

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Thursday, April 7, 1960.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Walter Duncan) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTION.**SLEEPER BERTH ACCOMMODATION ON SOUTH-EAST TRAIN.**

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY—In view of the statement made by the Minister of Railways yesterday in reply to my question showing the very unsatisfactory condition with regard to sleeping accommodation on the South-East train, will the Government provide new roomettes for this service?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—The honourable member has drawn attention to a point that was made recently, I believe, in the South-East by a representative of the South Australian Railways. Frankly, the position is that to provide roomettes not associated with the joint rollingstock of the South Australian and Victorian Railways—and there would need to be two, one working each way, and which would provide little more accommodation than one of the present carriages available—would cost in the neighbourhood of £140,000, whereas the revenue derived from this service is some £4,000 per annum. Under the circumstances, I feel that it is not reasonable to meet this request, at least until we can ascertain that there would be far more business available to the railways than there is at present.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from April 6. Page 59.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland)—At the outset I should like to join previous speakers by endorsing the remarks they have made with regard to Her Majesty the Queen and the Royal Family generally. We are extremely proud to be, firstly, British stock, and secondly, Australian citizens, and that Her Majesty should have now given us a son to the Royal Family is indeed pleasing to us all, plus the fact that Her Royal Highness, Princess Margaret, has decided to do what most of us do during our lifetime, to become married; and we are hopeful that the issue will be of benefit to the Royal Family and the Empire generally.

I would also like to follow other speakers who mentioned His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor who presented his speech to Parlia-

ment only a few days ago. Sir Mellis Napier has played an outstanding part in the judicial and civic life of South Australia and I am very happy indeed to endorse the remarks of previous speakers. I am very sad, however, to have to associate myself with the remarks concerning our late friend, George Hambour, who passed away a week or so ago. I was fortunate and very privileged to have worked very closely with George Hambour after he came into Parliament, and knowing him as a home man, as a legislator, and as a business man, one could not but admire the wonderful talents he had and the inquiring mind he possessed. I do not think anybody who was with George for more than a few moments could but be impressed by the depth of his thought and by the inquisitiveness with which he approached life. His death was a great blow to members of this Chamber, and members of Parliament generally, more especially to the people that he so ably represented for such a short period. It is tragic when a person of his ability, who was prepared to give his time in the interests of the State, is taken at such an early age and so suddenly. I would join with others who have expressed their sympathy to Mrs. Hambour and their son, Brian, and the rest of the family.

I congratulate the proposer and seconder of this motion. Both these gentlemen on previous occasions have made valuable contributions to debate, and I think that the plane of debate set by them is extremely high and that the standard of debate in this Council has not been higher than since this last intake of new members. I congratulate them both on the way in which they spoke to the motion and the thoughtful contribution they made. I was a little disappointed, however, to find that my old friend, Mr. Condon, was a little scathing about Mr. Potter's remarks because Mr. Condon, on very many occasions, has expressed the view in this Chamber that everyone is entitled to his opinion, and I think Mr. Potter's opinion was a very good one and he expressed it quite fully and frankly. Mr. Condon seemed to think he should not have done so, but if members are not to be allowed to express their thoughts freely Parliament will become simply a rubber stamp, and there are people outside who would like it to be that way. While we have members who are prepared to express their thoughts fearlessly Parliament will maintain as an institution that very high order that has been maintained through hundreds of years in the Parliaments of the British Commonwealth. I agree with

much of what both Mr. Giles and Mr. Potter said, and I do not make any apologies for saying that quite a lot of the sentiments they expressed were very down to earth and quite true.

I congratulate those who implement the policy enunciated by Parliament and those who administer the laws. They have done an extremely good job considering the year we have just passed through. No-one will doubt that it has been the most difficult year in the latter part of the State's history, at least. We hear from the old timers that 1914 was a particularly bad year. One can only go on the rainfall as a basis, and last year we received less rain than in 1914. Fortunately, the development of the State has taken on a somewhat new look since 1914. Secondary industry is now playing a far bigger part in our economic life than in those days. I compliment the Government on encouraging people to put away grain and fodder for bad times. The Department of Agriculture has played a very big part in this and therefore I am pleased to see that we got through last year much better than we would have under conditions that existed a few years ago.

