Rowe, should be complimented on his work as Vice-Chancellor. The staff is working overtime without monetary remuneration merely to assist the faculties in which there is a shortage of teaching staff. The Chancellor, Sir Mellis Napier, is also to be complimented on the manner in which the University is conducted.

I also propose to reply to Mr. Robinson's statements about wheat acreages. Nearly all stock raised in the State comes into my electorate when it is sent to the abattoirs market. I find that, according to the State Statistician, during 1938-39 there were 11,842 wheat farms in South Australia. Last year the number had dwindled to 8,416. According to press reports the area sown was 200,000 acres less than the previous year and was expected to fall by a further 88,000 acres this year. A few years ago 48,000,000 bushels of wheat were reaped, but last year the crop was down to 27,000,000 bushels.

The Hon. R. R. Wilson—What about barley replacing wheat? There has been a complete change-over there.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—But not to such an appreciable extent. It is true that many farmers have gone out of wheat production. They have a right to change over from wheat to barley and from barley to wheat if they so desire.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—What is the position when they say they will not produce because of high taxation?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Mr. Oliver Badman, former Liberal member of the Federal Parliament, was reported in last Saturday's *Mail* as saying that Australia would not produce more wheat when growers were receiving such small returns from the home market. He was speaking as chairman of the Wool Committee of the Australian Primary Producers Union, at its annual conference. What have Mr. Robinson and Mr. Densley to say to this go-slow policy under a Liberal Government? They will probably claim that it is not a go-slow policy.

The Hon. R. R. Wilson—You are talking about wheat only.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—That is the subject under discussion.

The Hon. R. R. Wilson—There was no strike.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Mr. Badman said that primary producers would not grow more wheat when they got such small returns from the home market.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe—It will be a long time before primary producers get any help from the Labor Party.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—That statement is unjust. It was during the war years that the Federal Government, by concerted action, set up a Rural Reconstruction Commission, and the policy pursued by the Labor Government was in conformity with the reports of the Commission. Mr. Badman goes further and says that all the present Governments of Australia are aligned against the wheatgrowers and want food cheap for political reasons.

The Hon. R. R. Wilson—Why quote Mr. Badman?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—He is one of your big shots, and speaks officially for your Party. I do not know whether he is speaking for the King William Street wheatgrower or the man on the land.

The Hon. R. R. Wilson—Say, "For a section of the wheatgrowers."

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—All right, and a big section.

The Hon. R. R. Wilson—No.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Mr. Badman said:—

No real concessions have been offered to encourage growers to greater production. He suggests that stabilization schemes are no good and that the conference opposed any renewal of the International Wheat Agreement. It will be interesting to hear some Government members' replies to that. Mr. Anthony

said that the Prime Minister had not promised to put value back into the pound but I read a signed article in the *Women's Weekly* wherein Mr. Menzies did make that promise. Where do we find value back in the pound? He put it back into a pound of butter because the subsidy was withdrawn and the price of butter was increased by 1s. a pound, notwithstanding that, before the last elections, he said he would subsidize food supplies where necessary. That has not been done. I would like to know whether Mr. Rowe would go out among his electors and advocate the Menzies' cause in view of the broken promises to primary producers, workers in industry, and the man in the street. If he does he will ascertain the true feelings of the people in his electorate. The Government fears the result of the next State elections. The electors are aroused, and notwithstanding the popularity of any leader of leaders, desire a change of Government. After the next election we will see Labor Ministers gracing the Treasury Benches in this and another place. When that great day arrives I hope that members of the then Opposition will give the same consideration to the Labor Government as they have received. In no part of the British Empire do we find a political set-up similar to ours. In the House of Assembly there are 39 members with 12 members of the Opposition and four Ministers. In this Chamber there are four Labor representatives, two Ministers, and a total of 20 members. We all know that the most popular planks of Labor have been implemented by the State Government.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe—Then there is no need for a change of Government.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—There is a valid reason for a change. The Government only goes quarter way with the planks it has used. Legislation is introduced from time to time in another place and if Labor members consider it to be in the interests of the State they support it. The Leader of the Government can rely on 12 supporters in the House of Assembly and, with his Ministers, he has 16 out of a total of 39. He needs only seven supporters from that number of Liberal Country League members to carry legislation, but gets the greater bulk of his support from the Opposition. I have supported the Government on many occasions and so has the Leader of the Opposition and we have defended the Government against its own members on legislation. Labor considered beneficial.

The Hon. F. T. Perry—Are you praising the Government?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I am praising the Opposition. Often legislation could not be passed either here or in the House of Assembly without the support of the Opposition. When the change of Government takes place I hope members will realize the support it has received and will give the Labor Party the same support. I was going to expose the fallacy of Communism but will leave that to the Budget debate. I thank members for their patient hearing and lack of interjections and support the motion.

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY (Southern)—In supporting the motion I associate myself with other members in expressing regret at the death of our late King and in paying tribute to our new Queen. I hope hers will be a happy and prosperous reign for the British people. I express personal thanks and the thanks of my electorate for the work done by Sir Willoughby and Lady Norrie in this State. Country people have benefited greatly by their presence and regret their departure.

