

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Wednesday, September 19, 1962.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. L. H. Densley) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.**COURT REPORTING STAFF.**

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The following appeared in the *Advertiser* this morning under the heading "Regret" at Lack of Court Staff":

The lack of staff to man the court for a case set down for hearing was referred to "with regret" by Mr. D. F. Wilson, S.M., in the Adelaide Police Court yesterday. "I regret having to inform you that for the second time this fortnight this case cannot be heard today," he said. "It is not that there is no court available, but that there is no court staff to man it.

"This is not the only case that cannot be heard today for the same reason. It seems to me to be a lamentable state of affairs that this court has no reserves on which to draw to replace reporters and deposition clerks who are on sick leave or recreation leave." The remedy, Mr. Wilson explained, was not in his hands; and he could only offer his apologies to those who were inconvenienced.

Has the Attorney-General a report on this question, and if not will he seek one and take steps to see that the position that has arisen does not occur again?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I have already had a report on this matter, because I was greatly surprised to read what I did in the *Advertiser* and the inquiries made indicated that the position unfortunately occurred through the illness of Mr. Coombe, S.M., who was away from the court yesterday. Mr. Wilson, S.M., apparently is not quite as up to date on the matter of arranging these matters as the normal head, Mr. Coombe. The result was that Mr. Wilson was under a misapprehension as to the facilities that were at his disposal. I understand that this difficulty occurred because the court was short of a reporter. One of the reporters was away on recreation leave and another on sick leave. The court was able to borrow a reporter from the Industrial Court and I am informed that if it had asked for two or even three reporters from the Industrial Court they would have been available. I have spoken to the responsible officers regarding this matter and they assure me that the court is adequately

staffed at present and that there was no reason for the position to have arisen as it did yesterday, because adequate reserves could have been obtained.

LIGHTS ON STATIONARY VEHICLES.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: Has the Minister of Roads seen the comment in the press recently regarding broken-down or parked vehicles and the advisability of having flashing red lights to indicate the fact when a vehicle is in that position?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: I did notice it, and the matter has been referred to in another place. I would advise the honourable member that there are several aspects of this matter that have not been given the fullest publicity. The chief one is that the majority of heavy transports (that is, those which cannot be moved easily by pushing manually) that are found stationary on the roads at night are broken down, and have lighting problems, and therefore the regulations that provide for reflectorized signs to be carried were devised in the interests of the stationary vehicle which virtually has lost the use of its lights. That is all-important, and I would not like it to be thought that it was not desirable or that reflectorized signs were not the best we could do under the circumstances. Obviously, if a vehicle has broken down electrically no form of lighting beyond reflection can be provided. The idea of its being compulsory to carry flashing lights of the type used in lamps put on roadworks at night is receiving the Government's immediate consideration. There are, of course, practical difficulties with interstate regulations, as to whether all vehicles could carry them. I would inform members that the Road Traffic Board is taking this up immediately, and a demonstration, in conjunction with the police authorities, is to be given on Friday morning of a portable electrical arrangement. It may be somewhat of a problem to carry equipment for flashing signals on interstate vehicles whereby signals could be emitted for a considerable period when a vehicle has broken down. I assure members that the Road Traffic Board has the matter under the fullest consideration immediately.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: About two years ago I referred to the Minister of Roads the question of whether the Government would

make it mandatory for these transports to have flares, as is done in America, where they have had the teething problems we are having. They have the flares so many yards away from the rear of the transport. The Minister said he would have inquiries made and report back to Parliament. In view of the Minister's statement to the Hon. Mr. Giles, why has the move that has been most effective in America not been carried out in this State?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: This matter has been looked into and I inform the honourable member that it is not compulsory in all States of America, only in some. The problem is being treated in different ways in the different States. The result of the consideration of the honourable member's specific point was that it was decided to have something that could be satisfactorily carried by a heavy motor vehicle, such as reflectorized signs, to the extent that they could be policed even in the day time to see if the vehicles were carrying them. The problem with flares is that the vehicle would have to carry a container with fuel. The container could be empty or the flare could run out of fuel, and a driver could claim that it was alight when the vehicle had broken down, and so on. On the other hand reflectorized signs remain effective and the Government agreed to bring in regulations dealing with their introduction.

PORT LINCOLN BULK LOADING FACILITIES.

The Hon. R. R. WILSON: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question. Leave granted.

The Hon. R. R. WILSON: Recently on a visit to Eyre Peninsula the Attorney-General and I inspected the bulk handling system at Port Lincoln, where the grain is unloaded from railway trucks to a conveyor belt that carries the grain to the silo. In my opinion, that system is primitive, in comparison with modern facilities. The trucks are of an oblong type with a flat bottom and square corners. Four mechanical scrapers had to be invented and purchased at much cost. They were needed to scrape the grain out of the corners of the trucks and this apparently caused considerable delay in the turn-round of trucks. Apart from the installation of grain elevators, this is the only place where grain is not handled by gravity. Can the Minister of Railways say whether it is the intention of the Railways Department to employ rolling stock on Eyre Peninsula of the tippler self-emptying type, thus averting the bottleneck in handling grain at terminal ports?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: It would appear from the honourable member's remarks that flat bottoms and square corners are not very artistic in design, but from the point of view of general efficiency I am certain that the lack of these facilities is due to the recent build-up in the freight requirements in that area. However, in view of the serious import of the question I will obtain a report for the honourable member if he puts the question on notice.