No doubt the deficit estimated by the Government this year will be exceeded, but when we consider the results obtained from the money expended, it is probably a pretty good investment. We shall be down this year in the Treasury coffers mainly because of the cost of pumping water from the Murray. When Mr. Alfred Deakin went to America and induced the Chaffey brothers to come to this country to develop our first irrigation schemes, these men referred to water as liquid fertilizer. No doubt anywhere where water can be provided something can be grown. In the metropolitan area it is absolutely essential that industry be provided with water, and that those who work in industry should have a reliable water supply. In South Australia water is probably our most essential commodity, but most of us realize that it is a restricted commodity. Last year Parliament passed a Bill dealing with underground waters. Those who have spoken with authority in the last five to 10 years have emphasized how water supplies govern the development of this State. I think it is a very real problem. The Premier's announcement a few weeks ago regarding the establishment of further storages on the River Murray must be encouraging to all, irrespective of whether they live in the city or the country. I know the locality very well where the

Premier considers a dam should be constructed on the Murray. Its construction will certainly inconvenience one or two graziers in this area and will inundate the Lake Victoria storage scheme as we know it today.

There are some people small-minded enough to say, "Why did not we start this 50 years ago?" The problem was not with us then. If we could look into the crystal ball and study the future it would be very easy to plan a long way ahead. Some people with vision have not been great geniuses, but have been extremely lucky because their proposals have paid off. The Lake Victoria scheme has been very necessary for horticulture on the Murray, because when the salinity of the Murray reaches 25 grains or so to the gallon it is possible to send down a freshet to flush the river and reduce the salinity to 10 or 15 grains. If under the new scheme we lose the works established in the Lake Victoria scheme, it will have been an extremely good investment. South Australia had to pay only one-quarter of the cost, because under the River Murray Waters Agreement it did not have to find all the money. If the scheme is brought to fruition some people on the anabranch will be at a distinct advantage because water will be backed up some 40 miles, whereas at present in dry years it is nothing but a chain of water holes.

It is interesting to observe that over the last few weeks not one drop of water has run over the lock at Mildura. If we are depending on Victoria to provide water to keep us going, we shall be out of luck. But for the Menindee Lakes scheme constructed by New South Wales to conserve water to be released down the River Darling, this State would have been in a pretty parlous position as regards water from the Murray. If the proposed dam is constructed, it will probably be one of the greatest schemes undertaken by any Government in this State over the last 100 years. The capacity of the lake so formed could be greater than Eucumbene in the Snowy Mountains, and Eucumbene has about the same capacity as Sydney Harbour. It is a mighty quantity of water to impound to assist us in dry years. If the Treasurer has any difficulty with the other States or with the Federal Government in this matter, especially the Federal Government, in arranging finance (I am not suggesting that he will), he should go alone on the expenditure of the approximate £9,000,000 involved to get this dam established, because I feel that the whole welfare

of the State is dependent upon water. We should be able to impound the water and have control over it.

Mr. Giles made some very useful comments regarding primary production. I think his was a well-considered speech and my views are very much the same on this subject. Especially this year when primary producers are not having a particularly good time we should look at the position and see where we are going in relation to various phases of primary production. It has been the catch cry over the last few years for many of those addressing primary producers to tell them to reduce their costs. I cannot imagine anything more stupid, because there are so very few things over which primary producers have any control today. The price of practically everything they want to buy is governed. About the only things they have any say in at all are the number of hours they work and the efficiency of their management. They cannot do a great deal about the number of hours they work because the sun is with us for only a certain number of hours each day. It is beyond their control, in the main, to do very much about bringing down costs of production.

If we look at the over-all picture of the economy, perhaps certain savings can be made. I am prepared to venture that perhaps in some of the commodities they have to buy certain savings can be made. It would appear to me that a certain cost structure has grown up in manufactured goods that could be fictitious, a structure that was built up during the war years under a system of cost plus; and that structure was taken as a base when free trade came along. Every cost of living adjustment or anything else that is created and arises in the use of the raw materials has been tacked on to the cost of the processed article.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—Considerably more than the cost of living too.

The Hon. C. R. STORY—Quite so. In my opinion, it is a fictitious figure. Many of those commodities are sheltering behind a very nice tariff barrier, and while the primary producer at the moment is producing and exporting on a market that is heavily subsidized in nearly every case by even the poorer countries, 70 per cent to 80 per cent of our commodities are being sold on the export market. We still have to compete with the other countries, which are subsidizing on the one hand and working on cheap labour on the other.