As Mr. Bardolph mentioned the unique position of our Government, it is worthwhile reviewing some of its achievements. No matter what activity we examine, we find that almost superhuman tasks have been attempted and achieved. Since 1946 over 29,000 houses have been built, providing accommodation for 116,000 people. A tremendous effort was necessary to achieve those results. The Government has also been responsible for developing our coal industry, and as a result almost continuous employment and power have been maintained in industry. Our programme of land development is surely one of the greatest in the State's history. The development has not been haphazard but such as will assist the productivity of the State. Our transport system, which a few years ago was in a difficult position, has slowly improved. A number of railway lines have been renewed and the broadening of the gauge in the South-East has been almost extended to Mount Gambier. Lines in the metropolitan area also are being improved. The Government, through shortage of labour, was forced to look overseas to recruit migrant labour and about 1,500 immigrants have now arrived to work with the department, and I have little doubt that it will not be long before some of our own people will be anxious to get back under the wing of the Government in our transport systems.

It is not long since the Whyalla water main was built and later extended to Woomera. The Mannum-Adelaide main is in course of construction, so I feel sure that everyone, if not completely satisfied, is pleased with the progress being made in water reticulation. We have every reason to be proud of our achievement in this respect for I believe that 92 per cent of the people are able, simply by turning a tap, to get as much water as they require. Again, we have the work which has been done since the nationalization of electricity services and, although it has cost large sums of money, it is an undertaking which is paying dividends for country people. The State is responsible for our public hospitals and has spent huge sums on them despite all the difficulties which have been met from time to time. The same applies to schools. Our school population has increased by about 25 per cent in the last three years and therefore it will be seen what a huge task the Government has had to face in providing schools and tutorial staff for the ever-increasing number of children, due not only to natural increases but those consequent upon our immigration policy.

As regards soldier settlement the Government has done, in the main, really wonderful work in the preparation of land for servicemen. The Government was fortunate in that it bought a great deal of land before there was a severe increase in price, but in travelling around my electorate I have been a little disappointed to meet with a few causes for dissatisfaction amongst settlers, which I believe could have been remedied. For example, I asked a question earlier today regarding the right of returned soldiers to the same privilege as is enjoyed by every holder of a perpetual lease, namely, to apply for freehold tenure after 10 years. As a member of Parliament I have understood that an agreement had been reached with the Commonwealth Government on this matter and, although I would not care to place my information at any particular door, I have from time to time when interviewing soldiers said that I understood that this right would be granted because an agreement had been reached with the Commonwealth Government. However, returned soldiers have all said that they could never get anything official regarding their rights in this matter and consequently I thought that if I asked that question it would clear the matter up. Although this has been a current topic for years, members heard the very disappointing reply the Minister gave me this afternoon.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—Hear, hear!

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY—I was disappointed because I feel that when a member asks a question departmental officials should supply the information if it is at all possible. One other matter I have tried to have cleared up by means of a question is in relation to agistment fees. Returned soldiers in category III. take contracts from the Government for the clearing of their own blocks, as well as others, and as their blocks reach the stage where they are able to run some stock they have the right to take agistment at fixed fees. Some of these soldiers—and I am not saying there is a great number—have had agistment fees for the pasturing of sheep deducted from money owing to them by the department on contracts. As some of these soldiers are dependent on those contracts for sustenance it does seem unfortunate that agistment fees must be taken from what is virtually their sustenance allowance. When a settler buys a flock of sheep it is often six to 12 months before he gets a return and he cannot be expected to carry on without some allowance for sustenance. I think it a mistake that the Government should take agistment fees from contract moneys and I hope that further consideration will be given this matter. Possibly it would not be desirable to make the rule generally applicable, but if it could be done in individual cases it would afford considerable satisfaction. There have been mistakes in soldier settlement schemes I have no doubt, but where thousands of decisions have to be made it is obvious that some mistakes will creep in. However, there is no disgrace in admitting an error and correcting it if possible.

I listened with some interest to Mr. Condon, when he entered what was to him a new era as far as I know him, in criticizing primary producers on their outlook. I believe no-one in this place enjoys so much affection from all members as he does, and I would like to reply to some of his statements, because it is desirable to examine the position a little more closely. We have in South Australia a recognized authority in the Director of Agriculture, and it has been his policy to advise primary producers to reduce the area under cultivation and go in more for pasture. One cannot expect city members to know all the ramifications of the Agriculture Department as they affect general work on farm land, but time and time again Dr. Callaghan has expressed the desirability of a new land usage, turning more to the growing of meat and rather less to the production of grain, and with that lead members will agree that the

primary producer has not fallen down on his job. I do not say he could not have done better; the time has arrived when everyone in Australia should do better, but I will quote briefly figures from the Statistical Review recently tabled. The average area under cultivation for the five years prior to 1950 was 6,286,000 acres and the reduction in 1950 was only slight, namely, to 6,243,000. The average area of all crops for the five years was 3,787,000 and for 1950 it was 3,617,000. The respective figures for wheat were 27,190,000 and 28,250,000 bushels. Barley production has grown by about four times what it was a few years ago and the same applies largely to oats, very little of which was exported for some years.

