

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Thursday, July 24, 1958.

The Council assembled at 2.15 p.m.

APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY PRESIDENT.

The Clerk having announced that, owing to the unavoidable absence of the President, it would be necessary to appoint a Deputy President,

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary) moved that the Hon. Sir Collier Cudmore be appointed to the position.

The Hon. F. J. Condon seconded the motion.

Motion carried.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT took the Chair and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.

FRUIT FLY ROAD BLOCKS.

The Hon. C. R. STORY—Will the Minister representing the Minister of Agriculture obtain the following information regarding fruit fly road blocks:—

- (1) Has any decision been reached by the Government concerning the setting up of a fruit fly road block on the Dukes Highway for the purpose of confiscating fruit entering this State from known fruit fly areas?
- (2) Has the road block on the Eyre Highway proved necessary from the point of view of confiscated fruit?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—I will take up those two questions with the Minister of Agriculture, under whose administrative responsibility the matters come.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE CLOCKS.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL—I ask leave to make a brief statement with a view to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL—Although I was here for prayers on Tuesday, I very much regret that I was not here when the Deputy President was elected because I was a few seconds late. I rather thought that the clock was fast, and as those who are responsible have been to a lot of expense to have clocks that are consistent and are supposed to keep correct time, I want to know whether the clocks are showing the correct time. Time is a question of what the clocks show, and one has no direct reference to what the real time is. In view of my experience on Tuesday, I took the trouble of setting my watch, which is a consistent timekeeper, on the strikes of

the Post Office clock at noon today, and my watch now shows 17 minutes past 2 o'clock whereas the clock in the Chamber shows 20 minutes past 2. As time is fleeting I think our clocks should be correct. Has any check been made on the clocks in the building to see if they show the correct time, and if not, will such a check be made?

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT—I take it that this question is directed to me, because the President is in charge of affairs in the House. I was late for a meeting attended by honourable members at 12 noon yesterday, and I queried the time then. I will endeavour to have a check made to see if we are right or whether the Post Office is right.

FLOW OF WATER IN PIKE AND MUNDIC CREEKS.

The Hon. C. R. STORY—Can the Minister representing the Minister of Works obtain an answer to the following question concerning the improvement of the flow of water in the Pike and Mundic Creeks in the hundred of Paringa:—

Will the Minister inform me whether the preliminary survey carried out by his department warrants a detailed investigation of the project and, if so, will the necessary funds be placed on the Estimates?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—Honourable members will appreciate that the question is definitely a technical one. I will consult my colleague and let the honourable member have an answer at the earliest opportunity.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 23. Page 119.)

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Central No. 1)—I assure honourable members that I will not take up very much time this afternoon, because I do not intend to answer in detail the major portion of His Excellency's Speech. I join with other members in expressing my regret at the sudden demise of Sir Wallace Sandford, who was for many years a member of this Chamber. I sat on one or two committees with Sir Wallace, particularly one Joint Parliamentary Committee on which he acted as chairman. I join with other members in expressing my condolences to his bereaved family.

I also join with other members in expressing a tinge of regret that some members are not seeking re-election next year. Mr. Bice came

in with me in 1941, together with Sir Norman Brookman, and I remember that Sir Walter Duncan, who was then Leader of the L.C.L., referred to the incoming of the three B's. I do not know who was the most turbulent of the three. Nevertheless I join with other honourable members in expressing regret that they will not be with us in 1959.

I compliment the Leader of the Opposition for his advocacy on behalf of the flour millers. It may be claimed by some members that I know very little about flour milling. My Leader is the chief spokesman in this House for that particular industry and the case he put up in his speech to this House on behalf of the milling industry and the facts that he gave to members and the Government show that the Government should take an active part in assisting to maintain this essential industry as a component part of the Commonwealth.

I understand that the main reason for other countries getting the markets which Australia, and South Australia in particular, used to supply is that those countries in which the flour is produced grant to their milling industry a subsidy. They fix a home consumption price and then can sell on the world's markets backed by a subsidy with which Australia cannot compete. Therefore, I compliment the Leader of the Opposition, especially as we have been told that this industry has been carried on through the years with no industrial upheaval and with that happy relationship which we all desire between the employer and the employee.