In the industries with which I am particularly acquainted, we are not able to charge the

Australian public very much more, and in some cases we charge less, than the export price. So we cannot average the export and the home market prices to bring us up to a figure where some of those commodities are really payable compared with other sections of the community. If we analyse what Mr. Giles said, he seemed not very worried about what happened in Australia, provided everybody got a fair crack of the whip. At the moment certain sections of the community are not enjoying quite the same boom as other sections. I refer particularly, once again, to those industries about which I have some knowledge, because the producer at the moment is much worse off than he was four or five years ago. In fact, in some cases, his income has been halved, and that should not be. With primary production at £153,000,000 per annum and secondary industry at £127,000,000 at this stage, we have come to regard secondary industry as a useful means of employment in the "New Australian look," when we bring migrants out here to develop our country. We have come to recognize also that secondary industry plays a most useful part in the community but, when we look at our export earnings overseas, we see that they are not playing nearly as big a part as they should be because their cost structure is a little high.

There is only one way to get cost structures into line. If we want free enterprise, we have to be consistent in that matter; we cannot shelter behind a tariff barrier on the one hand and drop various other controls on the other, because that is just looking after the internal economy. We have to look far more to the external economy, to our exports and what they bring back. At the moment, with the primary produce that we send overseas, we get back much raw material which is made up in Australia and sold to the Australian public, so I am a little worried about some of the costs in primary industry, particularly as we have recently noticed some increases in the price of some commodities to the Australian public. I refer particularly now to the wine industry.

Recently, sixpence has been put on the price of an ordinary bottle of wine. That does not sound very much but, when that sixpence is related to thousands of gallons of wine, it should be a great help to the industry. When I say "the industry," I mean the hotel-keeper, the wine-maker and the producer of the raw material, plus the people who are engaged in work in the industry. They should all benefit from that. The sixpence rise in the

ordinary humble bottle of wine one would have expected to be passed on right down the line, but that is not the case. That sixpence was put on, apparently, to cover the recent wage increases. That was the reason given by the president of the body concerned. I do not know how much it costs to bring a bottle of wine from the cellar to the table, but I do know that in the case of an ordinary half-bottle of claret, or something that one normally buys over the counter for 3s. or 3s. 6d., one rarely gets any change out of 10s. when one gets it at the table. That is not a bad profit for corkage, so to speak. If we relate that additional sixpence a bottle back to a ton of grapes, that gives us about a £12 increase on a ton of grapes, in the case of fortified wine. If we take it on non-fortified wine, it gives us £15 a ton increase, but I am being generous and bringing it back to a £12 increase in relation to fortified wine. The growers would be expected to get at least one-third of it, but that has not happened either.

The wine industry recently approached Parliament for an inquiry into the price of grapes. The Government appointed Mr. Murphy, the Prices Commissioner, to go into the matter and bring in a report, which he has done. It said that in his opinion growers were entitled to £2 10s. a ton increase in the price of grapes in irrigated areas, and £4 a ton increase in the non-irrigated areas. He observed also that the winemaker was entitled to some increase in the price of wine. The winemaker has in fact taken a small increase in the price amounting to probably 2d. a bottle. Had he passed on what the Prices Commissioner said he should—£2 10s. a ton—that would have represented 1d. a bottle.

It has been stated that the winemaker has paid on the basis of the £2 10s. and £4 recommended by the Prices Commissioner, but when we look at the position that does not pan out too well because although he is paid £2 10s. a ton on certain varieties of grapes very few of those varieties are grown in the irrigated areas. The wine variety Cabernet Sauvignon is produced to the extent of one ton in the whole of the South Australian irrigated areas, but the increase on that particular commodity is some pounds a ton. There are very few Rhine Riesling and White Hermitage grown. It is easy to get £3 to £4 a ton on those varieties because we have not got many of them. Production of Sultanas was 15,000 tons, of Gordo Muscats 31,000, and of Doradillos 12,000. An amount of 60,000 tons, or the rump of the South Australian wine industry out of a total

of 80,000 tons in irrigated areas, is made up of these three varieties and the increase in those three varieties was gordos £1 a ton; doradillos 10s., and sultanas £1. It is quite ridiculous to say that the industry has received £2 10s. a ton increase from the winemakers. That point should be made quite clear because it has been bandied around the country quite a lot.