Because of the tremendous developmental programme undertaken by the State a considerable market for pasture seeds has grown up. In 1940-41 only 2,167 cwt of clover seed was harvested. In 1950 this had increased by nearly eight times to 17,933 cwt. Lucerne seed increased from 1,209 cwt. in 1940-41 to 9,090 cwt. in 1950 and other seeds increased from 698 cwt. to 2,702 cwt. Turning to stock, the average number of sheep for the five years was 8,529,000 compared with 9,477,000 for 1950, showing that the doctrine enunciated by Dr. Callaghan was being carried out. The same applies as regards cattle, the average for the five years being 432,714 compared with 464,141 in 1950. The average wool clip for the five years was 82,596,000 lb. compared with 92,556,000 lb. for 1950.

The question of the use of superphosphate has been mentioned frequently, but it as well to bring it forward again. In 1950, 1,740,000 acres were top-dressed with superphosphate, using 93,000 tons, whereas five years ago only 24,500 tons were used to top-dress 704,000 acres and 20 years ago the figures were respectively 11,000 tons and 214,000 acres.

Mr. Condon referred to barley production as undesirable. I think he said that the whole thing was wrong, but I do not think there was anything wrong with farmers turning from wheat to barley. There has been a strong demand for barley from the Eastern States at a higher price than wheat. Much more grain has been grown by combining barley and wheat in this State. In one year there was a particularly high production of wheat. I think we have been around the 12,000,000 bushel mark for barley for several years, with 17,000,000 bushels last year. Barley has entered largely into the economy of farmers and has been of great benefit to Australia generally. I think we

can do better with farm mechanization and hope that primary producers will accept the challenge and help build up our economy by producing necessary and highly-priced foodstuffs. It has been claimed that the number engaged in secondary industry during the past few years has doubled. However, the number engaged in primary production has remained largely static.

I desire to bring the question of country sewerage before the notice of members. Many of these country sewerage schemes have been inquired into by the Public Works Standing Committee and recommendations made, but in some country districts the position is very acute. I hope that it will be possible, in the near future, to make some definite advance in districts where considerable difficulty has been experienced in the disposal of sewage.

I extend my sympathy to the Minister of Education who is confronted with the difficulty of building more schools. I am certain that members appreciate the efforts that are being made to accommodate our increased population. I was greatly concerned about an article that appeared in the *Border Watch* of Saturday, July 19, about a new primary school for Mount Gambier. In the first place, some pertinent remarks, which I think were unwarranted, were made regarding a meeting attended by the Minister of Education at Mount Gambier last December. In order that members may understand how country people feel on this matter let me quote two or three passages from the *Border Watch*. Alderman S. H. Elliott, at a meeting of the town council, said:—

The Minister for Education, Mr. Rudall, on his visit to Mount Gambier last December, was evidently almost at the end of his excuses to explain the delays in commencing work on the new primary school.

The report recapitulates happenings over the years. It was first decided to ask for the school in 1946. In negotiating for the purchase of land on which to build the school, the Superintendent of Primary Schools, Mr. Manton, said:—

I need not remind you that the matter is urgent.

Notwithstanding the requests that have been made from time to time and that the Premier, the Minister of Education, and the Director of Education promised that the school would be opened in the near future, the Mount Gambier Council was informed that this would not be possible because of the unavailability of Loan funds. This matter needs to be looked at from the point of view of the public as well as State administration. It is no use our trying to lay

the blame at any one particular door, but if there is one door at which I lay the blame more than another it is that of the preaching of the spurious doctrine of a mythical "Golden Age," and the associated policy of restriction of output. Probably that has been the beginning of the trouble.

On the other hand we find, through fortuitous circumstances, that primary producers have, probably for the first time in their lives, been favoured by almost unlimited money through high prices received for their wool, grain and stock. Primary producers who have been starved for years for farm equipment and desirable facilities have had sufficient money to pay for such items as tractors, machinery, fencing, and amenities for the home, including refrigerators and washing machines. We should not cavil at their obtaining these things when they were in a position to do so. In most instances they have had to buy imported articles from overseas, as Australian industrial production did not measure up to their requirements in the post-war years. The steel industry could produce only about 60 per cent of normal production and farmers were forced to buy badly needed requirements for their farms from overseas sources. Undoubtedly many farmers and their wives and daughters worked for long periods without adequate amenities or machines. Everybody, I am sure, will agree that they had a right to buy these things even if they had to pay two or three times the normal price in Australia.

A number of passages have been quoted from the *Institute of Public Affairs Review*. Mr. Bardolph almost referred to it as a Bible. Let me read a few paragraphs from the May-June issue. I am sure that Mr. Bardolph could not have noticed the first matter mentioned. Dealing with "Productivity—an attitude of mind," the *Review* states:—

The economies of the English-speaking nations falls broadly into two classifications—"high productivity" economies and "low productivity" economies. The "high productivity" economies are to be found on the North American continent—the United States and Canada. The chief "low productivity" economies are Britain and Australia. In America, output per man-hour or man-year is the highest in the world; in general terms about two to three times as great as output per man-hour in Britain or Australia. In America, massive strides in production have been made over the last decade. In Britain and Australia, advances in production have been by comparison, meagre . . . In the "high production" economies, the standard of living of the average person is high and

the potentialities for further rapid improvements immense . . . The "high production" economies seem capable of surmounting their basic economic difficulties with extraordinary buoyancy and confidence. Nothing seems beyond them. The United States is proving that she can carry out a gigantic armament programme without serious inflation, without any perceptible reduction in living standards, and concurrently with large-scale advances in the capital equipment of civilian industry. The lower producers, on the other hand, seem to live perpetually under the looming thunder clouds of economic crisis. Obstacles are overcome only with laborious difficulty; but fresh ones almost immediately appear.