ADELAIDE OVAL.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: A few weeks ago the Minister of Local Government indicated that he would have a survey made of the methods of controlling the respective cricket grounds throughout Australia before the agreement between the Adelaide City Council and the South Australian Cricket Association was ratified. Has the Minister received that report, and can he say whether any action has been taken by the Government in regard thereto and whether the agreement will be laid before Parliament and not just ratified by Executive Council?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: I find the honourable member's question somewhat hard to follow. Has he asked one, two or three questions?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: They are correlated. Firstly, the Minister indicated that he would seek information from other States regarding the control of the respective cricket grounds. The next question was whether before ratifying the agreement between the Adelaide City Council and the South Australian Cricket Association the Minister would consider the information from other States as to the differences and the setting up of a commission to control the oval. The third question was whether the Minister would bring the question before Parliament before it was ratified by Executive Council.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: Firstly, I have received information of the trusteeship, etc., of ovals in other States. The answer to the second question is that the agreement has not yet been ratified. However, it has been before Cabinet and Cabinet made certain suggestions to the Adelaide City Council in a letter forwarded to the council on Monday last. I have not yet had a reply to that letter. The third answer is that it rests with the Government as to whether the agreement will be tabled or whether it will be accepted by the Government, according to the Act.

STATE TRAFFIC COMMITTEE.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I ask leave to make a brief statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: My question relates to the Road Traffic Act and the Motor Vehicles Act and thus I address it to the Chief Secretary and/or the Attorney-General and/or the Minister of Roads, because I understand they are all concerned with portions of those Acts. Recently, in the press there was a letter regarding diamond turns, the terms of which letter I do not necessarily agree with. The point I raise is that the Chairman of the State Traffic Committee said his committee would investigate the matter. In my mind the Road Traffic Board seems to have become the Pooh-Bah in this matter since it was instituted and I therefore ask the Ministers if they will reply to me either in series or in parallel as to what, if any, are the residual powers in the hands of the State Traffic Committee?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: If I may reply on behalf of my colleagues—we always seem to achieve uniformity in these matters—the powers of the board have always been, for want of legal technical language possibly, of a negative variety. The board shall say when it disagrees with something proposed by a local government authority, but the power still remains with local government bodies in these matters subject to criticism or suggestions by the board. The board does not go to local government authorities, and indeed will not go, and say, “You put up a sign here and do this and do that”. The suggestion that the board has become a Pooh-Bah is quite unacceptable to the Government and will remain unacceptable, as I believe it will be to members of this Council.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I do not think the Minister has entirely answered my question. The basis of my question is, what powers remain in the hands of the State Traffic Committee?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: The State Traffic Committee was set up to consider various matters that were referred to it or that the Government thought could be referred to it from time to time, such as safety belts or matters of that nature. However, it was quite obvious in the opinion of the Government that a Road Traffic Board of some considerable permanence with an executive officer was necessary in order to bring about some uniformity in road regulations, signs, etc.,

throughout Australia, and to work in close conjunction with other States. The State Traffic Committee was never set up with a view to doing that. This committee is constituted on a very broad basis and it is a large committee in charge of a chairman who is a member of one of the Houses of Parliament.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Don't you think it has become too unwieldy?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: That is a matter on which the honourable member can express his opinion. The Government believes that, from time to time, it is desirable to refer certain questions to that committee, but due to the introduction of the new Road Traffic Act last year, the new Road Traffic Board was constituted as a small board on very businesslike lines, and the State Traffic Committee has not had many matters referred to it since then. However, it still exists and will no doubt be called upon to report on various matters at certain times.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: HON. JESSIE COOPER.

The Hon. C. R. STORY moved:

That one month's leave of absence be granted to the Hon. Jessie Cooper on account of absence from the State on Commonwealth Parliamentary Association business.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 18. Page 920.)

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Central No. 1): I rise to support the second reading of this Bill and in doing so emphasize that members of the Opposition realize and appreciate the fact that the function of the Opposition is to criticize, and to offer an alternative to legislation that may be proposed by the Government. I am not going to traverse the whole of the debate, but there are one or two points I want to mention in connection with statements made regarding the Labor Party and its respective Leaders and members in this House.

I want to disabuse the minds of some honourable members that the Labor Party has not a policy in connection with rural producers. I listened intently to the Hon. Mr. Story and his observations concerning what the Labor Party stands for regarding rural production, and I was somewhat surprised—because of the responsible position which he holds in this House—at his lack of knowledge as to the activities of the Labor Party both when out of

Government and whilst in Government. To disabuse his mind on that issue, I shall mention some of the planks of the Australian Labor Party's policy regarding rural production.