The whole key to the wine industry in South Australia is held by the co-operatives on the Upper Murray. They process a large amount of the grapes in this State. The shareholders in addition to producing a large proportion of the grapes also process a large quantity of them which is subsequently turned into spirit. Spirit is the one thing in the industry that is absolutely essential if any winemaker is to earn his bread and butter. If the co-operative wineries on the Upper Murray of South Australia could be induced to band together a little more and sell under one label it would help the industry immensely on the London market. The goods could be sold under one common label and at one common standard and there would be sufficient stocks of spirit to sell, and that would help greatly. Every winemaker in the State could pay a reasonable price and growers could get a reasonable return for their product. I am convinced that if everyone is to get a fair cut out of the wine industry in this State the growers must control their destiny from the grape to the retailer. I do not mind it going on record that I said that, because I have felt for a long time that the South Australian wine industry has a definite advantage compared with the rest of Australia. This State produces 80 per cent of the wine produced in the Commonwealth and this is one of the few avenues of production in which we have an advantage. We should not neglect to keep our industries buoyant, but should give the growers some reasonable return. It has been said that the varieties I have mentioned, sultanas and gordos, are not wine varieties. If they are not wine varieties it is most peculiar that they make up such a large proportion of the grapes used for the making of wine.

What opportunity has a vigneron in the non-irrigated areas of replanting his vineyard and replacing the old or debilitated vines? It may be said that he is growing the wrong varieties, but what hope has he of rehabilitating his vineyard if the winemaker is only paying for these new varieties on a one and a half acre basis? What sort of a return is £40 an acre for a vigneron? He would not get bread and butter out of that. What

encouragement is there for him to try and replant and get some of the varieties that the winemakers suggest? The majority of these high priced grapes that are mentioned in the schedule of this publication, Cabernet Sauvignon priced at £37 a ton, Frontignac at 25s. a baume, Palomino (sweetwater) up to £27 a ton, Rhine Riesling at £32—there are very few at more than £32—are produced by the winemakers in their own vineyards and therefore they are not paying anyone very much for them. In other words, they are not buying very much from the outside public. The whole rump of the industry is being carried on three or four varieties of grapes.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles—What prices are the common grapes such as Grenache fetching?

The Hon. C. R. STORY—That variety was sought after a few years ago but it has, in the opinion of the winemakers, been over-produced and therefore the producers get only 10s. a ton increase. It is one of the cheap bracket. Grenache was one of the varieties that growers were advised by various people to plant extensively a few years ago and the same applied to Mataro. Both varieties have become over-produced. This dovetails into the rest of the story because the sultana which was primarily thought to be a drying variety has been used extensively by winemakers and has cut down considerably in some years the amount of exports in dried fruits. Nobody can deny that that grape has made a great contribution to the amount of wine we have had to sell in this State. I do not believe that the wine industry is in such a parlous position that it cannot afford to pay £2 10s. a ton increase as recommended by the Prices Commissioner in his last report. I think that amount could be paid on all varieties of grapes, and on the rarer types a little more could be paid.

That is the first thing I want to say: that the grower is not really getting the benefit out of the increases that the retailer has put on a bottle of wine. Many people talk about the increase of 6d. a bottle, but that has not been passed on.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—Did the grower ever get the benefit?

The Hon. C. R. STORY—I suppose he has in years past had the benefit because in some commodities the primary producer has been able to look after his own interests. He is being more and more forced to do his own merchandizing; not that he wants to particularly; he does not want to put on his business

suit to go out and sell his goods, but he is almost forced to do it in many instances because he is not getting a sufficient slice of the cake.

Now I turn to the canning side of the industry where we find an even worse position. It has passed through a very difficult period in the last few years, and of the original five or six canneries operating at the end of the war two are in the hands of receivers, two are leaning very heavily upon Government aid, and the co-operative factory, which was established two years ago, is doing extremely well. I would like to add that the co-operative cannery has received an intimation from London that the fruit sent from this cannery was the best received on the British market from any source. It is now in the position of having to stop selling because its output has been taken up just about two months after the finish of processing. Growers who have put their fruit into this concern will get the benefit, but we have to look at the position of the industry on an Australia-wide basis and for this purpose I shall make a few comparisons. In doing this I am not having a shot at anybody on how much the basic wage has risen. I am merely using it as a yardstick for measuring the difficulties facing the canning industry. In 1950 the basic wage was £6 9s. a week and the price of apricots to the canner was £24 a ton. By 1955 the basic wage had jumped to £11 11s. a week, the price of cans was £20 17s. 9d. a thousand, and the price of fruit had gone up from £24 to £40 a ton. In 1956 the price of apricots reached the peak of £45 a ton.

