

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, July 24, 1968

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS**BIRDSTOWN TRACK**

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I ask leave to make a very brief statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Roads.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yesterday I asked the Minister a question regarding financial assistance from the Commonwealth Government for beef roads in this State. The Minister gave a reply relating to the \$1,000,000 that was made available by the Commonwealth Government. I have since discussed this matter with the Minister and I now ask whether he has any further information on this matter.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The honourable member did consult me on this matter after yesterday's sitting and, as a result, I wish to clarify the information given in the Council yesterday on the question of the upgrading of the Birdstown track. The facts, as far as the negotiations with the Commonwealth Government are concerned, are as follows:

1. In the latter half of last year the Commonwealth Government agreed to grant to the State \$1,000,000 to upgrade the track, subject to the State's providing \$600,000.
2. On October 25, 1967, the then Prime Minister cancelled, in writing, the requirement that South Australia must provide \$600,000.
3. In a recent letter just prior to the Commonwealth Act being passed on subsidies for beef roads, the Commonwealth asked the State to accept, or refuse, the offer of \$1,000,000.
4. The offer was accepted by South Australia.
5. In discussing this question with the Commissioner of Highways, it became apparent that the \$1,000,000 could not possibly upgrade the track to a standard considered necessary. The Commissioner discussed with me ways and means of financing additional work on the track and did point out that it was known that the Commonwealth department did expect that the State would spend \$600,000, even though the Prime Minister had agreed not to make

this sum a condition of the original grant of \$1,000,000. After further consideration of the needs of this road, the Commissioner proposes to submit a scheme that will involve the department's spending \$400,000 a year over five years, as well as \$200,000 a year for five years out of the Commonwealth grant. This will mean that \$3,000,000 will be spent on this road to provide, within reasonable limits, a continuous, all-weather, open-surface road.

When I receive the final proposal from the Commissioner of Highways, I will refer the matter to the Minister for National Development for his concurrence, because it involves the programming of the spending of the Commonwealth Government's grant.

I wish to point out that the engagement of the engineering consultants to make a feasibility study on whether upgrading of the track was a viable project has resulted in a report which has caused the State to consider there is justification for the building of a continuous road of this type. The report has definitely shown that the project is an economical and justifiable proposition from the point of view of the State.

CAPE JAFFA ROADWORK

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: Can the Minister of Roads say when the roadwork at Cape Jaffa in the South-East is likely to commence?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: No, I cannot answer that question without reference to the roads programme of the Highways Department. I shall ascertain this information for the honourable member as soon as I possibly can.

FLINDERS UNIVERSITY

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Can the Minister of Local Government obtain answers for me from the Minister of Education on the following questions: first, has Professor J. A. Richardson been granted leave from his duties at the Flinders University to travel overseas; secondly, how long has Professor Richardson been employed by this university; thirdly, does he intend to visit Soviet Russia and Communist China in the course of his visit; fourthly, what is the purpose of his visit; fifthly, is his salary being paid during his absence; sixthly, has he given any undertaking, either verbally or in writing, that upon his return he will address public meetings and give a public account of his experiences; and, seventhly, what part of

his expenses are being met by Soviet Russia or, failing that, what facilities are being provided to him by Soviet Russia during his tour?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I shall pass those questions on to my colleague and obtain a reply for the honourable member.

ROSEWORTHY RAILWAY CROSSING

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My question concerns the railway crossing immediately north of Roseworthy about which representations have been made in this Council from time to time seeking warning lights. Perhaps, in view of the comments made yesterday by my friend the Hon. Mr. Kneebone, I should state that I have asked questions of this type about this crossing and others, and I think that if my friend looks through *Hansard* he will find that I have asked this sort of question as often of the previous Minister, the Hon. Sir Norman Jude, as I have asked it of the Hon. Mr. Kneebone, and I do not believe there is any politics in this type of thing, for it is a matter of preserving human life. The reason I ask the Minister of Transport to reconsider the situation at this crossing is that fatalities have occurred there, one only recently.

As I have explained before, the crossing is in a hollow and the angle at which the road crosses the railway line is a very bad one from the point of view of visibility. I believe that the Railways Commissioner has rejected requests by district councils whose ratepayers often use this Main North Road, and also requests by members in this Council, on the ground that not many trains use this line. I believe that the incidence of vehicular traffic, which runs into some hundreds a day, should also be considered in this case. In view of the danger at that railway crossing, will the Minister have this matter re-examined to see whether a set of lights can be installed at that crossing?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will investigate this specific crossing and bring down a report for the honourable member as soon as I can.

SMITHFIELD HIGH SCHOOL

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Smithfield High School.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 23. Page 167.)

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): I rise to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, and I join with other speakers in paying a tribute and expressing appreciation to the Lieutenant-Governor, the Hon. Sir Mellis Napier, on his opening of Parliament this session which, I understand, was his tenth occasion. It must have been obvious, particularly to those who have come in contact with him over the years, that on the opening day he was far from well. Indeed, I wondered what was wrong with him and I had no idea until lunch time of that day that he was to go into hospital that afternoon. He did a remarkable job for a gentleman of his age and, considering his disabilities at that time, he delivered an excellent speech and I congratulate him. I also express my sympathy to him in his illness. It is pleasing to note that he resumed duty last Monday and is now as fit, well and able as he has been for many years. I wish him well and hope he will enjoy good health for many years to come, thus enabling him to continue in his present position.

I also pay respect and convey my best wishes to our former Governor and his wife, Lady Bastyan. For those of us who had the privilege to say *au revoir* at the airport on the morning of Saturday, June 1, it was a sad occasion. As one who worked fairly closely with Sir Edric and Lady Bastyan over the last few years, I could not but admire their work. They were good ambassadors for the State wherever they went, and they knew no boundaries within our State. Indeed, recently when I was in the country I heard that a far-flung town was pleased Sir Edric and Lady Bastyan paid them a courtesy farewell visit. While we have Governors with the ability of Sir Edric (particularly if they have a wife with the outstanding charm of his wife) we will indeed be fortunate.

I do not know who will be our next Governor and, indeed, I have no choice in it, but if we can get another couple as interested in South Australia and as able as were Sir Edric and Lady Bastyan, this State will be well served. On behalf of the people of this State, I thank them and record my appreciation of their services, particularly in regard to the help Sir Edric gave me during my term in office. I also record my appreciation of the assistance of departmental heads,

particularly those of the departments under my control while I was Chief Secretary and Minister of Health. I think it can be truly and fairly said that the heads of our departments are public servants of the highest calibre. I for one totally disagree with some people I have read in the paper in the last few days who have written them down. I shall have a word to say directly about that and I am sure that those speakers who follow me will agree that the heads of departments and the top public servants have no other ambition in life than to serve their departments and the Ministers of the day for the general betterment and progress of the State. I have no hesitation in saying that the particular officers with whom I came in contact do just that.