One of the principal items is the stopping of further alienation of Crown lands and any further leasing or sale of the park lands which may deprive the public of free access at all times. Another point is the establishment of a Land Valuation Act for the following purposes: (a) to assess the unimproved values of all lands for all purposes of taxation within the State, (b) to establish a Land Court of Appeal, (c) the right of the Government to resume land for closer settlement and all public purposes at valuation under this Act for taxation purposes, plus 20 per cent and the value of improvements. My friend will wholeheartedly agree on that.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: That is interfering with freehold tenure.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: No, it is not. I will amplify that. Labor's rural policy continues:

The acquisition on just terms as provided for in this policy for closer settlement of large areas, so that productive land may be classified and used to the fullest possible extent and to prevent the re-aggregation of this land into unnecessarily large holdings.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: Would you say that 700 acres on Yorke Peninsula is a large area?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: No.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: What is?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: Not being a farmer and not being on Yorke Peninsula I would say something like 1,500 to 2,000 acres. I hazard that guess while not knowing the productive value of land on Yorke Peninsula.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: You should read what your former Leader said about it.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: Labor's platform also states:

The allotting of land to applicants of whom the Land Board has approved to be decided by ballot. No person who holds under any tenure such area of land as in the opinion of the Land Board is sufficient for the maintenance of himself and family shall be eligible to take part in any ballot. Every person who is successful in any ballot and subsequently transfers his land shall be disqualified for a period to be determined by the Land Board from taking part in any ballot. Readjustment of areas in what is known as the fringe country to enable mixed farming to become the stable industry.

Those are the cardinal principles in connection with land. I do not wish to flay any of my honourable friends from country areas, but when they attempt to belittle the efforts

of the Australian Labor Party in connection with land settlement, and attempt to create a chasm between the city and the country dweller, then I state emphatically that they are doing this State, the country dwellers and the city dwellers a disservice. Honourable members will remember that wheat pools, wheat stabilization schemes and wool stabilization schemes—

The Hon. C. R. Story: Which one?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: Am I speaking about something which the honourable member does not like? These schemes were all established by Labor Governments. At the outbreak of the last war a wool agreement was entered into by the Menzies Government. When the Curtin Government came into power wool was being sold overseas at a low price, and that Government reorganized the agreement on behalf of the woolgrowers for the purpose of giving them some benefit.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: That was years after.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: No, it was not. My honourable friend has a short memory because this happened in 1942-43.

The Hon. N. L. Jude: That is right.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: As my honourable friend is a woolgrower I appreciate his acceptance and his acknowledgment of what that Government did regarding the raising of wool prices. Instead of allowing overseas vested interests to fleece the woolgrowers here, the Curtin Government was successful in seeing that wool producers received a fair return during the war years for wool which was sold overseas.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: That was years after!

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: It was not. My friend is thinking of the Australian Wool Realization Scheme. If the other scheme had not been established the woolgrower would have been at the mercy of those people who control the financial interests governing wool production. I am not a woolgrower—

The Hon. C. R. Story: You are good at pulling the wool over people's eyes.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I do not know about that, but you used a lot of wool yesterday afternoon and attempted to pull it over people's eyes. I mention these points to indicate to my country colleagues here exactly what we as members of the Australian Labor Party in this House stand for. I go further, and say that that is what all members are pledged to.

The Hon. A. C. Hookings: Be careful!

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: There is no need to be careful because this is in black and white. If any of my country friends is interested I shall give him a copy.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: I will be glad to have a copy.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I promised the President one and I will see that you receive one, too.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: You may consider laying it on the table.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I would not mind doing that. On the question of marketing and finance and answering questions raised by the Hon. Mr. Giles, I compliment him on the very reasoned speech he made yesterday which was on all fours with the principles of the Australian Labor Party regarding land settlement.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: He had already read our policy.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: He may have and perhaps has been converted. I hope so. The rural policy of the Australian Labor Party is the encouragement of orderly and co-operative marketing; a board to fix a standard for cereals according to quality—growers, buyers and the Government to be represented; proper storage for handling grain where required; adequate assistance to all primary producers; assistance to landholders to furnish and finance local irrigation schemes to improve carrying capacity; assistance and encouragement to landholders to conserve fodder reserves; and effective legislation for the destruction of vermin and noxious weeds to be administered by the Government. Our policy is also the establishment and maintenance of a pool of agricultural and heavy machinery for hiring to landholders with special concession rates to landholders developing virgin lands. That is where Labor stands. The Hon. Mr. Giles yesterday mentioned the cost of heavy farm machinery that may be left idle for six months of the year, the capital cost of which would be a huge burden to a young man attempting to establish himself on a cereal or grazing property. I hope that members will take cognizance of what I have said about the Labor Party's policy and realize that Labor has done more to assist both the man on the land and the establishment of industries in South Australia and Australia generally than any other Government. We are always being twitted that Labor has no definite policy, but the Labor Party has long

affirmed the need for national planning of the economic, social and cultural development of the Commonwealth. That was borne out during and after the Second World War and since the last Commonwealth elections, when every member of the Australian Labor Party in the Commonwealth Parliament has advocated a national planning scheme.