Referring now to other parts of your speech, Mr. Deputy President, I do not want to be charged with taking an unfair advantage of your being in the Chair. First, you implied that members of the Australian Labor Party in this House received their instructions from the Trades Hall and you fortified yourself too with *Hansard* reports that your Party threatened some newspaper or broadcasting station with the issue of a writ if they had the temerity to mention that members of the Liberal and Country League received instructions from headquarters in connection with their work in Parliament. I want to make it quite clear this afternoon that the Trades Hall is not some sinister political institution, it has played a prominent part in the economic development of South Australia, and indeed the whole of Australia. It has been said in this Chamber that there is no Party politics, that this is a "House of Review." On every occasion when it suits some honourable members, they are prepared always to attempt to decry the citadel of Labor

which is situated in Grote Street and is known as the Trades Hall. I remind members too that the very foundation stone of the Trades Hall and the many benefactions that were given to the Trades Hall for its construction were provided by the ancestors of some of our leading citizens because they realized that those connected with Labor had nothing else to sell but their labour. Consequently, they became an organized force. It ill-becomes any honourable member to attempt to decry any activities of the Trades Unions who may be situated in the Trades Hall.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe—We do not decry the Trades Unions.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I am convinced that the Minister of Roads would not be in a position to know what he was decrying; he would be merely an echo. I would also remind honourable members—I think this is the occasion to mention it—what the Trades Union movement did in time of Australia's greatest emergency. This can be confirmed by my friend on my right, Sir Frank Perry. He did notable work on the Board of Area Management in connection with the war, on which there were many prominent trade union members, and on that occasion the members and leaders of the Trades Union movement did not flinch if anything was asked of them in order to prosecute the war. On many occasions they allowed conditions which they had won through the Arbitration Court and agreements with employers to be waived for the purpose of conducting and prosecuting a successful war on behalf of our Australian way of life.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—They did not abdicate.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—As my friend says, they did not abdicate, as members of another political complexion from those in the Labor Party did in the dark days of the war. If members opposite desire that spirit of co-operation which has been displayed by the Trade Union movement in this State to be continued, they will cease by implication those veiled threats that the Trades Hall and those occupying it are a sinister influence in this community.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe—There is no veiled threat.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—The Attorney-General did not make the speech. Had he done so I would have mentioned his name. This afternoon I am speaking from my own perspective of the Trades Hall.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe—It is quite a wrong perspective.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—The Attorney-General can get up and express his opinion in a different way. In this morning's *Advertiser* appears this statement from Sydney:—

For the second successive month, no time lost was recorded in June on the South Australian waterfront. This is shown in figures released today by the Australian Stevedoring Industry Authority. All other States except the Northern Territory lost man hours during the month.

I mention that to illustrate the cavalier way in which the press of this State have published it, in a single two-inch news item. If there was a projected strike they would have used three, four and six column banner headlines, but when it is something indicating that workers are prepared to pull their weight, it is dismissed in a very short paragraph in an obscure part of the paper near a large advertisement. If we are to continue on those lines, how can we have that contentment we all desire and the progress of the State?

The Hon. E. Anthoney—It is due to the splendid industrial conditions.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—These conditions were provided by Arbitration Courts. My colleagues and I are in the happy position of representing the key district in this House, extending on the one hand from the Outer Harbour to Gepps Cross. All the imports and exports of the State go through our district, including primary products which pass through the abattoirs. Therefore, we are in a much better position to give an over-all picture of the economy of the State than some of my friends opposite.

In your speech, Mr. Deputy President, you referred to a statement made by the late Mr. Bannister who, at the time, was President of the S.A. branch of the Australian Labor Party, in connection with certain legislation we were to discuss. The president of any political party, whether Liberal or Labor, has the right to express his opinion as to what members of his Party shall do in Parliament. It appears to me to be somewhat of a sham for honourable members to say that this is a non-Party House with no politics in it.

The Hon. A. J. Melrose—No-one says it but you people.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I always claim that I do not want to bring politics into all my statements, but I am always so charged.