I think that sums up the position here, not only as regards the working man but all people connected with production. The statement is both interesting and informative. Countries which have gone ahead and produced at capacity are having a much better time than countries where production has been retarded. We have burnt up, very largely, our overseas balance by the purchase of those things, many of which we should have been able to produce in Australia. Last year we had an adverse trade balance of £383,755,000 whereas in the previous year we had a favourable balance of £237,718,000. The favourable trade balance was largely the result of extremely high prices for wool, assisted by a high price for grain.

It is interesting to consider where all this money has gone. Of the things which are particularly required on farms metal and metal manufactures to the value of £393,000,000 were imported into Australia, being £100 million higher than the year previous. Australia imported £203 million worth of clothing, which was up by £60 million. Sulphur, a commodity which we have not been able to produce, was worth £3,516,000, a reduction of 70 per cent on the year before. We were forced to take our own measures to find sulphur supplies. Another item of great interest is the increase in petrol imports. The value rose from £39 million to £45 million. The increased quantity imported is not as large as many people think.

The Hon. F. T. Perry—Was it for petrol only, or did it include oil?

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY—Petrol only. Mr. Bardolph referred to import restrictions. If anybody should be pleased that restrictions were imposed it should be members of the Labor Party and those they represent. One almost trembles to think what the results would have been had there been no restrictions.

All warehouses were full to the brim with produce for sale and cargo sheds at our ports were full, yet sales were falling away. When members of the Labor Party look at the question of import restrictions I am sure they will see that the time is ripe for some action to be taken to protect people in this country from their own folly. The primary industries of Australia were in the fortunate position of having had money to spend. Farmers were entitled to spend it to purchase plant and equipment and even the luxuries referred to by some members in order that their wives and families could enjoy a standard of living equal to that of city dwellers. Little income is received overseas from secondary industries. Most people are alive to the present position and many value their jobs more today than they did six months ago. Primary producers realize that if they are to maintain the standards they have acquired they must continue to produce to a greater extent. They realize they cannot expect the high prices they have received to continue and they will accept their responsibility and maintain the highest possible production. I support the motion.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1)—I support the motion and join with other members in their expressions of loyalty to Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth. I do not desire to traverse the ground they have covered and am content to associate myself with their remarks. The State Parliament is concerned at the curtailment of public works created by the policy enunciated by the present Commonwealth Government. One notable ray of sunshine in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech was where he referred to our timber mills and said:—

The notable progress made in recent years in the State's forestry undertakings has again been fully maintained. The volume of log timber obtained from the pine plantations during this financial year will be approximately 136,000,000 super ft.—an increase of 40,000,000 super ft. over last year's record figure. There is a corresponding increase in the earnings for the year, which are estimated at £838,000—a sum £200,000 above the amount received in 1950-1951. The extensions at the Nangwarry Mill have been completed, and will double the production of fruit cases, bringing the output from this mill to at least 2,000,000 cases a year. The net area approved for planting this season is 4,300 acres. When this land is planted the total area of established pine plantations will be approximately 117,000 acres. The industry has increased enormously and its present position is very creditable. In future years we can expect considerably more profit from our timber mills. It has often

been said that Government-controlled projects always lose money but this is apparently an exception. As President of the South Australian branch of the Australian Timber Workers' Union, I was closely associated with the early stages of the timber industry. On numerous occasions during its infancy I visited the South-East forests and when I saw them recently I was impressed by the enormous strides that had been made.

His Excellency, in referring to the uranium deposits at Radium Hill and Rum Jungle, said:—

A favourable arrangement has been concluded with British and American authorities and the Commonwealth, which will enable work on the field to be expedited and will secure for the State technical information as to methods of extracting the uranium.