I now come to the question of what was done during the war and after the war. From 1949 we have had an anti-Labor Government in the Commonwealth Parliament. The Hon. Mr. Giles yesterday referred to the financial agreement whereby this State is tied and shackled to the whims and wishes of the Commonwealth Government in connection with the financial resources. I went to the trouble to look up the position when this agreement came into force. It was introduced in 1927 when the Bruce-Page Government was in power in the Commonwealth Parliament. I will not weary members by reading the whole of the speech made by the then Prime Minister, the Hon. Mr. Bruce, now Lord Bruce. He assured the Premiers that whatever power resided in the Commonwealth as to the borrowing of money, the States would not be treated harshly. In the preamble to his speech he said:

To make the agreement clear, it is necessary to go shortly into the history of this matter, but I need not do so exhaustively. In pre-Federation days the subject occupied probably more of the time of the conferences that were held, and certainly presented more difficulty than any of the other problems of Federation. Eventually, when the needs of the Commonwealth and the States had been considered, it was recognized that the financial security and independence of the States must be safeguarded, and that the Commonwealth must have adequate financial resources for both its known and its possible requirements.

Further on he said:

In 1919 the Commonwealth Government invited the Governments of the several States to meet in conference to consider the financial relations of the States and the Commonwealth, and the proposal then made by the Commonwealth was to diminish the per capita payments progressively by 2s. 6d. per annum, until the amount payable to the States should be reduced to 10s. per head. That proposal was not acceptable to the States. The only point which I desire to stress in connection with that conference is that the contributions of the Commonwealth to the States would have progressively diminished and the States would have received no compensation for that.

They were the remarks of the then Prime Minister and I want members to contrast the position that obtains in South Australia regarding the financial resources being made available by the Commonwealth. We had

the sorry spectacle only a few weeks ago of an agreement which should have been honoured by the Commonwealth Government, an agreement which had been entered into with the State Government for the unification of railway gauges. The Commonwealth Government refused to acknowledge it. That was brought about by that Government not allotting, according to the financial agreement, the necessary funds for the purposes of a scheme for national planning. The 1927 agreement fixed the contributions towards interest charges for South Australia at £703,816, for sinking fund contribution £115,000 and for increased interest on transferred properties £15,534, the total payments amounting to £834,350. I ask members to keep those figures in mind and to realize the increase in the amount of money needed in 1962 now that the Commonwealth does not give back enough to the States in the way of compensation for the taxes collected in the respective States. I want to show members, and those who believe that the Commonwealth is giving the States a fair deal, exactly what we are committed for. In the State's Financial Agreement Act of 1927 appears the following:

If at any time the Loan Council by unanimous decision so decides, a State may, in accordance with the terms of the decision, borrow moneys outside Australia in the name of the State, and issue securities for the moneys so borrowed. The Commonwealth shall guarantee that the State will perform all its obligations to bondholders in respect of the moneys so borrowed. For all the purposes of this agreement, including the making of sinking fund contributions, the moneys so borrowed shall be deemed to be moneys borrowed by the Commonwealth for and on behalf of that State.

Any securities that are issued for moneys so borrowed or used shall be Commonwealth securities, to be provided by the Commonwealth upon terms approved by the Loan Council.

The Loan Council is constituted of a representative from each State and the Commonwealth has the right under the agreement and a gentleman's understanding of appointing a majority on the Loan Council. That means that unless there is complete unanimity on any proposal for Loan Council expenditure submitted to that council, the Commonwealth Government can use its prerogative by sending along another delegate to give it a majority. That is exactly the position that this State finds itself in today. As far as I can ascertain, no effort has been made by any of the States under a Liberal regime to attempt to alter that condition which affects the progress and development of all the

States. I heard an interjection yesterday from the Attorney-General to the effect that the unemployment figures were higher in States governed by Labor.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: That is true.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I want to tell the Minister how that position comes about. In the States governed by Labor there is a larger proportion of the Australian population. My friend will find by a mathematical effort that on a population basis, in comparison with New South Wales, South Australia has the greater percentage of unemployment.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: On a point of order, Mr. President. That statement is deliberately untrue. On a per capita basis South Australia has the lowest percentage of unemployment.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: The Minister says that my statement is untrue. I have made the statement, and I ask him to bring figures forward to disprove it. I cannot see any point of order at issue. The Attorney-General has the same right as I have to get up and state his views. I cannot see any point of order, except that the shot has hit the bullseye. It is useless to decry what has been done by other Governments in order to bolster up this Government.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: You should not make statements that are not true.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: Mr. President, that remark is offensive to me and I ask that it be withdrawn.