Those who make that accusation in this Chamber are full of politics themselves. I compliment you, Mr. Deputy President, on your statement concerning the achievements of Parliament. Since the early days of representative Government, beginning during the reign of Edward III with the model Parliament, there has always been the Party system of Government. It reached its crescendo when Disraeli was Prime Minister of England, and has continued where we have the British system of government, and in Great Britain itself. There have been diverse views as to where the powers commenced and ended, and that the so-called Upper House was a House of review, and the fight is still going on. The Macmillan Government in Great Britain is not a Labor Government, but it has brought down legislation to reform the House of Lords. This House had its genesis in the feudal council of the Anglo-Saxon and Norman kings, and from that has developed what we now know as the Legislative Council. All these things have been changed since the Parliament of Edward III.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe—But you do not believe in State Parliaments.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Yes, we do. The Minister has read our policy upside down. What we do say is that if Parliament is to function, it should be by the expressed will of the people. I submit that this expressed will in this Chamber is hamstrung by the restricted franchise, and in the Lower House by what might be termed gerrymandering electorates. I know, and all members will agree, that all the ridicule and puns about Parliament and members of Parliament have been brought about by Parliament and the members themselves. When I came into this House in 1941 I said that Parliament was a noble institution; it still is. I went further and said that in no other part of the world, other than in the British Commonwealth of Nations, would we dare to stand up and discuss problems affecting the people as we do. If we were in a totalitarian country we would be afraid of the firing squad.

We have noble institutions such as our universities, our law courts and our Parliaments. They all revert to a denominator, namely, the people. The citizens elect the Parliament, Parliament elects its Executive Government, which in turn appoints its judges, who interpret the laws passed by Parliament. Labor has always stood on those principles, and what it desires, particularly in this Chamber, is to allow the people to express

their opinions. Labor members have been twitted about our policy for the abolition of the Upper House.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—You have it on your platform.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Yes. It was put there because of the ineptitude of friends of the honourable member in not democratizing the franchise of this Chamber, which is regarded not only by Labor members but by people outside as redundant and a brake upon progress. It was only this week that some of the public learned through the *Advertiser* that there is a Legislative Council in existence. It was due to the excellent reports given to the speeches by Sir Collier Cudmore and Mr. Bice. If there is compulsory enrolment and voting for the House of Assembly, why not have them for the Legislative Council? If it is compulsory for the Lower House why have a sort of laissez-faire atmosphere here? I said earlier that the trades union movement had played an important part in the economic development of the State. From 1951 to 1956 the total increase in factory production was valued at £63,315,000; the net increase was £57,602,000. When members assail the section of the community producing the wealth a great injustice is done to it. Some members who have spoken in this debate have lauded the Playford Government but all the credit and kudos for the things done by it could not have resulted except for the support of the Labor Party in both Houses. The voting lists for this Chamber show how some members of the Liberal and Country League Party have voted against Government legislation. Compare that with the support given by the Labor Party to Government Bills.

The Government claims that it has done much for the workers. I remember when the Workmen's Compensation Act was passed. I said earlier that the worker has only his labour to sell, and if the bread winner is killed or maimed whilst at work the compensation is meagre indeed. There is no cover for the man going to and coming from work. When a man leaves for work he is not going shooting or to see a football match but to sell his labour in order to maintain his family. The Government is lagging in this matter. When the Leader of the Opposition here moved to have the matter covered it was voted out, and there was the same result to a motion moved in the House of Assembly, I could go on *ad lib* setting out the lag in the legislation affecting workers, and the blame can be laid at the door of the Playford Government.

Sir Collier Cudmore proposed an increase in the size of Parliament. He suggested 60 members in the House of Assembly and 30 here. If he will move for a Joint Parliamentary Constitutional Committee to be appointed to review the present constitution. I and my colleagues will no doubt support him. He has made the first move but a mere statement like that will accomplish nothing. If his proposal were adopted he said we would have greater representation in Parliament and there would be a greater field from which to select Ministers. I do not know of any other part of the British Empire under a bicameral system of government that has 39 members in the Lower House, with 26 of them representing country districts and 13 metropolitan districts, when most of the people in the State live in the city. That is lopsided democracy.

I come now to the matter of housing. I was pleased to see that Mr. Brimblecombe, President of the Master Builders' Association, had adopted Labor policy about the setting up of a building commission, motions for which have already been moved in both Houses and defeated by Liberal and Country League members. I think the members of that association are very competent to understand the real impact and import of the proposals submitted by my Party in this Chamber for the purpose of providing homes for the people. When I asked a question the other day the Chief Secretary said that it was all right for people to do these things when they were doing them with other people's money, but I remind him that these people do not desire other people's money. They maintain, as members of my Party do, that sufficient money can be released by the Commonwealth Bank or, failing that, the Commonwealth Bank can release some of the deposits of the private banks which they hold under the Banking Act of 1954 in order that they may lend money for the purpose of carrying out this much needed reform in the building of homes.