Uranium ore is dispatched to America direct from the mine at Rum Jungle, and as most uranium ores in Australia contain copper, sulphuric and nitrogenous acids, quite apart from uranium concentrates, the extraction of these products from the ore is of vital importance to Australia. I have been reliably informed that Rum Jungle ore is rich in those materials, which are in short supply in South Australia. The treatment of ore in Australia is of paramount importance to the Commonwealth. I understand that a treatment plant is to be established here which will enable the ore from Radium Hill to be thoroughly treated. When in operation it should be of material benefit to the State. In despatching the uranium ore direct to America the by-products and their monetary value are lost to Australia, because I understand America is paying only for the uranium extracted. The favourable arrangement referred to by His Excellency should be disclosed to Parliament so that members will be conversant with what part South Australia will play in the treatment of uranium to recover the separate elements in the ores. If my information is correct, 40 per cent of the ore at Rum Jungle is pure copper and its loss to the country will be great. My informant has visited Rum Jungle for the purpose of inspecting and reporting on the project. Quite recently I read in the press that an agreement had been entered into but no particulars were given for security reasons. The whole world knows that Australia is rich in uranium and that an arrangement has been entered into between the Commonwealth and the British and American authorities and I cannot see why the agreement cannot be disclosed to Parliament.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—If you want information ask for it and it will appear in the press subsequently.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I have no doubt that is so. However, any agreement entered into should be tabled so that members can examine it. In referring to education His Excellency said that there were 99,000 students under the Education Department's control, but I understand the number has since passed the 100,000 mark. Various schools have been enlarged, including LeFevre boys technical, Nailsworth technical, and Findon primary, and others are awaiting additional classrooms. The increase in expenditure, which in 1951 totalled £1,039,203, is noteworthy. Whilst upon this subject I refer to remarks I made previously in this Chamber regarding the Findon school at Crittenden Road from which it may have appeared that I was criticizing the Minister of Education. However, I did not desire what I said to be considered in that way. Following that speech I received a letter from the Minister in which he referred to my speech on the Supplementary Estimates when I stated:—

On my latest information absolutely nothing has been done either to commence, let alone complete that school, so I do not think the expression "proceeding vigorously" can apply there.

That statement was made on June 25. In his letter of July 1, the Minister stated:—

Work on the Findon school, which will be of prefabricated aluminium construction, was begun some time ago and the foundations completed. The aluminium components have arrived from the United Kingdom and some of the walls have been erected and it is hoped that the school would be ready for occupation by the beginning of the next school year. . . . You will be able to check the above facts for yourself by a visit to the site and I think that when you have done so you will, at some later date, explain to the House that you were mistaken in the information which you set out in your speech quoted above.

On receipt of the letter I visited the school and in all fairness to the Minister I now wish to say that the foundations were completed in January, 1952, and the erection of the walls commenced on June 26. I appreciate the difficulties which the Minister faced in obtaining materials to complete the project and it is quite evident that the information with which I was supplied was not wholly correct. Therefore I would like to correct the impression I may have made as it was not my wish to appear over-critical. It appeared to me, however, that the period of 15 months which elapsed from the letting of the contract to the commencement of the work warranted some criticism,

but I assure the Minister of my whole-hearted support of all his endeavours in regard to educational matters.

Australia is entering upon a new economic phase directly opposed to the period of prosperity we have recently enjoyed. The main reason for this decline, which is already having its effect in South Australia, has been attributed to the 40-hour week and the increased basic wage. I do not wish my remarks to be derogatory, but I feel that the economic position is having a very detrimental effect upon the State and Australia as a whole and I cannot agree with the contention that the troubles we are facing are due to the 40-hour week and the increased basic wage because most of the increasing unemployment is taking place in private industry. In the *Advertiser* of July 23 it was reported that employment in private industry throughout Australia had dropped by 62,400 for the six months ending May, 1952, but of this number 22,100 had been re-employed in Government departments, leaving an overall drop of 40,300. Further figures of the numbers receiving unemployment benefits from the Commonwealth to June 30, 1952, are as follows:—

New South Wales.—There were 4,523 persons receiving unemployment benefit in New South Wales at June 28; of these 3,569 were in the metropolitan area. In the country districts the largest numbers were at Orange 270, Wollongong 131, Lithgow 74, Cessnock 73, Maitland 70, Lismore 69, Newcastle 66, Grafton 36, and Cowra 24. The increase during June was mainly in the metropolitan area 1,574, Orange 170, Lithgow 32, Newcastle 30, Cowra 18, and Lismore 16.

Victoria.—Most of the 1,108 persons receiving unemployment benefit in Victoria at June 28 were in the metropolitan area 860 and in the country district of Bendigo 72, Geelong 53, Ballarat 46, Wangaratta 34, and Shepparton 21. Of the increase of 759 during June, 617 were in the metropolitan area and 142 in country districts. The largest increases in the country were in Bendigo 52, Geelong 43, Shepparton 20, and Wangaratta 15.

Queensland.—In Brisbane the number receiving benefit increased by 133. Since the peak figure of 2,773 at April 19, there has been a fall of 718 in the numbers of benefits in Queensland.

South Australia.—The number of recipients of unemployed benefit increased during June by 96. Most of the 153 on benefit at June 28 were in the metropolitan area.

Western Australia.—There were 190 males and 22 females receiving unemployment benefit in Western Australia at June 28. Most of these were in the metropolitan area and at Kalgoorlie. Almost all the increase of 141 during June was in the metropolitan area.

Tasmania.—At June 28, 93 men and 11 women were receiving unemployment benefit in Tasmania. Most were in the Hobart district. The increase of 80 during June was at Hobart 62 and Launceston 18. Migrants are still being brought to Australia, yet work cannot be found for those already here. Homes are a thing unknown to them. This policy on migrants is putting additional burdens upon our already overstrained economy and, although Australia may need migrants for further development, no more should be brought to Australia, and particularly South Australia, until those already here are absorbed into industry, and the whole populace adequately housed.