In 1959 the basic wage rose to £12 16s. a week and the price of cans by £4 a thousand, whereas the price of fruit dropped by £10 a ton. In 1960, this current year, the basic wage has risen by nearly £1 a week. The price of cans remained as it was, but the price of fruit dropped back another £5 a ton. Taking the overall position for the past 10 years, wages increased by 210 per cent, and the price of fruit by 25 per cent, although in the last four years it has decreased by one-third. It is quite clear that the industry is not a payable proposition for anyone at those prices, which are fixed by the Fruit Industry Sugar Concessions Committee in Canberra.

The reason for this decline in fruit prices is that it is not thought that more fruit can be sold if the price of canned goods is increased, so we have to look around for somebody in industry who can absorb these increasing costs in the three main ingredients—wages,

cans and sugar. The sugar people have decided they cannot absorb any greater costs, and in order to buy sugar the canner must lodge his cheque with his order. The can makers are in almost the same predicament as the growers, but they have not reduced their prices and are waiting, in many cases, to be paid for cans used some years before. The workman has to be paid his wages weekly, so in searching for somebody to absorb these costs it naturally falls on the man who has perishable goods to sell; the fellow who has to sell whether he wants to or not, otherwise he would go broke.

In a few weeks' time probably the sugar producers will demand another one penny a pound. This will be the equivalent of a further reduction of £6 a ton to the grower for his fruit because he is the only person in the industry on whom the price can be levelled out. The price of clingstone peaches dropped from £56 a ton two years ago to £40 in 1960. I am afraid that I cannot offer any solution. I do know, however, that quality plays a very large part in the canning industry, but it is very small consolation to the grower to tell him that he must lift his quality. It costs £10 a ton to pick apricots because they have to be picked very carefully, and things have reached the stage where a good look has to be taken at many of our products because we are exporting 60 per cent to 70 per cent of our production. One solution I would offer is the setting up of a standard of canning common throughout the whole of the Commonwealth, policed in much the same way as is the present export standard. If a canner's product fell below that standard he could not get a certificate to sell to the public. That would tend to raise the efficiency of the industry and we would not find our cannerymen as they are now, with £150,000 worth of stock on their shelves and paying 5 per cent or 6 per cent interest on it.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—Would that increase the price to the grower?

The Hon. C. R. STORY—It would because it would allow the lending institutions to get a bit more money to develop co-operatives and return to the grower much nearer a reasonable return. It is all very well to contract to pay £70 for something and then not to pay it. That is what happened in the 1958 season; a terrific number of growers have never been paid for the fruit they delivered in that year. The cannerymen have consoled them by telling them that they will pay interest on the money which is owed, so the growers will become

larger creditors in the company when it finally folds up—not a very happy position.

I realize that I have been telling a rather unhappy story, but I want to get back to the question of development. We have a lot of people who are advocating the development of Australia at all costs. I am all for development, but there are certain sections of people who cannot be expected to develop Australia at their own personal expense. Australia has to be developed on a Commonwealth basis. We hear a lot about the great national outlook, but producers cannot go on developing acres and acres of land and thereby creating greater problems and cutting their own throats, so to speak, when we are selling our commodities overseas in a highly competitive market propped up by a set of circumstances which our Government has no power to control.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Your Government is in power in Canberra. What are you getting at?

The Hon. C. R. STORY—I am not asking the Government to do much about this; most of the things I have mentioned are industry problems, but I do say that there are people in Canberra who take great glee in saying that we must get more and more of our land opened up. I am all for that, but the point I make again is that we cannot do it at the expense of people who have spent a lifetime in trying to develop something, only to find suddenly that their markets have been completely swamped so that they cannot get a decent living, while other people are waxing fat at their expense.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—You want to restrict production in rural areas?

The Hon. C. R. STORY—I would not restrict anything. I am merely saying that the wheels of industry turn slowly and that every cog should get a bit of the grease.