Just recently the Commonwealth Bank released £500,000 for home building purposes. According to the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech the Playford Government proposes to expend £185,000 on cottage homes for the aged and infirm. My Party entirely agrees with that, but it does not alter the fact that the need for homes is just as important and just as serious today as it was five years ago. The greatest contentment of any country is having its people properly housed and

its manpower able to work, and that is the responsibility of Executive Government.

The Hon. C. R. Story—What has been the increase of population in that five-year period?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—The increase between 1955 and 1957 in South Australia, with migration and natural increases, was 24,291 persons.

The Hon. C. R. Story—That might explain some of the housing difficulties.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Yes, but with natural increases and migration we are still worse off than we were five years ago, because we never had the influx of migration then that we have today. The Government should attempt to assist, wherever possible, these well-meaning and enthusiastic members of the Master Builders' Association who have adopted our policy. I am not decrying them for doing that, because we are happy that they have seen the wisdom of such a policy.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—They are not the first people to adopt our policy.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—No, this Government takes all its good points from our policy. It may be said there is not sufficient money, but during the war period it was not a question of money; it was a question of manpower and materials, and money was the third consideration. The urgency is just as great now for peace purposes as it was during the war for war purposes. I come now to an item which you, Mr. Deputy President, mentioned with regard to the Industries Development Committee. I happen to be a member of that committee which was appointed by the Houses of this Parliament.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—By the Government; get it right.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—It came through Parliament. I was appointed at the inauguration of that committee, and whilst I may not be the oldest in years I can claim to be a pioneer member because Mr. Bice and I were two of the first members appointed. You, sir, claim that that committee should submit a report to Parliament.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—I quite agree with that.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I will explain why that cannot be done, and I think my friend will agree with me.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—Why don't we get a report on the Premier's overseas trip?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—This committee was set up for the purpose of assisting industry.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—Small industries.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—And big ones too. The Act does not limit the ambit in which the committee can operate. The motive was to assist industries and the Act says "all industries." We have helped some very big industries very considerably, one to the extent of £1,000,000 or £1,500,000. I think the committee has done very laudable work on behalf of this State. I will not recount in detail the industries that have been assisted, but I can say that a number of big industries have been assisted as well as small ones.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—How much money have you guaranteed?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Some millions. These people pay it off.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—Some of them do.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—All of them do. My friend makes a charge and then runs away. He is like a boy who throws stones and breaks a window and then runs away. The losses incurred by the activities of this committee are infinitesimal. I wish to explain to the Deputy President why reports from that committee cannot be submitted to this Chamber. An application is made to the Treasurer for financial aid in the continuance of some industry or the setting up of a new industry. Departmental officers of the Treasury make a survey and glean information as to whether the industry's application should be submitted to the committee. Very private information is given to the committee during its inquiry.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—No more private than the Public Works Committee is given.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I will deal with that in a moment. It is like a client going to a bank manager, and a bank manager is not expected to publish in the press what is said with regard to establishing an industry.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill—He is not lending public money.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—We are not; we are only recommending that a guarantee be given. My friend is well aware that we are not lending public money. I do not know of any guarantee accepted by a bank which has not been met, because the erudition of members

of the committee is such that they do not recommend any South Sea bubbles or shandy gaff shows that may be submitted; they are genuine, solid South Australian industries which, through lack of capital, come to the committee for assistance to extend their works or put in capital machinery which the ordinary lending institutions are not in a position to provide.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—Don't you think something in the nature of an over-all statement could be given?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I refer the honourable member and the honourable Mr. Anthony to the statement of the Auditor-General. In his report he sets out a complete statement of the moneys recommended for loan and any money that may be in default, although I do not think there has been any. That report deals with the activities of the committee. Honourable members can see that it would be unfair and unjust and most improper to put before this House what an applicant says with regard to his application for a loan or a guarantee.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—I do not think the House expects that.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Mr. Anthony does. He mentioned the Public Works Committee, but that is in a totally different category because it does not recommend the Government lending money or giving a guarantee.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—It recommends the spending of it.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Yes. That committee merely sees that there is no unnecessary over-all expenditure on certain things, and when it submits its report there the matter begins and ends.