The PRESIDENT: The Attorney-General.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: In deference to the honourable member, I am prepared to withdraw the remark.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I come back now to what was done after the war. Sweden continued with its post-war machinery from 1947 onwards. Instead of going in for a fiscal budget it went in for a national budget covering national works. To Australia the important thing is to start on the planning of public works, not only from a national point of view, but for the purpose of assisting the States in their programmes of public works. I have instanced that the standardization of railway gauges could not be proceeded with because the Commonwealth Government refused to grant the necessary funds. What was the position after the war under the Chifley Labor Government? It inaugurated the Snowy River scheme as a national project. Members will recall that when the first sod

was turned in this scheme the Hon. R. G. Menzies, who is now the Prime Minister, refused to attend the ceremony, thus indicating his lack of interest in national development introduced by the Labor Government.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: What has been done for South Australia?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: We are all South Australians, yet in the final analysis we are Australians. No nation should be divided. South Australia contributes to the Commonwealth pool of loyalty, and South Australia is one of the units that helps to make Australia a nation. The first step in national planning is a change from the mere financial wrangle of the Loan Council and the gentlemen's agreement, and develop the concept of a national works planning council. I have instanced the Snowy River project. I could instance the celebrations that took place last week in connection with the commencement of the work on the East-West railway. That work was done under the auspices of the Commonwealth Labor Government, and it was objected to by some people who opposed Labor policy. It was brought about by the visit of the late Earl Kitchener to Australia prior to the First World War. He came here to advise the then Commonwealth Government on military matters in order to protect Australia should she ever be invaded. This railway work was a long-range programme, and last week the jubilee celebrations were held. The work was carried out without any recurring interest charges. This was done under the auspices of the Commonwealth Bank by the issue of Government notes. I do not think anyone went bankrupt at that time because of what was done. Recently, the following appeared in the *Quarterly Survey* of the Australia and New Zealand Bank:

Once again, the developing economic scene emphasizes the need for the introduction in Australia of a more closely co-ordinated, more effectively integrated over-all planning approach. An effective central planning system would enable the tempo of the economy to be assessed accurately, and on a current continuing basis, so that forces of expansion or contraction could be applied firmly but gently, and early enough to avoid sharp and disastrous surges in the tempo of economic activity.

What is the position in regard to that? We find that since the Menzies Government has been in power it has adopted a stop and go policy. It has been advised by Canberra economists, who do not realize the effectiveness of allowing the economy

to develop itself with the aid of Governments, and they took upon themselves the responsibility of bringing in a financial squeeze two years ago, and so lost the confidence of the people. Everybody knows that when confidence is lost, whether in business or on the sporting field, it takes some time for confidence to be restored to the level before being lost. Writing recently in the *Quarterly Review* of the Skandinaviska Banken, Mr. Gosta Rehn, Chief of the Economic Division in the Swedish Ministry of Finance, pointed out that it is useful to recall that the word "plan" has a double meaning, and that it can mean "intention" and "central co-ordination." He said that central co-ordination is discarded in favour of the broad generalization that "those who have a constructive role to play in the economy should have all possible light on the scope and prospects for future growth, the broad directions it can be expected to take, and the limitations it is likely to encounter."

The Hon. N. L. Jude: Whom are you quoting?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: The Swedish Ministry of Finance. I thought the honourable member did not catch it.

The Hon. N. L. Jude: I did not think it was the honourable member's material.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I did not say it was. Perhaps the honourable member thought it was from Spain. We have heard a lot about the Common Market. The greatest common market for Australia is within its own boundaries. In 1954 the Australian home market was beginning to stagnate and unemployment was rising. That was five years after the Menzies Government took office. Workers won rises in margins in November of that year and increased purchasing power in the home market checked the upward swing in unemployment and absorbed workers in production activities. In December, 1959, unemployment was snowballing. It was checked and reversed by the 28 per cent marginal rises. Those increases restored the lost purchasing power in the home market. In July, 1962, still under the Menzies Government, the purchasing power of wages and salaries was down. It is now 2½ years since the last margin rises, and prices have increased. Australia has almost 100,000 people out of work. I think that figure was challenged by the Hon. Mr. Story when speaking about the Hon. Mr. Shard's remarks.