I want it to be clearly understood that I did not agree with everything they did when I was Chief Secretary. I think it would be totally wrong if the present Ministers agreed with everything that the heads of departments put to them. That is inevitable but it does not affect their courtesy and willingness to serve the Ministers of the day. If I may be permitted, I should like to say a word of thanks and appreciation to the staff of the Chief Secretary's office. It is rather a big staff at the moment and the office is busy, but from the Under-Secretary at the top downwards I experienced nothing but efficiency, courtesy and ability. I express to each and every one of them my thanks for their courtesies to me.

I should also like to place on record my appreciation of and thanks to the numerous people (too many even to try to mention individually) throughout the metropolitan area and the country who accepted my wife and me in our official capacities for the many courtesies extended to us. In travelling around the country my work was made lighter by the appreciative attitude and willingness to co-operate of those people doing various jobs in the interests of the State. The way they accepted us with their co-operation and courtesy made our work easier. I should not like it to be thought that everybody accepted us, but to the few who did not accept the fact that there had been a change of Government (and, if they read *Hansard*, they will know to whom I am talking) I offer my sympathy in their not being able to accept the change; and I advise them that common courtesy costs nothing.

When there is a contest, be it a football or bowls match or backing horses at a race meeting, one likes to say to the people concerned, "Congratulations and best wishes on a contest

well played, well conducted and fairly won", but I find I cannot do that in connection with the State elections and the change of Government, because it is quite clear to everybody that the Government did not receive a majority of the votes cast at those elections; nor did it win a majority of the seats. Hence, I cannot be quite so frank as I should like to be in offering my congratulations to the Government on taking office, but it does not stop me placing on record my personal congratulations to the Ministers (and particularly in this Chamber the three gentlemen concerned) on their appointments. I have already congratulated them personally and I should like to place on record that I wish them well for the future and congratulate them on obtaining their positions. The only thing I have to say about them is that I thought the choice for one portfolio left much to be desired.

I do not intend to speak for long today but, while speaking on this matter, I want to assure the Chief Secretary, the Ministry and you, Sir, as President of the Council, of my and my colleagues' ready co-operation in assisting the Ministers in the running of the business of this Chamber. It is only right and reasonable (and I am sure we all agree on this) that we shall not agree on all legislation brought before the Council. We shall have our differences of opinion, but that is one of the freedoms we enjoy in this country. We should not want it to be otherwise than that we have the right of expression, but it does not deny us the right to see the business of the Council conducted as reasonably and expeditiously as possible.

I want to mention just one or two things in connection with the last State election, because I think there will be more suitable times to speak of it and its results in the future. I say openly and sincerely that I was perturbed at the conduct of the election and its aftermath, not only personally but from the point of view of the State and more particularly from the point of view of Parliament. I do not think that either Party got out of that election very well, nor did the Electoral Department get out of it with any kudos; nor do I think, coming nearer home, that the Court of Disputed Returns got out of it with any kudos; nor did some members of this honourable Chamber. It all comes down to the fact that we have all to share the responsibility of the election and the Electoral Act and some things that were done which, to say the least, were borderline.

It is the responsibility of Parliament as a whole as soon as practicable to get down to looking at the electoral boundaries and the Electoral Act and the regulations to see that what happened in the 1968 State election is not repeated. It is no good anybody in the future referring to the irresponsibility of those in Government and blaming somebody else, because it is the members of this Thirty-ninth Parliament who must bear the responsibility. The position has been exposed and is wide open to all of us. Whilst at the moment it may be the Government's responsibility to introduce appropriate legislation, each and every member of Parliament, either in this Council or in another place, will have to face up to his responsibilities and see that what was done at the last election does not recur at the next election, whenever it may be, whether it is soon or after this Parliament has run its full course, though I have my own ideas on when it will be.

I meet a mixed section of the community, and the people I have spoken to about the last election are astounded and disturbed, and we may even say disgusted, at some of the things that were done and can happen in an election. They have all been brought forward; whether everyone knows about them, I do not know. I shall not go into details regarding the postal voting system. I have heard our trade union movement rubbished and I have heard trade union ballots condemned, but, in connection with postal voting, nothing like the anomalies that occurred in the last general election has happened in a trade union poll, which closes at a given time and all ballot-papers must be in the ballot-box or at the post office at that time. This rule is strictly enforced.

I have said publicly and I repeat it here today that there is only one answer to the problems that have arisen in connection with postal voting: the postal ballot-papers must be in the hands of a Returning Officer at 8 p.m., or whatever the closing time of the poll may be. If the ballot-papers do not arrive by this time, they are not counted.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: That did not cause any trouble this time. The ballot-papers were in the hands of the Returning Officer.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It cost the State only \$40,000! That is all it cost!

The Hon. F. J. Potter: The Returning Officer had all the ballot-papers in his hands.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No, he did not. I shall tell the honourable member what

happened in one country electoral district. The Returning Officer went to a country post office at 9 a.m. on the Monday after the poll and was handed some postal vote certificates that had been postmarked at 3.30 a.m. on the Monday morning, and he included them in the count; the postmark satisfied him that the votes had been posted before 8 p.m. on the Saturday, in accordance with the Act. I do not know how anyone could satisfy himself on this point when the postal vote certificates had the postmark I have described on them. The Returning Officer went to the post office again on the Monday afternoon and was handed another batch of postal vote certificates, which had the same postmark on them, but they had been posted in the city and he ruled this batch out.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: The honourable member is not talking about the Millicent poll on March 2?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No. Much that is wrong has gone on, and I am prepared to take the responsibility (and I shall urge my Party to do so, too) for moving an amendment, when the relevant legislation comes before the Council, to provide that ballot-papers that are not in the hands of the Returning Officer at the time of the close of the poll must not be counted. We must have no more phoney affidavits and no more arguments like those we had in connection with the Millicent poll held on March 2.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Were there any phoney ones in connection with that poll?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes, and at least one honourable member of this Council did not get out of it too well: it was not the Chief Secretary. The affidavits I am thinking of were worth little. One only had to listen to the proceedings of the Court of Disputed Returns to form an opinion regarding some of them.

I cannot understand, and neither can the public, how the Chaffey poll could have been declared when a parcel of 205 postal votes had been sent from one Returning Officer to another but had not turned up at the correct destination.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Would an alteration to the Electoral Act overcome this?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The Electoral Office did not get out of this with too much kudos. Maybe it is Parliament's fault because the staff of the Electoral Office is not paid enough to do the job properly. The Electoral

Office, however, must be told that when a parcel of postal votes is sent from one Returning Officer to another, the poll must not be declared until the parcel is properly dealt with. I realize that this did not affect the result of the Chaffey poll, and I am not blaming the Returning Officer for the Chaffey District, because it may not have been his fault. However, the public wants such irregularities prevented.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: These things have possibly gone on before, but have not come to the surface.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Perhaps I am to blame as much as anybody is. This is the third time since I entered Parliament in 1956 that this kind of incident has occurred, and it is three times too many. This kind of irregularity occurred in a by-election in the Frome District after the death of Mr. O'Halloran, and it also happened in Chaffey in 1962. Parliament must take the blame in the final analysis, because this kind of thing has occurred three times in 12 years, and it must be stopped.