Another matter I want to touch on is the question of the University. I stress that the University of Adelaide is an institution for which I have the highest regard. Expenditure on the university has been as follows: 1953-54, £483,095; 1954-55, £509,095; 1955-56, £713,015; 1956-57, £733,012; and in 1957-58 it jumped to the colossal sum of £925,200. I will not say that the university should not have that money but it is unfair to expect the professorial board to attempt to carry on the university on a business basis without proper training.

They have been trained in respective faculties in which they have received their degrees—philosophy, medicine or pharmacology.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—The control of the university is much wider than that.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I am coming to that. In order to relieve those eminent men of the mundane work of administration, which is a specialist's work, I suggest that a board of business management be set up, on which there should be two representatives of the Treasury, to assist those laudable people in conducting the business of the university. I do not say that in a spirit of carping criticism because we shall be spending more money. As these buildings develop and the population increases through migration, it will be necessary to have another university to satisfy the needs of tertiary education. Another point is that a section appears to have grown up whereby they regard themselves as the supreme beings of all educational attainments.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—Who—students or professors?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I do not differentiate. When boys and girls leave high school or a private school and attend the university, they come from an atmosphere of school discipline but, when they go to the university, either here or in other States, that discipline appears non-existent. This can be borne out to some degree by the percentage of failures which means a loss of teaching hours and gainful employment hours on the part of the student, the lecturer and the professor.

The only time when it is apparent whether the student at the university is or is not doing well is at the end of the year's term. In all colleges and high schools a report is made of the progress and activities of the student at least every quarter. I suggest that there should be a report submitted every half or quarter year on the work and progress of the student in fairness to the student as a guide. Some university people may say that they would need a battery of typists to prepare reports, but does not that apply in our private and high schools?

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—They are immature when they reach the university.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—They are. They have just left the discipline of a college or high school.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—It is a big change.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—It is. In other words, it is a form of jumping over an educational chasm. We authorize the spending of money and have our representatives on the University Council. That is what should be done to allow professors, who are eminent in their particular sphere of training and academic attainment, to carry out the work for which they are appointed. I know that all my submissions this afternoon will be taken in the spirit in which I gave them. I have no desire to cause rancour in the minds of anyone, but believe it my duty and right to mention these matters in the place where they can be rectified.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland)—I join with other honourable members in supporting the motion. Firstly, I refer to the death of Sir Wallace Sandford. I was privileged to have had 12 months in this Chamber whilst he was a member, and his kindly attitude and helpful manner gave me much encouragement. It was therefore with a deep sense of regret that we learned of his demise. I congratulate you, Mr. Deputy President, on your very fine speech in moving the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I think honourable members will agree when I say that on the occasion of the next centenary celebrations in this State there will be a place in the records for the honourable member. He will go down in the history of this Parliament as having been a great Parliamentarian, one who upheld the traditions of responsible government. In his Address in Reply speech he excelled himself.

I also congratulate the seconder, Mr. Bice, whose work in soldier settlement after World War I is well-known. As a member of Parliament and the Public Works Committee he has played a most important part. His keen interest in the Murray irrigation settlements and the products of those districts are well-known to me and will always be remembered. The Lieutenant-Governor's Speech gave a remarkable record of development in this State. The Government does not claim to have been entirely responsible for this vast development during the last decade, which resulted because of the industry of the people, who have capitalized on good markets, good prices

for both primary and secondary goods, high production yields in primary industries and the increased population, which increase has been greater here than in any other State. The Government has every right to be proud that it has encouraged development in this State by introducing legislation to meet the needs of both secondary and primary development, and providing for the ever-increasing need for additional public services to keep abreast of the social and industrial development. What a pity that yesterday Mr. Condon spoilt an otherwise delightful speech by downgrading his own State. I know that really he is very proud of South Australia, and that he has done a tremendous amount in the industrial field, but just for the sake of a little political kite-flying he allowed himself to say certain things in which, honestly, I do not think he really believes.