We find ourselves in the same position as the other States, although perhaps not on such a large scale as at Bonegilla migrant camp. A deputation from the Trades and Labor Council waited on the Railways Commissioner about the position and was informed that the contract for the remaining 343 German migrants who were to come to South Australia for employment in the railways had been cancelled. That was a commendable decision for the Commissioner to arrive at. The Commonwealth should accept the lead given by the South Australian Government and bring no more migrants here until such time as all workers are in full employment and Australian people have a home which can be called a home in the real sense.

We have been told that the production of goods must be increased and that in order to do so we must return to a 44-hour week, with a decrease in wages rates. If this policy is given effect to it will only mean more unemployment. One is led to believe that the whole purpose of employers is to create a big unemployment pool for their own purposes. It appears that this policy has been endorsed by the Menzies Government. Mr. Menzies was reported in the *West Australian Wheatgrower* of April 24, 1946, as saying that a pool of unemployed was necessary to discipline the workers. Evidently Mr. Menzies was not concerned with the suffering and hardship caused to the women and children through unemployment so long as it ensured that the class he represents holds the whip hand over the workers.

The Hon. E. H. Edmonds—What authority have you for saying that?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—It was reported in the *West Australian Wheatgrower* of April 24, 1946, which can be perused by the honourable member. The policy closely resembles that which followed World War I. and led to the depression. Unemployment reduces the purchasing power of the workers, decreases the demand for goods and leads to further unemployment, the whole of which is very serious for the State. Let us be realists and admit that there is no necessity for unemployment in Australia, if what employers collectively claim is correct, so one can only assume that production has now passed the demand and goods are plentiful, but the continued high price demanded for goods is becoming above the ability of the public to buy. The decontrol of prices is tending to push up the cost of living. Real wages are now pegged, but the continual increases in every-day commodities force up the basic wage. It must be remembered that there is a lag of three months between increased prices and the adjustment of the basic wage. The Government is contributing to the basic wage spiral. In the *Advertiser* of July 23, 1952, the Premier is reported to have stated:—

The 22½ per cent increase in rents over the 1942 level was now coming into operation, and probably had influenced the recent cost of living adjustments more than anything else. The Commonwealth Government three months ago when the increase to the basic wage was only 6s. loudly proclaimed that this increase, the smallest for some time, was the result of the effect of their policy now operating. I am interested to see the proclamation emanating from the same source, now the basic wage has increased the highest it has ever gone. The dog is still chasing its tail, and to straighten him out again, the only remedy the employers can offer is that the workers must receive less wages, which would enable them to sell goods cheaper, thus still maintaining their high profit margin. I advance a suggestion that goods be sold at a reasonable profit, and that manufacturers produce to their plant capacity, and that the 13s. increase be absorbed from profits, thus stabilizing the cost of living. All these things are reflected on our State to its detriment, and because of the restricted loan market, public works will have to be curtailed, and I am afraid unemployment will increase, adding further burdens to the general public.

I think members will agree that some matters published in the press from time to time emanate from various prominent people who contend that workers throughout Australia should accept a voluntary cut in their wages in order that goods can be reduced in price.

It is always the workers who should accept a cut. Employers should, for a change, consider carrying a little of the burden instead of fully passing it on whereby the vicious circle still operates and where the three months' lag between an adjustment in the basic wage and the cost of living increases will continue to operate as long as the prices for everyday commodities are increased. If prices were stabilized in the same way as they were during the war years by rigid Commonwealth price control, it would have the same tendency in peace-time as in war-time. The cost of living would not rise, as figures during the war years prove.

The Hon. F. T. Perry—Wages were pegged during that period.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—Wages are pegged today.

The Hon. F. T. Perry—No.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—They are. Increases in the cost of living are being forced up by manufacturers; it is not wages that are moving. If members want any proof of it all they have to do is to read Mr. Conciliation Commissioner Galvin's award. If that it not pegging wages then my experience in industrial courts is negligible. I have been an advocate in the South Australian Industrial Court and the Commonwealth Court of Conciliation and Arbitration for the past 10 years. If any member can go into those courts today and successfully obtain an increase in real wages and margins he is a clever advocate. I have gone there repeatedly and notwithstanding the case presented the court is reluctant to increase wages.

The effect of the Galvin award is to peg wages. Not only should wages be pegged, but there should be rigid price control over all commodities until such time as full employment can be maintained with a decent standard of living. All these things are tending to create considerable unrest amongst the workers. It might seem that I am attempting some political kite flying, but that is far from my mind. The position into which we are clearly heading is one that other countries have experienced, one which creates and breeds Communism. We are told that Communism is something we must defeat at all costs. I wholeheartedly agree. I know where I stand on the question of Communism or where I would stand if Communists obtained control of this country. I have no illusions about it.

Chief Judge Sir Raymond Kelly realized the position in February, 1952. Let me quote one

of his remarks before A.C.T.U. representatives in conference on the hours question. He said:—

The inclusion in the court's list of the claims for review of the existing awards in relation to standard hours in industry occurs, in my opinion, at a time of uncertainty, when a continuing inflationary drift threatens our economic structure and, if not arrested, will surely undermine personal security and happiness, and may lead to loss of confidence and unemployment, with a consequent reduction of personal incomes, hardship and possibly destitution. The last mentioned things are what some misled disruptive elements in our community (who are, make no mistake about it, serious) may even welcome if they desire to create a fertile field for the seeds of despair and revolution.