This morning's press shows that we shall have many battalions of boys and girls leaving school to go on to the labour market. They will be unable to get jobs unless there is

economic buoyancy. About 200,000 young Australians come on to the labour market each year. The large intake of migrants is being maintained. These are economic factors that not only the South Australian Government but the Commonwealth Government must grapple with. Australia needs the creation of hundreds of thousands of jobs between now and the middle of next year if all Australians are to be gainfully employed, and if the economy is to function to a proper extent. I wish to take members' minds back to the period of the Second World War, and also just after the war when everybody was gainfully employed, when men were sent overseas to defend this country, and when there was a labour shortage. I put it to honourable members this afternoon that if those conditions can apply during war-time they can apply during peace-time. Those are a few observations I wish to make this afternoon on the Loan Bill. I had intended dealing with hostels for students following on a reply I received to a question yesterday, but I will reserve my comments on that until the Budget comes before the Council. I support the second reading of this Bill.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): I rise to support the second reading of the Bill. Statements have been made about the Estimates as outlined by the Chief Secretary when he presented this Bill, and I wish to make a few comments. The first is with reference to the £150,000 which is to be made available for student hostels. The provision of hostels is a pressing need throughout South Australia, particularly for country students who find that they have to travel to the large centres or to Adelaide to further their education at a time when the necessity for better education is becoming greater. We find in many country districts that facilities are not available for children to proceed further than the Leaving class and also that the number of students offering for higher education is quite often small and does not warrant the establishment of a Leaving Honours class. This, of course, necessitates those children who are interested in furthering their education travelling to the city where the necessary facilities are provided and where it is possible to supply the staff to handle the higher courses satisfactorily. One of the problems of all students coming to Adelaide, not only to the Leaving Honours classes, but also those attending the university, is the question of accommodation. It is a big worry to parents when their children come to Adelaide and accommodation

is not readily available. I commend the provision of this money for this purpose because it will be of great benefit to the State.

The provision of £2,330,000 for railways includes some money for diesel-electric locomotives and spares for the Port Lincoln and Peterborough divisions, both of which are very important divisions in the South Australian railways system. The railways on Eyre Peninsula carry an enormous quantity of produce over long distances, and any move that can be made to cut costs will benefit that area. A similar comment applies to the Port Pirie to Broken Hill line on which is carried the ore from Broken Hill. This line has received much publicity during the last few months and the proposed use of diesel-electric locomotives is the first attempt to reduce freight costs on products carried over that line. I support any attempt to modernize this line and I hope that the plans of the South Australian Government for the further modernization of the line will be put into effect as soon as possible.

One item of particular interest referred to country water districts, for which £751,000 is allocated. This is particularly interesting, because much of this money will be spent in areas where water reticulation is a serious problem and is becoming more serious as the season progresses, in view of the light rainfall and the absence of surface water. Several of the districts mentioned in the Bill are in this position. An area adjacent to Booleroo Centre has no suitable water and surface water is practically non-existent. The people there have had to sell their stock for several years past during the autumn period. They have been desperately seeking some relief from their problems. This is production country and not an area where the capital cost of reticulated water may not be justified. I am pleased to see that this money is being provided. Money is also being made available to improve the present water supplies for Hawker, Ororoo and Kimba. These are all areas with serious water reticulation problems, and some relief will be given in the near future. I commend the expenditure of money for that purpose.

The provision of £2,300,000 for the Electricity Trust is most interesting because £1,250,000, or a little over half of the allocation, will be spent on country extensions. This illustrates that the money has been fairly allocated throughout the State, and that provision will bring added benefit. I wish to make

one other point about the works I have mentioned. It concerns the question of employment, which has been discussed at some length during the debate on this Bill. One of the points raised was that these works do not provide new employment. However, if we examine the position closely we shall find that much new employment will be created by many of these works. In particular, the Morgan-Whyalla main duplication is a very large undertaking. I have occasion to travel in the area through which this main passes and it is most interesting to note the huge quantity of pipes, equipment and men involved in this project. The expenditure of the large amount allocated for this project must increase new employment throughout the area. The same applies to all the other projects where money is allocated for new work, and we should keep in mind that not only do we have to provide for new employment, but we must also ensure that our existing employment figures are maintained. This can be done by wise planning in any business, whether it be a private business, a Government instrumentality or at Cabinet level. We are providing for an expanding economy with increased employment, but we must not lose sight of the fact that there must be a continuity of employment maintained in our existing works. I consider that the money which will be made available under this Bill will help considerably in providing employment in this State.

One or two points made by the Hon. Mr. Bardolph require comment. He read from a publication, and his remarks have not yet been printed in *Hansard*, but he referred to the policy of the Labor Party regarding primary production. I do not have a copy of the publication, but from what I can recall it appears that there is still not a definite Labor Party policy as regards primary production. Amongst other stabilization schemes, he mentioned the wheat stabilization scheme, for which he gave a Commonwealth Labor Government credit for establishing some years ago.

The Hon. W. W. Robinson: Is that something new?