It stands to reason that if a particular State is progressing at the rate at which this State is progressing many people will be attracted by the prospect of better opportunities, and from time to time more people will arrive seeking work than there are jobs available. I feel that Mr. Bardolph was wrong when he said that we are lagging so far behind the other States in our industrial legislation. If we inquired from workers in other parts of the Commonwealth about their conditions, I am sure they would be intensely pleased to change their lot and come to South Australia, as many of their colleagues have done in recent years.

The subject of decentralization was raised yesterday by Mr. Wilson. Many loose statements have been made recently on this subject, and the Government has been charged with not decentralizing industry but encouraging people to leave country areas to come to the city. What can be further from the truth? The Government's responsibility is to provide facilities to make decentralization possible by providing conditions attractive to industry. Has any industry been lost to country towns because of the Government's failure to do its part in this direction? Certain industries are suited to certain localities. The availability of raw materials, transport costs, water requirements, climatic conditions, proximity to traditional markets or ports must be considered by the promoters of industries before a site is chosen. After all, the customer is always right. A firm which intends to invest capital in an industry is entitled to establish itself

at the most advantageous site. The only other alternative to this policy I know of is the one employed by people who embrace a different political philosophy from the one I believe in. Under their system, industry is directed to a certain area, and the work force is either directed to that locality or forced by circumstances to follow in order to gain employment.

If Government critics spent as much time in discussing with the authorities such as local councils, chambers of commerce, progress associations and kindred bodies the natural advantages offered by certain localities to certain industries as they do in preparing political gags to use at elections, I feel that a lot more could be done in assisting in the economic decentralization of industry. Mr. King, M.P., and I have suggested that a series of meetings be held in the upper Murray towns of Renmark, Berri, Barmera, Loxton and Waikerie at which could be discussed the appointment of a committee in each town to make a survey of their district to ascertain the type of industry, either primary or secondary, which could be economically established or expanded, and "economically" is the word.

It is no trouble for the Government to set up an industry in any part of the country, but the point is it must have every chance of being an economic success. Particular attention should be paid to absorbing the increasing volume of young men and women leaving school and wishing to remain in their home town. I sincerely believe if these young people remained under their parents' influence in their formative years from 15 to 18 and had congenial employment in their own surroundings they would not prove the social problem we are faced with in increasing instances today in some parts of the State.

Let me illustrate a few practical forms of decentralization which are under way in certain River Murray areas. Recently it was announced by a group of winemakers that they had purchased an area at Waikerie for the production of wine grapes. Such an enterprise must assist in the development of the town and district. The local population of any country town depends to a very large degree on primary industry. As an instance, in Renmark there are approximately 700 fruitgrowers, and the district population is about 7,000. About 10 per cent of the population is employed directly in fruit production. The remaining 90 per cent is dependent on the 10 per cent for a livelihood. Therefore, it is not difficult to see that if we increase

our primary production in country areas we will, of necessity, in some form assist in the decentralization of our population.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—What about your seepage problems?

The Hon. C. R. STORY—This is a very vexed and difficult subject, and I will deal with it on another occasion. I know the honourable member's Party does not like criticism of anything they say about their sworn policy of breaking the Government on decentralization.

The Lieutenant-Governor mentioned the establishment of a co-operative cannery in the upper Murray area, and the Government, true to its promises to assist industry in country areas, will ask Parliament during the session to vote a large sum under the Loans to Producers Act to assist to bring this excellent project to fruition. In my maiden speech in this Chamber on May, 24 1955, I said:—

My belief is that the time is opportune for the establishment of a co-operative cannery similar to those operating in Victoria and New South Wales where handsome profits are made. Growers receive an ample bonus and are assured that their fruit is properly treated and exported to enable them to retain their markets. I therefore urge the Government to seriously consider making capital available on a long term loan basis at the appropriate time and I consider the appropriate time is when growers make an approach to the Government for assistance.

This has now come to pass and I am glad because it will do an immense amount of good for the industry and for the State economy. The building is already under construction, as mentioned by Mr. Wilson yesterday. We all have our pet subjects. Some of us talk about Public Works Committee reports, some about wheat, some the Industrial Code and others price control, but I now propose to refer to a subject about which I know something.