Are we not approaching the stage he visualizes? Do we not daily see increases in our unemployment figures? Because of the policy being pursued by the Commonwealth Government we are becoming a breeding ground for Communism and I am concerned about it. I think it appropriate to refer to an American publication entitled "Who is the Imperialist?" meaning, of course, Soviet Russia. It points out that, as at 1951, Russia had annexed 10 territories comprising Rumanian Provinces, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, northern East Prussia, eastern Czechoslovakia, Eastern Poland, Finnish Provinces, Tannu Tuva, Japanese possessions, and also controlled Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Eastern Germany, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, China, Outer Mongolia and North Korea. The opportune time arose in those places for Communism to take control and if we revert to the 30's Communism will gain here because people will be looking for some relief and will grasp at any straw in desperation. We do not want to be like ostriches and bury our heads in the sand but to be realists and look to the future to see that conditions here are not such as give Communists an opportunity to take control.

With the curtailment of certain public works I hope the highest priority will be given to the Adelaide-Mannum pipeline and additions to hospitals and schools. It is inevitable that certain public works must be curtailed and less important projects should be sacrificed for the more important. I thank members for their attention. I expected some of my remarks to provoke interjections but I have escaped.

The Hon. F. T. Perry—Do not think we are in agreement because we have not interjected.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I realize that. I advocate a policy of full employment throughout the Commonwealth and it can be achieved if the Commonwealth Government is assisted by State Governments and their members. I support the motion.

The Hon. J. L. COWAN (Southern)—In supporting the motion I join with other members in lamenting the untimely death of our beloved King George VI. He will long be remembered for devotion to duty and the high service he rendered to his people. I unite, too, in expressing sentiments of loyalty and goodwill to Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth. We pray that her reign may be long, happy and useful and that during it peace and co-operation may become the desire of all countries. I also add my tribute of appreciation of the valuable services rendered to this State by Sir Willoughby and Lady Norrie during their long term in Vice-Regal office. They discharged their duties with ability, dignity and charity and by example and precept they enhanced those virtues on which rest the true greatness of the States. By so doing they won a place in the hearts and affection of the people which will endure for many years.

The Lieutenant-Governor's speech embodied a comprehensive plan of governmental activities and was noted for the solid basis it laid for sound confidence in future progress and development. Among other matters of importance, it described a varied list of projects which will influence the expansion of rural production including the increase in the output of fertilizer, timber and cement, the improvement of rail, water and other services and the further development of our brown coal and uranium deposits. All these projects will materially assist the drive for increased primary production to which we all subscribe and which is of paramount importance to the future wellbeing of every person.

Although no mention was made of further irrigation schemes on the Murray I have no doubt that, as the result of the recent approval of the Australian Agricultural Council of an allocation of another 3,000 acres of plantings on the River Murray, other schemes will immediately be commenced in order to settle all ex-servicemen who wish to work irrigation blocks. This is welcome news and, if we are to make any worthwhile attempts to increase production, it is essential that we do so by means of irrigation. We all know the importance of coal and the many benefits derived from its use by mankind and the detrimental

effects that shortages of coal can have on our economic set-up. By way of comparison water is in every aspect just as important to our existence as coal but, because nature has placed at our disposal one of the largest fresh water rivers in the world, we see fit to allow large quantities of this life-giving stream to flow to waste in the sea whilst production on adjacent land is retarded for the lack of moisture. I strongly advocate that much greater use be made of River Murray water for irrigation purposes. Only a small portion of the total area of the State has an assured rainfall and most of it is cleared and fully producing, and it is imperative that we resort to irrigation to step up production. South Australia is still not using its share of the water available under the River Murray agreement which was incorporated in the Act of 1915.

During the past 10 years Lakes Alexandrina and Albert have slowly been converted from salt to fresh water because of the construction of the Goolwa barrages. These lakes are now natural reservoirs of fresh water, covering an area of 288 square miles, and constitute an immense storage for irrigation projects on a large scale. On the Lower Murray and adjoining the lakes vast areas of land are eminently suitable for irrigation, particularly because of the low lift and level nature of the country. These factors contribute to the economic success of irrigation schemes. Under irrigation this land would permit of a vast expansion of the dairying industry as well as aiding the production of fruit, vegetables, and pigmeats. It would also be ideal for the growing of pastures for general stock raising. The old idea that it was economically impossible to irrigate grass lands has now gone by the board.

The Hon. F. T. Perry—Do they irrigate by flooding or sprinkling?

The Hon. J. L. COWAN—By both systems, but the sprinkler system is more economic and has become more popular.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—Irrigation is cheaper but drainage is more expensive on low lying land.

The Hon. J. L. COWAN—That is so. Another great advantage is that these areas are only 50 or 60 miles from Adelaide and the products would be only a couple of hours travel from the city markets, thus obviating the wastage of perishable produce which so frequently occurs as the result of transport over long distances. Recently, the Premier referred to further irrigation developments.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Just before election time.