Turning to the subject of water, I want to pay a sincere tribute to the members of the public, particularly those in the metropolitan area (because they were immediately affected), for their response to the Government's appeal last summer during the water shortage. We were indeed fortunate to pass through last summer without any water restrictions, and I am glad we were able to do this. It was done as a result of the co-operation of people in the metropolitan area and in the rest of the State, and I wish to express my thanks and those of the then Government.

Because the present winter has been so wet it seems that the reservoirs will be filled this year. I place the welfare of this State above Party politics: I shall not be miserable and say that it should have been dry this year so that the new Government would have to pay \$60,000 a week for pumping all round the clock. I am sure we all appreciate how fortunate the State is in having such an opening to the season, because there would have been terrible consequences for the city of Adelaide and for the State as a whole if we had had another dry year. Restrictions were imposed on the people of Victoria until the end of June, or perhaps early July; it was a terrible position, and we would have suffered similarly this year if the drought had continued any longer.

I want to pay a tribute to the *Advertiser* (it is not often I am able to do so) as a

result of the magnificent article published on Tuesday, May 28. I hope that every family in the State studied the article and understood it, because I do not think many people realize how seriously short of water we are in this State. This article was one of the best on water that I had ever read, for it put the position quite plainly to the people, few of whom realize the seriousness of the situation. Apparently the reporter was asking questions of the Director and Engineer-in-Chief (Mr. Beaney), for we see the following question:

If we fill the reservoirs to their capacity of 36,000,000,000 gallons, can we do without pumping Murray water next summer?

Mr. Beaney replied:

No, we are past the stage of the non-pumping summer, but the less we have to pump the more we save. Full pumping costs about \$36,000 a week. Reduced pumping now has cut this cost to about \$15,000, and this may be further reduced or even cut to nothing if the wet weather continues.

I understand that there is no pumping at the present time. This is important, and I think the more we speak about it and the more it is brought home to people the better off we will be. The article continues:

However, we would not go through a summer without pumping because it is the aim of the Engineering and Water Supply Department to carry a reserve of water through into the next winter.

I think the most important matter before the Government and the people of this State today is water conservation and supply. It is all very well for the Government of the day to publish information in the newspapers about what industries are coming here. However, be they multi-million dollar industries or small ones, they will not be able to operate if we do not have water for them. Even one of the Government's supporters in another place yesterday said that to think otherwise would be wishful thinking.

I have heard it said that Chowilla is the only answer. I want it to be understood that I am not entirely convinced about Chowilla, but if it is the best proposal then let us have it; on the other hand, if Chowilla is not proved by the experts to be the best thing or to be in the best place, let us have something else. If we get another dry period such as we have had in recent years, and it goes on for one year more, we shall not have enough water to supply the community.

Another article in yesterday's newspaper referred to a statement by an officer of the Engineering and Water Supply Department that on present indications any step towards

the desalination of seawater was premature and that we had enough water supply, as near as could be gauged, for the next 20 years. I think that statement is poppycock, and I do not accept it. Before the height of the Mount Bold reservoir wall was increased, I was told by no less an authority than the late Sir Malcolm McIntosh, then Minister in charge of the Engineering and Water Supply Department and a gentleman for whom I had the greatest respect and liking, that we had enough water for the city area until 1970. How far out was he! That department is telling us now that we have enough water for the next 20 years. I sincerely hope this officer is much nearer the mark than was the late Sir Malcolm McIntosh some 20 years ago.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Since the Mount Bold wall was raised another couple of reservoirs have been established.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes. This shows how wrong the department was on that occasion. I am not a pessimist: in fact, for most of my life I have been more of an optimist.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Talk like we have heard does not help us with Chowilla, does it?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Not at all. Being a South Australian first and an Australian second, I urge the Government, whatever may become of Chowilla and whatever industries may come here, to get down to the serious work of doing something to assure an adequate water supply for this State. I have my doubts about Chowilla, although I am not an authority on it. When I inspected the area with the late Mr. Frank Walsh before my Party took office, I saw a peg here and a peg there. However, I have heard enough to gather that the project was not examined properly in the first place. Perhaps something better is in store for us; I hope it is. Paragraph 19 of His Excellency's Speech states:

My Government is taking active steps to effect urgent improvements in prison accommodation in this State. As a first priority tenders are currently being called to construct a women's rehabilitation centre at Northfield. Planning is now proceeding to provide a new maximum security block at Northfield and investigations into a new remand centre are being undertaken.

I compliment the Chief Secretary on being able to get on so quickly with the first section before the Loan Estimates are introduced. Apparently he has had this guarantee from Cabinet. This matter was not so far advanced

as this when the present Government took office, although it was well on the way. I think the programme of work for the years to come is good. The first step (building a women's rehabilitation centre at Northfield) cannot be taken quickly enough, for this will help the unfortunate women who now have to be kept in the Adelaide Gaol. They will now have better accommodation, and it is necessary that they have better supervision and a better environment. Those unfortunate people who break the law will be better treated. Also, it would be better for men to be on their own at the Adelaide Gaol.

I hope that the Government has not lost sight of the need to proceed with the maximum security block at Yatala. This question worried me during my term as Chief Secretary to such an extent that I had to find some money (no small amount either) to provide a mini-maximum security centre at Yatala. I think it was expecting too much from the warders at Yatala to have all these people brought together and confined more or less in one area. It is a tragedy that in our community there are individuals whose only place, for their own safety and that of the warders and the community generally, is in a maximum security block of a prison and, unless we have such a block, one does not know what might happen. I hope the Chief Secretary will persist in the matter and ensure that the programme is continued. It is not easy to get one's Cabinet colleagues to approve such a scheme: no political reward is involved, and it costs much money to look after these people. One gets nothing back for one's efforts except, perhaps, some kudos. I was in Government long enough to realize that departmental officers, Treasury officers and one's Cabinet colleagues viewed matters differently from me, especially as a limited sum was available. If money can be spent on something from which there will be a political comeback, that project will always go ahead; the man who wants to do something from which there is no political comeback will miss out. I hope this does not happen to the present Chief Secretary in relation to the Prisons Department programme.

I conclude by referring to the following statement made by the Hon. Mr. Kemp yesterday:

I sincerely congratulate the Chief Secretary, the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Roads upon their appointment and upon the energy and devotion with which they have undertaken their very heavy duties, but I think it is meet that we sound a friendly

warning to them that, although they find their portfolios in such serious disarray, working themselves to death (as they appear to be doing) will not further the best interests of the State.