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: As far as I can recall the wheat stabilization scheme at that time did not benefit the primary producer to any extent, because the home consumption price was fixed on a cost of production basis. The wheat was used for home consumption, which meant that the Australian wheatgrower was subsidizing the cost of wheat to the consumer in Australia. I can remember that at that time it was cheaper for a primary producer to buy wheat from the stacks than it was

for him to use his own wheat, and that was done on a large scale particularly by primary producers who were raising pigs and using large amounts of feed wheat. They were delivering their wheat to the centres, buying it back at the home consumption price, and then feeding it to their stock. I believe that at that time a large parcel of wheat was sold to New Zealand.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: We did not hear of these things this afternoon.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: It was an advantage to the grower if he could get more by taking it to the stack and then buying it back.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: That would apply to the grower who kept pigs and other stock.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: That applied to seed wheat, too.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: If a grower does not grow more wheat than he feeds to his stock, then he is really not a true wheatgrower. The man who was growing wheat for a living was supplying cheap wheat to those who were reaping the benefit of the cheaper home consumption price. However, all that is past history. I am speaking from memory, but I think those details are accurate because at that time the so-called wheat stabilization scheme caused discontent among wheatgrowers.

Another point mentioned by Mr. Bardolph was a plan to control the area of holdings. That, of course, is hardly a rural policy, but a policy regarding land tenure. Perhaps the two could be related to some extent. Mention was made of a national plan for primary production. That could be a dangerous thing for this State and for Australia. As a point of interest, I remember about two years ago it appeared that we would have a large carry-over of wheat, and at that time a number of would-be experts suggested the restriction of the acreage sown to wheat. A whole new market area was then found in the Near-East. Fortunately we had wheat on hand to meet these requirements and we established new markets which enabled us to increase our overseas balances. This new market for our wheat could have been lost if we had introduced a plan of restricted acreage. We should approach any national plan, such as that advocated by Labor, with extreme caution.

A number of other points were raised of a Commonwealth nature, but as we are debating this Bill on a State level I will go no further into those matters. I support the second reading.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Attorney-General): I did not intend to speak on this Bill, but certain things have been said this afternoon which I have had an opportunity to investigate. The interpretation I placed on unemployment figures is strictly correct, and I think that the matter should be clarified. The unemployment figures and the percentages which I announced recently were correct in every detail. The truth is that the percentage of the work force which is unemployed in this State is the lowest of any State in the Commonwealth. Since certain statements on unemployment were made earlier this afternoon I have made inquiries and find that as at August 31, 1962, the number of unemployed in New South Wales was 32,878, which was 2 per cent of the total work force. The number in Victoria was 22,655, which was 1.8 per cent of the work force; in Queensland 13,040 and 2 per cent, respectively, and in South Australia 6,109 and 1.5 per cent. The South Australian figure is considerably lower than that for any other State. It is not a percentage of the total population, but a percentage of the work force, which was the point I tried to make clear to the Hon. Mr. Bardolph. I am glad that my inquiries have vindicated my interjection to the hilt. In Western Australia the respective figures were 4,981 and 1.7 per cent and in Tasmania 3,730 and 2.8 per cent.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: What is the total work force in Australia?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: The figures I gave were obtained by me from the Department of Labour and Industry and are correct and justify to the hilt my statement, which I have reiterated. I am prepared to substantiate that at all times since the credit squeeze the percentage of unemployment in this State has been less than that of any other State, and I deprecate any attempt to misconstrue those figures and to twist them around to give another picture. We should all feel pleased that South Australia has been able to make such progress. We have come out of the difficulty more quickly than any other State, and that is something which should receive the support of all members, and the figures should not be controverted to create a different picture. Immediately the South Australian Government saw what was happening as a result of the credit squeeze it took appropriate steps to remedy the position and in the 12 months following the squeeze it increased its own work force by no less than 2,800 people and this had an immediate bearing on the situation. Since then the Government has adopted a

policy designed to create more employment for more people, and we are rapidly getting to the position where every man willing and able to work will have a job.

The Hon. Mr. Bardolph referred to the Labor Party's attitude to the primary producer. I thought it very good of him to admit that he was not a farmer and I think he also admitted that he did not know very much about farming. I do not know whether I know very much about farming or not, but I happen to own a farm and know something about the problems facing farmers. One or two years ago when the Government introduced a Bill the effect of which was to reduce succession duties on farms by about 30 per cent, a concession which the Government felt was amply justified because of the excessive value of farming lands, I think it was the honourable member who moved an amendment to provide an extension to other categories of estates. The fact was that the amendment would have wrecked the whole Bill and denied farmers the concession the Government proposed. The honourable member knew that the State Treasury was not in a position to make a reduction at that stage over the whole field of succession duties, and if he had considered the position he would have found that his amendment would have wrecked the Bill. The Government succeeded in having the Bill passed and it has been of great benefit to primary producers in the last few years, with values remaining high, though the income of farmers had fallen considerably, more considerably than most people remember.