The Hon. J. L. COWAN—I have heard him make similar genuine references on other occasions. He suggested that these projects could be assisted by private individuals installing self-contained pumping plants along the river and shores of the lakes. It is true that private enterprise has shown what can be done in this direction, for quite a number of people have undertaken their own irrigation schemes between Bowhill and the lakes, and are carrying on quite successfully growing products of all kinds. I am sure that many more owning similar land would be prepared to do likewise if they were able to finance the purchase of plant and equipment. If the Government sees fit to leave this matter to private enterprise it will be necessary to arrange long-term loans in order to assist them. I know of a number who have already attempted this work, but cannot complete their installations owing to lack of finance.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—What is being done to prevent the flooding of irrigated areas?

The Hon. J. L. COWAN—Everything possible. The Government is handling the situation as well as possible; water has been released from Lake Victoria in order to absorb some of the floodwaters and the barrages at the Murray mouth have been adjusted to allow the water to flow out to sea as fast as possible. The flood threat is very serious and well organized efforts are being made by everyone concerned to meet the emergency, which will probably occur in about a month's time. Unless the Government is prepared to make loans to private individuals for irrigation schemes I feel sure that little progress will be made in this direction, so I hope, following the Premier's recent statement, that it will consider my suggestion on this plan for increased primary production. Should it be possible to develop the Moorlands brown coal field and establish there a regional station it would permit of the electrification of the pumping plants, which would greatly assist irrigation schemes in and around the area I have spoken of.

A matter of vital concern to all primary producers in the upper Murray areas and country east of the Murray is the inadequacy of the present ferry services to cope with the volume of traffic, particularly at the Blanchetown crossing. These ferries always constitute a bottleneck, but quite frequently a dead end when they are out of commission through mishap or accident. The flow of traffic over the Blanchetown punt is so great that it is not

unusual for trucks and cars to have to wait hours, and this delay and waste of time is a very serious matter which should not be allowed to continue.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—What does the honourable member suggest?

The Hon. J. L. COWAN—If it is not possible to construct a light traffic bridge over the lock at Blanchetown capable of taking cars—and I have not been convinced that it is impossible—something else will have to be devised. Had a little foresight been shown when the locks were constructed it would have been a simple matter.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—What about another punt?

The Hon. J. L. COWAN—Punts are outmoded; I do not think there is such a thing as an up-to-date punt.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—It would be impossible to get a bridge before another four or five years.

The Hon. J. L. COWAN—I do not think so. A bridge will come without doubt, and the sooner the happier the people will feel about it. Most of those who use the ferry pay a fee and I go so far as to say that everyone of them would be prepared to pay a toll considerably in excess of what they pay at present in order to be able to effect the crossing without the tremendous delays which now occur.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—In the meantime what about constructing a first-class road on the north side of the river via Morgan?

The Hon. J. L. COWAN—I think something is being done to put that road in order. As the possibility of commencing work on the suggested new road between Burnside and Crafers is receding owing to lack of funds it is all the more important that some improvements be carried out on the existing road between Glen Osmond and Crafers without delay as the narrowness of this road, with its many blind corners, makes traffic slow, dangerous and difficult. It requires only a slow-moving bus or semi-trailer to hold up traffic over considerable distances, for it is impossible to pass them without the risk of accident. It is essential that provision be made for faster vehicles to pass the heavier and slow-moving traffic and this could be effected by a widening of the corners and the construction of bays or passing places in which the slower vehicles could make way for the faster. With our present-day earth-moving machinery this should not be a very costly matter or involve a great deal of time.

South Australia recently lost one of its foremost agriculturalists in the person of the late Sid Shepherd, O.B.E., and I wish to pay a tribute to the valuable services he rendered to rural interests. He was always an advocate of pasture development and led the way in this field of agriculture. He pioneered the top-dressing of pastures with superphosphate and for this purpose invented the Shepherd broadcaster. So well did he fashion this machine that thousands of them are in use throughout Australia and they will remain a memorial to his energy and valuable work. Although a successful and very busy man he was never too busy to lend practical advice and assistance to any one who sought it, and many have profited from his kindly help. We regret his passing because he was the type of man who possessed that pioneering spirit which this State could ill-afford to lose.

During this debate we have heard on several occasions, and again this afternoon, the phrase "putting value back into the pound" and I wonder whether we stop to think what is involved when we use that somewhat hackneyed expression. I do not suppose we could all agree on how value could be put back into the pound, but it is certain that we should realize that there are other things to which

value must be restored, and I am sure that they are individual and personal responsibilities and not those of Governments. If every individual were prepared to shoulder his responsibilities and exhibit a little more co-operation, honesty of purpose and goodwill, the pound would soon look after itself and many of our present-day problems would be solved. Australia would be in a much better financial position and, instead of suffering the humiliation of having to borrow money whenever it can be found abroad, we should be in the position of lending it, for we have all the resources necessary to provide the funds. I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE secured the adjournment of the debate.

WOODVILLE HIGH SCHOOL.

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works on the Woodville high school new classroom and workshop block, together with minutes of evidence.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.57 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, July 30, at 2 p.m.