I give the lie direct to the Hon. Mr. Kemp for that statement: the departments administered by me, by my two colleagues in this place and by Ministers in another place were left in an efficient and up-to-date condition. Indeed, the Chief Secretary's Department (which dispenses all dockets) was left in exactly the same condition as I found it on taking office, and I have no complaints against my predecessor, as I said in this Chamber when I was Chief Secretary. I throw the lie back in the honourable member's teeth and challenge him or any honourable member to prove me wrong. I could say much more, but I will not. The honourable member's statement is what I have come to expect from such an uncouth and unethical member of this Chamber.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Midland): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Speech made by His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor in opening this session. I regret that soon after the opening His Excellency was indisposed and unable to carry out his duties for a short time. I believe he is now making excellent progress towards recovery, and I am sure it is the wish of all honourable members of this Council that that recovery will be expedited and that he will soon be back performing his accustomed duties as efficiently as he always does.

I join with previous speakers in congratulating the present Ministers on their appointments. In every case the appointment was wisely made, and I congratulate the Ministers on the way they have settled down to their responsibilities. At the same time, I pay a tribute to the Ministers of the previous Government in this Council. I found them always courteous, attentive and responsible, and I particularly appreciated the satisfactory way in which they vacated their Ministerial posts. In each instance they did all they could to ensure that their successors went into their positions as easily as possible and there was certainly no public criticism from them. This has earned them respect, and for this reason I pay a tribute to them.

I also pay a tribute to Sir Thomas Playford who, after so many years, is no longer a member of this Parliament. I think we shall never again see a Playford era in South Australia and all it meant to the development of this State. I particularly pay a

tribute to him for his assistance to me over so many years and, more particularly, for the stamp he has left on this State that will remain for many years to come. I regret that his services are now lost to South Australia, because there is in his mind a tremendous storehouse of wisdom and experience, and I hope that, at the appropriate time and as and when opportunities offer, a place will be found for him where adequate scope can be given to and use made of the talents which he still has and which, I hope, will remain his for many years.

I want to deal with several matters, the first of which is the responsibility to maintain law and order, not only in South Australia but also in many democratic countries throughout the world, because we are passing through an era when maintenance of law and order and, indeed, the institution of Parliament and the Legislature do not command the respect they should. True, in a democracy there are three heads of Government: the Executive, the Judiciary and the Legislature, each of which has its separate and important functions. Where democracy has broken down, it has done so because one or other of these heads of Government has failed to carry out its responsibilities. In some instances the judicature has been dispensed with and the Legislature has dealt with what really belongs to the sphere of the judiciary: the Legislature has determined whether a man should be free or placed in gaol. In those instances, the freedom of the individual disappears.

In other cases, the Executive has done away with and taken over the assumptions of Parliament. In such cases something in the nature of a dictatorship has been established. It is, therefore, important that we keep each of these separate functions apart, each doing its proper job. We in South Australia are fortunate that the whole of the judiciary has always been completely beyond reproach. Indeed, it is still the same. I do not think anyone fears that he will not receive complete impartiality of judgment and fairness before the judiciary. But there has been, I think, a falling-off in respect for the Legislature, not only in South Australia but also in other parts of Australia. There are a number of causes. One of them has been mentioned by the Hon. Mr. Shard this afternoon—the problems and difficulties that arose in connection with the recent election in South Australia. I agree with the honourable member that there

are loopholes in the present Electoral Act that must be remedied and there are matters relating to electoral boundaries and Parliamentary representation that are also in need of urgent attention.

There is no point or purpose at present in discussing who is responsible for the situation, whether one Party or the other has to share the majority of the blame for it, but I think we are all agreed that something must be done to put these matters in order. I for one will go along with the idea that the sooner this can be done the better, but there is a tendency because people are dissatisfied with these things to organize demonstrations and to express in what I consider to be an improper way their resentment that this position obtains. This modern idea of having demonstrations, not always orderly, about anything in society with which one disagrees causes me great concern. I do know there were demonstrations on these matters after the election of a new Government. Without entering into the controversy which is going on elsewhere, I believe it was not in the best interests of law and order in this State that a demonstration should have been arranged on the steps of Parliament House on the day of the opening of the new session.

It was not wise that such a demonstration should have been addressed by members of another place, because that inevitably leads to the possibility of events occurring which we would all regret, and in some respects those events did happen. But what did surprise me was that, although this demonstration was arranged and was addressed by two members of Parliament in another place on the front steps of Parliament House, one of those gentlemen who was addressing a meeting in the country during the election campaign and was interrupted, only temporarily, by the rather childish blowing of a trumpet should have thought it necessary to report it to the police and ask them for some action in connection with the matter. This was an unfortunate situation but I believe it is necessary that law and order be maintained and that there be a respect for law and order. I sincerely hope that this Parliament will make this clear to everybody so that we can go about our business without fear of interruption or being prevented from doing what we should.

There is a new Government, resulting in a change of administration, and every such change has its own particular emphasis. As far as I can see, the emphasis of the Labor

Government was upon several different matters: it emphasized industrial legislation and it brought into this Chamber many new matters of legislation which we had not seen here before and which received our consideration—which legislation, incidentally, is only on the Statute Book today because of the support of us, then the Opposition in this Chamber, so that whatever benefit was achieved by virtue of that legislation was achieved with the acceptance of the then Opposition.

Secondly, the Labor Government did emphasize much social legislation in many forms. Everybody knows what they were and I think it is true and fair to say that that legislation is working reasonably well in each instance. Again, it is important to note that it was passed only with the concurrence of both Parties in this Chamber. But, whilst emphasis was placed on these matters (I give credit for the emphasis placed on them) there were other unfortunate aspects of the administration which eventually resulted in the Labor Government's being defeated. Those results showed themselves in the economic sector. After all is said and done, the important thing for any Government is to see that the economics of the country are kept on a fairly even keel, but we found that under the Labor administration there was a very big drop in the number of migrants coming to this State.

The result is, first, that today many industries are short of skilled migrants where they are needed. Secondly, there has been a drop in the number of houses constructed. For instance, the Housing Trust record showed that 3,238 houses were constructed in 1966-67, but that number dropped to 2,500 in 1967-68, and during the whole of that period of administration no major industry of consequence came to this State. Any extensions or developments announced were purely in respect of existing industry. Indeed, some industries left the State during the Labor Government's term of office. It is also true to say there was a remarkable run-down in the finances of the State. All these things combined had an effect upon the people and the net result was that the Labor Government lost the Treasury benches. There is only one further comment on that, and that is that, fortunately or unfortunately, whichever way we look at it, the full and complete effect of the Labor Party's administration had not become apparent to everybody by the time of the election, and I think we shall suffer for some time to come the effects of its administration, because we

still have to restore the financial position of the State and reverse the situation so that we can attract more migrants to staff our industries. We still have to get the building industry going and we still have to restore confidence, which is most difficult.