I have been asked questions on a number of occasions recently about the South Australian canning industry and I give members some details in the hope that they might find them helpful when the matter is considered later. In the last three years growers of canning fruits have received satisfactory returns for their products, due to a large degree to the fruit being sought by local canners and some interstate operators. There has been a tendency on the part of canners to buy fruit below the standard quality required to make a satisfactory export pack. The Commonwealth Government has fixed a standard for export quality. Many canners and canned fruit processors in this State have not kept

their pack up to the required standard. It is only saleable on the Australian or local market. Canneries in the eastern States have packed the major portion of their fruit to the export specification and have disposed of their stocks either on the United Kingdom market, which is not yet over supplied by Australia or South Africa, or have taken advantage of their higher quality product to supply buyers in Australia. Recent figures show that of the total canned fruit stocks held in Australia at present three-quarters are in South Australian canners' warehouses. The capital tied up in this stock is about £1,500,000.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—Last season's fruit?

The Hon. C. R. STORY—Yes. The capital tied up is extremely embarrassing to the canners who hold the stocks, which in the main are not up to export standard. If the South Australian canning industry is to prosper growers and canners alike must pay more attention to the quality. The canners have the right to reject any fruit not up to the required standard quality. They must only pack fruit to the specification of the export regulations so that if the home market cannot absorb the production it can be exported. We still have export markets open to us. Whilst we keep the *avalorem* tariff on the American commodity we will be able to keep the Americans out of the British market, which is Australia's traditional market. Some interesting figures are available to indicate the false economy of producing inferior quality fruit, that is fruit that is under the required size and badly marked fruit.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—How would you get on if America paid a subsidy?

The Hon. C. R. STORY—It could not be done under the present agreement. Let us look at the results of having four batteries of girls working 21 pitting machines on varying sized peaches. Each pitter would do a different sized fruit. These figures are worked out on a season's operations. With a 2in. peach, which is a small peach, the batteries would produce 1,070 tons. With a 2½in. peach the production would be 1,520 tons, with a peach 2¾in. it would be 2,250 tons, and with a 3in. peach it would be 2,800 tons. This shows a discrepancy between 1,070 and 2,800 tons, all from the same battery of girls. This will give some indication of the fallacy of canning inferior quality fruit. The required size according to the specification is 2½in., but a lot of 2in. fruit was canned this year.

The grower must produce fruit up to the required specification, otherwise his picking and freight costs will soon absorb any profit he can expect from his operations. The waste in peeling and pitting in various sized fruit is a major factor in the cost structure of the industry. The stone is practically the same size in a 2in. peach as it is in a 2½in. peach. There is more skin with the smaller sized peaches because there are more of them. With a peach of 2in. the percentage of waste in stone and skin is 16 per cent, 14 per cent with the 2½in. peach, 12½ per cent with the 2¾in., 11 per cent with the 3in., and 10 per cent with the 3in. There is a considerable difference between the 10 per cent and the 16 per cent on the small peaches. A further illustration of the number of dozens of tins that come from a ton of fruit in the various sizes is interesting. From the 2½in. peach there are 110doz. per ton, 105doz. with the 2¾in., 100doz. with the 2½in. and 90doz. with the 2in. Again, it is false economy to buy the small inferior type of fruit. There is no necessity for anyone to buy it, because the canner can reject it.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—Can the grower control the size of the fruit?

The Hon. C. R. STORY—Yes, by thinning and by practising better pruning methods. The tendency in the last few years has been to put as much fruit as possible on the trees, in the hope that someone will buy it. It is the canner who has to set the standard by rejecting the inferior and small type fruit, and so make the grower get back to the old practice of growing quality fruit. That is the only way the industry can progress. These are a few of the reasons why the South Australian canning industry is experiencing difficulties. If these troubles are corrected it will go a long way towards stabilizing the economy.

Several questions have been put to me about the industry on several occasions recently. It has been asked that if this is the position with the present canning industry how can a co-operative cannery do any better? That is a fair question and as an explanation I offer the following points. First, the cannery will be located in the district of production. One of the difficulties in the canning industry is the picking of immature fruit in order to get it to the canneries over long haulage distances. That immature fruit has to stand often about 12 hours in the broiling sun and if it is not canned immediately it has to be put into cold store. There it takes on a leathery feeling

on the outside, which makes it almost impossible to impregnate the fruit with sugar. The result is that instead of using one brick of sugar it is necessary to use two bricks, which means additional cost.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—What would be the period between the picking of the green fruit and canning it?