I do not want to discuss the matter at great length, but this Government has done more to provide amenities in country areas in the extension of electricity, water supplies and good roads, in exempting primary producers from a road tax on their vehicles and in granting other concessions than any other Government in Australia. It takes second place to nobody when it comes to looking after the interests of primary producers. I have made these remarks because I felt that the record should be put straight, and because people should know that this State has a record relating to the unemployment position that cannot be beaten by any other State. At the present stage the picture looks quite bright. Industries are engaging more employees all the time and the economy is on the uplift, and therefore it is not a time for anyone to try to falsify the position. The position today is that the Government has been trying to get the economy on an even keel and to

see that everyone who is willing and able to work can do so. It is therefore a great pleasure to know that this Government has succeeded to a greater extent than any other State Government in that regard.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I desire to make a personal explanation, Mr. President, in connection with the statement of the Attorney-General concerning unemployment figures. I do not suggest that the figures he has given are not correct. I made the statement that per capita of the population of the States—

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: That is not a personal explanation. It is another speech.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I am not making a speech, but in my statement I said that we had a higher per cent per capita of the population—

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: That statement is not borne out by those figures.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I am making a personal explanation and I want the same courtesy extended to me that I would extend to the Minister.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member must not debate the matter. If he wants to make a personal explanation he has the right to do so.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I will not debate it. I made a statement regarding the per capita of the population of the respective States. If it were worked out mathematically, it would probably be shown that South Australia has a greater percentage of the work force unemployed on the figures that have been quoted today, and I have a copy of those figures, which are based on a work force of 4,300,000.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: With the greatest respect, this is a second reading speech. The honourable member has already had the opportunity to quote those figures, and now he is seeking the opportunity to do so again.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I claim the right to make a personal explanation, and I am not debating the question.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: You can't take it!

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I can take it. I shall not get into a debate, but on the score that I have been charged with giving false figures, I have the right to indicate to the Council—

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: On a point of order, Mr. President, I am not charging the honourable member with giving false figures.

The statement is objectionable to me and I ask him to withdraw it.

The PRESIDENT: I must ask the honourable member to withdraw the statement.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: If it offends the susceptibilities of the Attorney-General, I withdraw, but I still desire to make my personal explanation. How I arrived at the figures I mentioned was on the per capita of the population of the respective States. The figures I have here are based on a work force of 4,300,000, which is not a per capita figure. I want that to be in *Hansard*.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER secured the adjournment of the debate.

BULK HANDLING OF GRAIN ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 18. Page 921.)

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON (Northern): This is a short Bill to enable the Treasurer to enter into an agreement to guarantee the Commonwealth Trading Bank an amount of £200,000, which is part of a loan advanced by the bank to South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. Last year Parliament passed a similar Bill dealing with a £500,000 guarantee to assist the co-operative in extending the bulk handling of grain services. The present arrangements will enable the Australian Barley Board to have in-transit silos erected at Wallaroo and Port Lincoln for the bulk loading of barley. This will reduce the loading time of ships to one-fifth of the existing time, as mentioned by the Hon. Mr. Wilson.

Recently when the Public Works Committee was at Port Lincoln members watched a ship loading wheat in bulk and barley in bags. The wheat was flowing at the rate of about 400 tons an hour, but the barley was being loaded slowly. Going on what we saw of the rate of loading it would take about 10 days to load the ship. It was nauseating to watch the rate of the barley loading and I can understand the board's desire to have these in-transit silos to enable barley to be loaded at a reasonable rate, which must have a bearing on freight rates and port dues. The cost of the work at Port Lincoln and Wallaroo will be £330,000, that is, £165,000 at each port.

At Port Adelaide a terminal is being erected on a reclaimed area. I pay a tribute to the Harbors Board for reclaiming 1,200 acres of land by dredging the channel and putting the waste material on the adjacent land. On part of this reclaimed area the Port Adelaide

terminal will be erected. It will receive wheat or barley at the rate of 600 tons an hour, and the ship loading rate will be about 800 tons an hour. In addition, there is provision for the loading of salt from the Imperial Chemical Industries works, or any other material that must be loaded in bulk. The Commonwealth Bank agreed to advance the balance of £400,000 on condition that the State Bank guaranteed half the amount. I understand that the terminal is now in the course of construction.

I pay a tribute to South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. for the progress it has made in providing facilities for the bulk handling of grain. I understand that already 70 silos have been erected throughout the State. It is pleasing to me that the vertical concrete silo has been adopted as against the original horizontal galvanized iron silo. The vertical silo is of a permanent nature and allows mechanical handling both in and out, whereas the horizontal silo permits a mechanical intake, but the out-turn is done manually. I also pay a tribute to the Australian Barley Board that was established to handle

barley in Victoria and South Australia. Over the years it has established efficient marketing facilities, and each season has disposed of the barley available. It has run its affairs efficiently. I pay a tribute to the late Mr. Spafford, whom I remember more particularly as the Director of Agriculture. During his term of office he gave a wise guidance to agriculturists in this State. In 1939 he gave evidence to a committee inquiring into the establishment of additional killing facilities in South Australia. Five years later, when appearing before another committee, he said that perhaps much of the information he had given in 1939 had been proved to be wrong, but investigations showed that the evidence given in 1944 supported his forecasts in 1939. As most of the important points in the Bill have been discussed already, I will not refer to them. I support the second reading.

The Hon. C. R. STORY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 3.44 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, September 25, at 2.15 p.m.