The new Government, as far as I can see, has set about its proposals in a competent, businesslike and efficient manner. I commend it for what has been done. I think the move of the Premier in going overseas and interviewing people personally was excellent. We have yet to see what the results of that will be. I think the alteration made in the committee set up to attract new industries to South Australia and the appointment of Mr. Barker, a man of very considerable energy and experience, to his new position in connection with that committee was a good one. No matter how energetic and sincere the Government is in its efforts, it will still be difficult for South Australia to regain its former position in economic development in Australia.

If we look at the history of the last 25 years, we find that much of our development was related to mineral discoveries. There was the work done in connection with the Leigh Creek coalfield, which gave us the cheapest form of power we have had in this State, and it was a tremendous impetus to us. There was the work done under your administration, Mr. President, as Minister of Mines, in connection with Radium Hill and the establishment of the Radium Hill treatment plant at Port Pirie. A tremendous amount of work was done in connection with the discovery of iron ore in the Middleback Ranges, which had a great bearing on the development of Whyalla. And, of course, there was the work of which you, Mr. President, have personal knowledge and behind which you were a driving force: I refer to the discovery of natural gas. These things have been the base for the expansion of the South Australian economy.

It is important that we spend as much as possible on future attempts to discover more mineral wealth in this State. If we consider South Australia's history we find that mineral discoveries have pushed our economy ahead by leaps and bounds from time to time. Anyone who knows the history of the discovery of copper at Burra and later in the Moonta, Kadina and Wallaroo area will know the tremendous boost it provided to this State's economy. Consequently, I was a little disturbed to read that in 1967 the value of

minerals sold from this State was \$69,000,000, which was \$3,000,000 less than the figure for 1966.

I hope the present Minister of Mines will regard it as his first priority to see that we push ahead with mineral exploration, because new discoveries offer the best possibility for quick development of this State. Such development has occurred in Western Australia: the boom there can be attributed entirely to mineral discoveries, and if we had been fortunate enough to discover valuable mineral deposits in South Australia, such as offshore oil deposits, it would have helped us tremendously. I hope this will happen.

Regarding moves by the new Government to stimulate the economy, I wish to refer particularly to the proposal to increase to \$8,000 the amount that can be advanced for house building under the Advances for Homes Act. When we remember the decreased value of money, we realize how wise this move is, and I hope it will stimulate the building industry.

It is good to see that the Government is concentrating on the efficient management and control of Government departments and Government instrumentalities. I compliment particularly the Hon. Mr. Story on so quickly calling in an expert in connection with the problems that existed at the Metropolitan Abattoirs. I believe that, in a matter of weeks, a report was made available and discussed with the board of management, and that proper and efficient steps are being taken to ensure that the abattoirs operate efficiently.

The Government also faces the problem of restoring to Loan funds all moneys that should be spent on Loan works, which in themselves are creators of employment and assist the development of this State. These moneys were, under the previous Administration, to some degree diverted to meet Budget expenses. I do not expect that it will be possible to stop this policy completely in the current year but I sincerely hope that, as far as possible, we use moneys that are required for Loan works for this purpose, not for the day-to-day costs of running the Government.

Road transport policy is still of great interest to many people and over the last three or four years we have seen considerable changes in this policy and considerable changes in the policy of the Opposition in connection with road transport. We have had the benefit of a report of the Royal Commission on State Transport Services. Yorke Peninsula has benefited from a road passenger service for many years; it has been very efficient from every

angle and it has given to the people a service that I do not think the railways could have supplied. The other day I was talking to the proprietor of the service and he told me that it is 23 years since there was any accident of consequence on his service. It is run without cost to the Government; indeed, the proprietor pays to the Government heavy registration fees for his vehicles and considerable fuel tax.

I suggest that country areas that lose a rail passenger service could, with little inconvenience to anybody, have the benefit of the kind of service we have had on Yorke Peninsula for so many years; this applies particularly to the Moonta, Kadina and Wallaroo area. I certainly believe that caution must be exercised in connection with some aspects; before a road passenger service is licensed, we must ensure that the operator has financial standing and considerable experience. It would be dangerous to grant a licence to a person purely as a result of the fares he proposes to charge. It is simple for anyone to buy a bus on a small deposit without realizing what is involved in efficiently operating a road passenger service.

I hope the Transport Control Board, which I presume will have the responsibility, will consider the operator's financial standing, experience and ability to run an efficient service. If this is done, I believe that the fares will be up to one-third less than present railway fares, but I hope the amount of the fare will not be the only consideration. We must not be too cheese-paring in our attitude to the fares, but we must concentrate on a basis that will enable the proprietor to operate efficiently. It is important that the vehicles be of a high standard and that they be kept in excellent order.

The question will arise whether the vehicle should be air-conditioned. I understand that seven additional horsepower is required to operate an air-conditioning unit that will adequately heat a 45-passenger bus in the winter and adequately cool it in the summer. This involves additional cost, so I think the Transport Control Board must consider whether to insist on refrigerated air-conditioning. Personally, I would be happy to pay a slightly increased fare in order to benefit from air-conditioning. I point out that the railcars on the Kadina service are air-conditioned.

Proper depots, both in the city and at country stops, should be provided so that passengers and parcels can be sheltered. On some services at present passengers alight

more or less on to the open street without any protection from the heat or the cold. I do not know whether it would be feasible, but I suggest that existing railway facilities could possibly be used to provide such shelter. I am anxious that this policy should be pushed ahead as quickly as possible. I think that once we get some of these things established and operating efficiently it will be an answer to those who are critical of the situation at the present time.

I think reference has been made to the altered policy of the Government regarding the freeholding of land. I commend the Government for the decision it has made in this connection. There is no doubt that the policy of the previous Government in preventing the freeholding of land has had an adverse effect on those people who are unfortunate enough to hold leasehold land at present. I had occasion a few days ago to ring a reputable institution in South Australia which has trust moneys for investment. I said I had a person who was interested in borrowing some thousands of dollars on first mortgage security of land and that it was a very good proposition. Before I could get any further with my question to this lending institution, the person to whom I was speaking interrupted and said, "Mr. Rowe, is the land leasehold or freehold?" Fortunately, I was able to say it was freehold land. Although I did not pursue the matter further, I rather gathered that this institution is not at this point of time lending money on leasehold land.

This is a most unfortunate affair, and it will have some serious effect. Consequently, I congratulate the Government on its policy of allowing people to freehold land because, as I see it, the development taking place on so many properties in the country in this State has taken place only because people know that they hold freehold title to the land and that it will be theirs and those who are to succeed them for generations to come. Because they have that security of tenure, they treat the land as it ought to be treated and put up improvements which are substantial and which will remain for generations. However, immediately we interfere with this freehold tenure, and immediately we cast some doubt on the possibility of a man and his family after him being able to retain the land, he loses interest in getting the best out of the land and protecting it for the future.