The Hon. C. R. STORY—The estimate is three days. From personal experience I know that it is possible to keep fruit on the river three days longer than if it had to be sent to a cannery in another district. The second point in support of a co-operative cannery is that the fruit will be canned at a more mature stage. A further point is that it is to have the most up-to-date factory and machinery in Australia today. Some of the machinery is more modern than that now used in America. Another point is the financial backing of the State Bank of South Australia, the Ardmona Fruit Products Co-operative Ltd., of Victoria, and the shareholder growers of the Upper Murray of South Australia. Also, there will be a board of management comprising the chairman, vice-chairman and managing director of the Ardmona Fruit Products Co-operative Ltd., as well as three highly successful fruitgrowers in Messrs. Andary, Coats and Coombe of the South Australian Upper Murray areas. The general manager will be a man who was previously production manager of Ardmona Fruit Products Co-operative Ltd. He has spent all his working life in the canning industry. There will be an efficient selling organization which has been established for 25 years on the London and Australian markets—the Ardmona Fruit Products Co-operative Ltd. Also, there will be a balanced pack with South Australia producing the peaches and apricots, and Ardmona the pears from the Goulburn Valley.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—What kind of apricots?

The Hon. C. R. STORY—Trevatt and certain types of Moorpark. There will be an assured supply of fruit under legal contract from shareholders and only fruit of export standard will be accepted and packed. These are some of the practical approaches to the decentralization of industry. The news of the finding of the Public Works Committee on the proposal to build a bridge over the Murray River at Blanchetown has been well received. I am indebted to Mr. Condon for the information he gave me yesterday about the bridge. He did not give me much other information of value.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Your colleague in another place eulogized the work of the Public Works Standing Committee.

The Hon. C. R. STORY—The honourable member took up some time this afternoon with a rather militant speech and I thought that he would have by now exhausted himself.

It is very pleasing to see that at last the Public Works Committee has come out with a finding that a bridge is to be located at Blanchetown. As I pointed out in my earlier remarks, the development of that area is considerable and will be more considerable as time goes on; with the representation that the district has, it cannot help but develop. I make the strongest plea to the Government, now that the committee has made its report, and with the known increase in production that will take place, that the urgency of the project cannot be too strongly emphasized.

One could go on for a considerable time talking of the points contained in His Excellency's Speech, but I do not wish to do that because there are plenty of other opportunities to speak on these various subjects. I would like to say how much we should be indebted to the efforts of the Premier and his officers for safely negotiating with the Federal Government a suitable compromise on the Snowy Waters Agreement. It has been a source of constant worry to everyone in South Australia, irrespective of whether they live on the River Murray or not, to know that there was some doubt about whether we would get what we considered was our proper and legitimate quota of water. It is like a weight being lifted to realize that agreement has now been reached between the Commonwealth and the States concerned.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Your Liberal members of the Commonwealth Parliament did not support the Premier.

The Hon. C. R. STORY—The River Murray Waters Act can now be amended to ensure that we do get our legitimate quota of water. The honourable member in his interjection has raised a very interesting point. It was the Chifley Labor Government which decided on the Snowy Mountains Scheme but Federal Labor members did not take very much trouble to see that South Australia was protected, and, in fact, it does not appear as though they knew the River Murray Waters Agreement even existed.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—It did not bring in the legislation to take our rights away; your Government did that.

The Hon. C. R. STORY—The position seems to have been that until our Premier was in a position to know what was contained in the Snowy River Waters Agreement he was unable to do anything about it, and the moment he knew it did not take him long to get about his business. With regard to the honourable member's suggestion that the Liberal Senators did not do very much about it, I say that this is one of the greatest examples of jumping on the political band waggon that we have ever seen from Labor Senators. An assurance was given by the Prime Minister that everything would be done to see that an agreement was reached and that South Australian interests would be protected. The Labor Party Senators certainly jumped on the political band

waggon, hoping that for the first time in many years they would see a split in the great Liberal Country Party Government of Australia, and tried to pit one section of the Party against the other. However, I am very pleased to say that it did not work. We can give the credit to our own Government, led by the Premier and Mr. Julian Dridan, our representative on the River Murray Commission, who did an extremely good job in handling this whole affair. I support the motion.

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 3.50 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, July 29, at 2.15 p.m.