I now turn to something that I have discussed on previous occasions, namely, the dredging, snagging, and clearing of some of the backwaters and lagoons near the cliffs along the Murray River to enable people with established pastures and orchards to get decent water to their pumps. The full level of the river is being maintained at the moment by Lake Victoria. If that level falls most of the pumps in the upper reaches will be out of water. We have to draw off only a few inches from the shallow backwaters to build up the salinity of the water considerably. It is an unfortunate thing that most of the good land is situated, not on the main stream, but on

these backwaters, and I again urge that attention be given to cleaning out these wide expanses of water and to banking off certain small creeks to divert the water into fast moving streams and thereby reduce the evaporation basins which cause a tremendous amount of salinity further down river. It would not be a very expensive job, but it is most essential so that people on these backwaters can get a decent, clean, stream of water. We have miles and miles in some places of shallow lakes, perhaps two feet or three feet deep. They fill up every time any water is sent down from Lake Victoria.

The evaporation rate in that area is about 7ft. or so a year, and if it takes a foot of water out of them, it increases the salinity terrifically, and the next freshet of water coming down goes over the top and carries the salt back into the main stream. Most of those shallow lakes and billabongs are fed from creeks which are not more than a few feet wide, and it would not be a very big job to block them off and bank them around the bottom of the cliffs where the creeks run, get the snags out, remove some of the silt, and thus speed up the flow of the water. I was interested recently to inspect the new bridge at Cadell and the Cadell Prison Farm. I was quite alarmed to learn that several prisoners had left the farm. I cannot imagine why anyone should want to do that because the facilities are so good and the conditions should be ideal. I should not mind if I were incarcerated there myself. The dining rooms are nicely decorated with bright colors. There are very nice dormitories with a steel locker to each person. Everything is conducive to people rehabilitating themselves if they want to. All I should be frightened of would be that some people living outside would want to break in to live there. The Government should be complimented, firstly on having set up this rehabilitation centre, and secondly on having made such a good job of the project. When the irrigation scheme associated with the farm is under way, I am hoping that it will be a payable proposition. Many Government institutions will receive some benefit from the produce grown there.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Do not forget the Public Works Standing Committee.

The Hon. C. R. STORY—That committee played a very big part in recommending the scheme, and members of the committee were very interested in the matter. I should also like to mention the advisory committee, of which Mr. Tom Miller is chairman.

Paragraph 23 of the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech deals with the Magill Boys Reformatory and the placing of destitute and orphaned children in individual homes. The latter appeals to me. When I see large institutions with 100 children or so in them, I cannot imagine anything more pathetic or pitiful; whereas suburban type homes with eight or nine children in them would be much better. I cannot visualize that there would be much difficulty in getting foster mothers for these children. I should think that a widow with two or three children who was having a fairly difficult time to keep her own children could give a bit of motherly love to five or six other children. This would be not only a convenient arrangement, but a very rewarding one. I should like to think that this scheme would pay off.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin—It has been in practice for the last 40 years. It is not an experiment.

The Hon. C. R. STORY—I am quite aware of that, but it has not stopped many children from being placed in big institutions. I am afraid that I am not one who is always completely in agreement with some of our good Christian friends who are bringing children up properly in institutions, because I believe they should be in small units where they can get the one thing they need, and the one thing they are most starved of—a bit of love. And I think they can get it on a more intimate basis than being housed in big institutions.

Mention has been made of the Government's legislative programme for this session, but I do not wish to deal with that. I spent some time recently in the Gerard Mission area, an aboriginal mission. I was somewhat appalled at the waste of effort at this lovely piece of land near Winkie, where the aborigines are living in fairly decent little cottages. The Government has nothing to do with the operation of this mission. It would appear that much more could be done to make use of this extremely valuable piece of land given by a benefactor. Really, very little use is being made of it. There is a group of people interested in doing something to develop this mission, and they are quite expert in their own particular lines. It is quite conceivable that they will have to ask for a little assistance in the near future, and I am sure that when they do they will receive the same sympathetic treatment as many other people have at the hands of the Government.

The adoption of the single wire electricity circuit is probably the greatest factor introduced to make electricity available, thus making conditions more comfortable to people living in the country. This is one of the outstanding things that the trust has done in the last few years. It has made it possible for people in rather remote areas to get electricity, which they could not possibly have if they had to pay the old standing and surcharge fees. I realize that in such a year as this, when Government resources are being strained to their limit, not many concessions will be given by Government Departments and instrumentalities. In due course, when the electricity standing charges are reduced, it will be possible for many people in the

outer zones to take advantage of cheap electricity. The trust is also doing a remarkable job in the development of secondary industries in some of the more remote country areas. Again I compliment the Government on the way it has faced up to a most difficult year, and also congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion on their constructive contributions. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 3.22 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, April 12, at 2.15 p.m.