I was very pleased to see that South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited intends to increase its storage capacity at Giles

Point and at Wallaroo. I think that, with the possibility of a good season, there will be fairly considerable quantities of wheat and barley available for delivery to these points during this coming year. We have had some unfortunate experiences of farmers being held up for hours at these delivery points. Therefore, this additional accommodation, if not for this coming season then certainly for future seasons, is well chosen and will serve an excellent purpose.

As everyone knows, 12 years ago, when this scheme was first commenced, the farmers voluntarily agreed to a toll of 6d. a bushel to enable the construction of the various bulk loading facilities and installations to be financed. The arrangement was that the tolls would be paid over a period of 12 years and that at the end of that period they would be repaid—one-twelfth each year. The time has now come when the first cheques have gone back to the farmers concerned for payment of portion of their tolls. This has been a remarkable achievement on the part of the co-operative. Two features which appeal to me are that the tolls are repayable in a year when farmers can find good use for the money and, secondly, these tolls, which were a capital deduction at the time they were made, are therefore non-taxable in the hands of the recipients at this particular time.

I have been in touch with the co-operative, and it does appear that over the period of 12 years some farmers have died and some have moved from the district in which they resided; and in other instances their addresses have changed. The co-operative is holding certain tolls at present which it should repay, but it is unable to find some of these farmers. Therefore, I appeal to any farmer who may have moved from his original address, and who is entitled to payment of tolls, to get in touch with the co-operative so that he can get his entitlement.

I now refer to the problem that exists at the Maitland Hospital. The hospital authorities have to provide hospitalization for Aborigines from the Point Pearce Mission. It appears that these Aborigines do not always pay their bills at the hospital, and the amount which is now standing in the hospital's books as being debts due by these people is not an inconsiderable figure. I hope that something can be done to assist the hospital in this regard. I realize that the answer to it may not be a grant from the Hospitals Department, because once one Aboriginal is advised that his account has been paid by the Hospitals Department

it will not take long for the rest of the people in the area to decide that the same thing can happen to them. I think every possible effort should be made to see that these people pay their accounts. As a practical suggestion, I would like to see the question taken up of requiring these people to take out insurance cover with one of the mutual hospital associations. If this could be arranged by deduction from their wages, or deduction from payments that are made to these people through the Aborigines Department, then they would be adequately covered and this problem would not arise. It seems to me that this is prudent. Although there may be difficulties, I hope that this scheme can be implemented. I raised this point on a deputation to the previous Minister of Aboriginal Affairs (Hon. R. R. Loveday), who looked into the matter with some degree of success. Although there are still problems, I consider that with a little effort these could be ironed out. At present these debts are an embarrassment to the Maitland Hospital.

I attended with a deputation to the present Minister of Roads (Hon. C. M. Hill), and we were received very courteously, regarding the proposal to bituminize the road from Moonta to Agery. This is a road which 30 years ago was on the schedule to be bituminized. Although traffic loadings on various roads on Yorke Peninsula have altered since then, there is still a demand for some work to be done on this road. I know that the Minister is looking at the situation and that he is trying to find a solution for it. I can say that there is no dissension among the people concerned over this matter; we are not in the position that we are in regarding a festival hall, where nobody seems to know where it should go: in this particular case there is complete unanimity. My experience as a Minister was that where there was complete unanimity it was fairly safe to go ahead, and to leave to their own devices the people who could not make up their minds.

I also took a deputation to the Treasurer regarding the problem that exists in respect of the imposition of land tax in the Virginia area. In some places in that area there is intensive cultivation of vegetable crops and market gardening, and water is available to enable this activity to be undertaken. In other areas there is not this intensive cultivation, nor is it possible now to get a water supply for these areas. The result has been that there is an unfair imposition of land tax on people who are still using their land for

open farming and grazing purposes. The Treasurer looked into this matter, and because he considered there was a case which should be answered he is giving it his consideration. I hope he can come up with a satisfactory solution.

I should now like to refer to one or two matters concerning town planning and the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study report, which should be available soon. I also wish to say something regarding one or two problems that I think will arise when this M.A.T.S. report is presented. In theory town planning is very good but, I feel, it will create problems for some people when it is implemented. I shall be very surprised if, when we find out where the freeways are to be and where the new roads are to be made, some industry is not seriously affected. It may mean that portion of the land occupied by an industry will have to be vacated and the operation carried on on the balance of the land. In other instances it may mean that the industry will have to move to a new area, which will, of course, create considerable disruption to the earning capacity of the industry in the meantime. It will also have a serious effect on the employees of the industry because in some instances industries have been operating in a particular area for 50 or 60 years and employees have bought their homes nearby so that they can get to work without too much trouble and expense. They have, in fact, become part and parcel of the industry in a kind of family association. If any of these industries have to move to a new area these employees will find themselves isolated from their place of work; they will not want to move to a new area and they may find difficulty in finding new employment in the area concerned. I raise these matters because these things will have to be considered seriously when the implementation of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study report is considered.

I congratulate the Hon. Mr. Kemp on the speech he made yesterday and, indeed, I approve and support everything he said. In that connection, I received a letter from a body known as the South Australian Council for Civil Liberties, asking certain questions in respect of which they required answers. On July 18 I sent its secretary the following reply:

I acknowledge your letter of June 27 last. I note your statement that the Council for Civil Liberties is a non-Party organization, Australia wide in its affiliations but with autonomous groups in each of the States. In view

of the above statement I shall be pleased if you will let me have the following information:

- (1) Details of the political affiliations (past and present) of the officers of your Association and of the members of its Committee;
- (2) I understand that some years ago a Mrs. Jessie Street was a principal figure of the Council for Civil Liberties as it was then constituted. Is the present South Australian Council for Civil Liberties the same Association;
- (3) With regard to paragraph 2 of your letter—

As far as I can remember, this related to the question of one vote one value—

would you please let me know whether your Council believes that the number of Senators elected to the Senate from each State should be in accordance with the population figures of the respective States or whether it should be on a basis of 10 Senators for each State as at the present time.

If you will let me know where your Committee stands in relation to the above principles I shall be pleased to consider further your letter.

I have not received a reply to that letter. Apparently the gentleman concerned has been busy making statements to the press on other matters. The position has arisen today (and most members of Parliament experience this) that we receive letters from all sorts of people asking us all kinds of questions and, quite frequently, the people who ask us these things do not state what is their policy or who they are, and they do not make it clear what interests they represent. For these reasons I now want to know who is asking the questions or who is my accuser before I reply. I think that is fair and reasonable, and I hope that such information will be forthcoming in due course because, after all, one is entitled to know the *bona fides* of the people with whom one is corresponding before one gives firm answers to questions.

As I see these numerous organizations cropping up with various names—some lasting for only a few weeks, others for only a few months, and others not even becoming of any consequence—I feel that my actions in this matter are justified. I have pleasure in supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): I, too, support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and in doing so congratulate the mover and seconder on their fine contributions to the debate. Some of the matters raised by those two gentlemen were indeed

timely and I fully support what they said. I congratulate His Excellency, the Lieutenant-Governor, on his tenth opening of a Parliamentary session and I join with other members in expressing pleasure at his quick recovery from his recent illness. I also express sympathy to the families of former members of Parliament, some of whom were known to me, whereas others were members before my time, but I have no doubt that in their own way they made a conspicuous contribution to the welfare of this State.

I wish to deal briefly with one or two matters that have been recorded in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech at the opening of Parliament, the first of which is dealt with in paragraph 4, namely, the importance of the revision of electoral boundaries in this State. There has been much misinformed criticism on this matter recently, but I commend the Liberal and Country Party for having a definite policy that has stood since the election which, of course, is quite in contrast to the attitude of the Labor Party which, to date, has had three policies. Indeed, it is not too sure whether the present one is acceptable.

I also join with my colleague, the Hon. Mr. Rowe, in congratulating the Premier on taking his overseas trip in an endeavour to promote industrial development in this State. An overseas visit by the Premier of this State was long overdue and it is unfortunate that during the period the Labor Party was in office the former Premier (Hon. Mr. Dunstan) did not make an overseas trip in search of industries for South Australia. He did, however, do some work in setting up a committee to investigate the needs of industry in this State; but when overseas organizations are contemplating setting up operations in a country such as ours they want to speak to a person in authority, and that person would be the Premier. It is, therefore, unfortunate that we have had to wait so long for one of our Premiers to go overseas on these matters.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You criticized the Labor Government when Mr. Walsh went overseas.

The Hon. L. R. HART: This is why there has been a dearth of industry entering South Australia recently. Labor Leaders are reluctant to leave this State because they are afraid that during their absence their leadership might be undermined.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: To go all that way to buy a Dutch doll! The Premier could have bought it here.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Could you tell us what is going on at present?

The Hon. L. R. HART: I believe I have given the reason why Labor Premiers did not go overseas in search of industries. Paragraph 6 of the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech deals with the Department of Agriculture, and I am pleased to see that Roseworthy College has instituted a fourth-year course. It is a fourth-year or a post-diploma course and it is instituted for the training of the officers for the extension services and for industry. I understand people who take this fourth-year course will also be qualified to act as farm advisers.

There has been a great need to train people in this sphere. I have referred to the need for a course of this type previously in this Chamber, when I have suggested there should be a post-graduate diploma course, and possibly this would be the ultimate. However, in the meantime we do understand that the fourth-year course at Roseworthy will give suitable training for people who wish to follow the occupation of farm adviser. There is a great need for these people today in South Australia; there is a great demand for them not only in South Australia but also in all States. The facilities available for training them have been inadequate and not uniform. Paragraph 6 of His Excellency's Speech states:

My Ministers will take all possible steps to promote the agricultural development of the State.

Under that heading, I should like to refer briefly to the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs. This is a public utility and, as such, is what is generally known as a common killer or a utility that is expected to kill all the stock offered to it by private operators, who over the years have accepted the advantages of this facility so they should be prepared to make some contribution towards its financial stability. However, at present, the abattoirs are losing a considerable sum of money each year. The present situation is largely caused because of the relatively dry season we have been passing through. It places the abattoirs at a considerable disadvantage. There are reports that say the Government should subsidize the Metropolitan Abattoirs. I shall not discuss the merits or otherwise of this idea but, before the Government subsidizes them, there should be a thorough investigation into what other economies could be made in this utility.

I congratulate the present Minister of Agriculture on the appointment of Mr. David McCall, the manager and accountant of the Victorian Inland Meat Authority, who made an investigation into the abattoirs and reported to the Minister. I understand further that that report is now in the hands of the Government and that it is acting upon it. So, at the present juncture the situation may be rather delicate so I do not wish to pursue it at any length. However, there is much concern among producers at present about some of the recent levies instituted by the Abattoirs Board. These will have a serious effect upon the producers in this State because I understand that the charges for inspecting meat coming into the metropolitan area in some cases have risen many thousands per cent. I realize that the charges for meat coming into this area should cover inspection costs. We cannot expect the charges for that meat brought into this area (which is brought in only when there is a need) to cover all the financial losses of this utility, so I trust that the Abattoirs Board will recognize the need for economies and for most, if not all, of the recommendations of the investigator to be put into operation. At this stage I will not pursue the matter further but I raise the point because it is timely and is one that is causing not only the producers in this State but also the people handling the meat much anxiety.

Paragraph 10 of the Speech deals with the development of Crown lands and pastoral areas, and also South-Eastern drainage. Not being a South-Eastern person, perhaps I should not be entering into this field, but I have taken much interest in the South-East for many years and have been concerned with drainage problems there. I suggest we should proceed with this drainage cautiously. I have read reports of the Land Settlement Committee taking evidence in the South-East recently where, almost without exception, the landowners were against further intensive drainage. Of course, many years ago the properties there needed some drainage but the development of modern pastures has helped to absorb much of the water. Also, some of the drains have been too deep and have tapped the underground springs; consequently, there has been continual drainage of the area, much to the detriment of the pastures there.

It must be recognized that in parts of the South-East it is necessary that some of the land be under water for some months of the

year to obtain the best results from the pastures. We in the North are accustomed to having some of our land out of operation for a month or two of the year because of the dry conditions. The situation in the South-East is somewhat similar but reversed: the land is out of operation for some months of the year because of excessive wetness. During the summer period it has green pastures, which are of great benefit.

According to paragraph 38 of the Speech a number of items are to be brought forward by the present Government for amendment and adoption. Among these is one dealing with wheat stabilization. At present it is a matter of negotiation between the Australian Wheatgrowers Federation, the Australian Wheat Board and the Government. The wheat stabilization plan is one that comes up for ratification every five years. The current plan has just reached the end of its five-year period and it is necessary to renew it. That is why this item is in His Excellency's Speech. I wish to deal, perhaps at some length, with the need for the establishment of an all-States barley marketing board and a stabilization plan on lines similar to that of the Australian Wheat Board. The present situation in barley marketing is that barley is grown in all the States and Government marketing boards are in operation in four out of the six of them. The Australian Barley Board operates in Victoria and South Australia. The other two are the Queensland Barley Marketing Board and the Western Australian Barley Marketing Board.

These boards account for practically all of the exports of barley. Tasmanian and New South Wales barley is marketed through private channels and practically all of it is sold within Australia. The operations of the marketing boards are handicapped by section 92 of the Constitution. It would appear that Victorian and Queensland growers in particular take advantage of this constitutional right. The situation that confronts the present State marketing boards is extremely complex, largely because of section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution. Not only does over-the-border trading involve trading in barley that is illegal in respect of State legislation, but additionally it is proving to be a most serious handicap to the home consumption marketing complex.

South Australia and Victoria combine to create the Australian Barley Board, South Australia being the principal barley-producing

State in the Commonwealth. Although South Australia and Victoria have each passed legislation providing for the Australian Barley Board to operate in the interests of their barleygrowers, the board's power is limited. For instance, it is impossible for the board to hold maltsters or merchants to an agreement to purchase their supplies through the board. Even in Melbourne, where 80 per cent of Aus-

tralia's malting barley is processed, there is nothing to stop maltsters purchasing their requirements over the border in South Australia, New South Wales or Queensland, and this is being done at present. I ask leave to have incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it a table showing the quantities of barley delivered to boards in the various States.

Leave granted.

BOARD'S SHARE IN BARLEY PRODUCTION

Year	1 Production 000 bushels	2 Delivery to the three boards 000 bushels	2 as percentage of 1
<i>Australia—</i>			
1960-61	67,970	52,929	78
1961-62	41,504	26,873	65
1962-63	39,579	23,282	59
1963-64	43,395	28,080	65
1964-65	49,315	31,482	64
1965-66	41,835	22,834	55
<i>South Australia—</i>			
1960-61	42,233	38,380	91
1961-62	21,292	17,226	81
1962-63	18,004	13,947	77
1963-64	24,337	20,360	84
1964-65	26,932	22,623	84
1965-66	18,514	13,296	72
<i>Victoria—</i>			
1960-61	7,719	6,245	81
1961-62	4,654	2,855	61
1962-63	5,469	3,248	59
1963-64	4,025	2,785	69
1964-65	4,334	2,842	66
1965-66	3,217	1,626	51
<i>Western Australia—</i>			
1960-61	8,496	6,965	82
1961-62	7,282	5,746	79
1962-63	6,056	4,697	78
1963-64	4,077	3,183	78
1964-65	3,701	2,691	73
1965-66	6,451	5,080	79
<i>Queensland—</i>			
1960-61	4,392	1,391	32
1961-62	3,532	1,046	30
1962-63	4,088	1,390	34
1963-64	5,191	1,752	34
1964-65	7,111	3,326	47
1965-66	9,137	2,832	31

The Hon. L. R. HART: This interesting table shows that an Australian average of 64 per cent of barley is marketed through the board; the South Australian figure is 81 per cent (the highest in the Commonwealth); Victoria, 64 per cent; Western Australia 78 per cent; and Queensland (which also has a marketing board) only 34 per cent. Section 92 can be largely overcome in the case of the Australian Wheat Board, because it is possible for it to cease supplying millers with

further supplies of wheat should they purchase outside the board. An all-States board (with a stabilization plan) could come to a similar agreement with barley users.

New South Wales does not have a barley board operating, yet it is the second largest barley producer in the Commonwealth. New South Wales barleygrowers are becoming concerned, because orderly marketing is breaking down in South Australia and Victoria, and because (although their barley is sold on the

open market) they are dependent on the yardstick provided in the price announced for the season by the Australian Barley Board.

Queensland operates a barley board, but not as effectively as it could do, when it is realized that more than half that State's production is sold outside its board. This State also largely depends on seasonal prices of barley as announced by the Australian Barley Board.

Western Australia has established a barley marketing board, which has functioned efficiently and well. The growers in that State, however, are alarmed at the fall in production over the last five years. Like all other States, Western Australia is convinced that the industry cannot go forward without stabilization. It must be emphasized that in Western Australia, although there is no influence from over-the-border trading of barley purchased outside the board, nevertheless production has fallen from 7,000,000 bushels to 1,500,000 bushels delivered to the Western

Australian board in 1964-65; this figure increased in 1965-66 to 5,000,000 bushels, because of a very good season.

Generally, the boards are vulnerable to fluctuations in domestic prices and, particularly, export prices. Where domestic prices for barley are pushed up, say, on account of drought, relative deliveries to the Queensland Barley Marketing Board and to the Australian Barley Board in Victoria fall markedly. Thus, the boards are influenced not only by normal seasonal fluctuations but also by relative price conditions.

Given that the boards have a cost structure with a meaningful overhead component, this makes for quite sharp fluctuations in the boards' operating costs expressed in per-bushel terms. As overheads tend to be pitched to cope with peak requirements, the situation spells considerable inefficiency. Additionally, the boards are relatively small and suffer from the disabilities associated with this scale of operations. These considerations come out clearly

COMPARISON: THE THREE BARLEY BOARDS AND THE WHEAT BOARD

I. Deliveries (million bushels).

	1962-3	1963-4	1964-5	1965-6
A.W.B.	285.7	307.8	346.5	234.4
A.B.B.	17.2	23.1	25.5	14.9
W.A.B.M.B.	4.7	3.2	2.7	5.1
Q.B.M.B.	1.4	1.8	3.3	2.8

II. Proportion of appropriate harvest handled (percentage).

	1962-3	1963-4	1964-5	1965-6
A.W.B.	93	94	94	90
A.B.B.	73	82	81	69
W.A.B.M.B.	78	78	73	79
Q.B.M.B.	34	34	47	31

III. Administrative expenses (cents a bushel).

	1962-3	1963-4	1964-5	1965-6
A.W.B.	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.6
A.B.B.	1.4	1.1	1.1	1.8
W.A.B.M.B.	1.0	1.2	1.4	1.1
Q.B.M.B.	3.0	2.8	3.3	3.4

in a table I have; I ask permission to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it. Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: This table shows the comparisons between the barley boards of the States and the Australian Wheat Board. The Australian Wheat Board, because of its scale of operations, is able to effect considerable savings; in fact, the cost a bushel of handling wheat through the Australian Wheat Board varies from 0.4c to 0.6c a bushel. The cost of handling barley through the Australian Barley Board varies from 1.1c to 1.8c a bushel. The Western Australian Barley Marketing Board, which is in a somewhat advantageous

position, has costs ranging from 1.0c to 1.4c a bushel. However, the Queensland Barley Marketing Board, which handles a relatively small amount of barley, has costs ranging from 2.8c to 3.4c a bushel.

The administration costs a bushel are very much higher in the case of each barley board than in the case of the Australian Wheat Board. The Queensland Barley Marketing Board is by far the worst in this regard, and the Australian Barley Board has the second highest costs. Despite its smaller size, the Western Australian Barley Marketing Board manages to record smaller administration costs a bushel; however, it has certain

advantages. Whilst admittedly the Western Australian Barley Marketing Board is ostensibly efficient, its administration costs a bushel in no way contradict the contention that there are economies of scale in the administration of grain operations. The Western Australian board, in fact, contracts out its managerial and selling functions to the Grain Pool of Western Australia, which operates, in addition to barley, a linseed pool and an oats pool, as well as acting for the Australian Wheat Board. Furthermore, it may be that conducting a multi-grain operation is inherently more economic than conducting a single-grain operation. This may be confirmed by the fact that the Canadian Wheat Board, which conducts a multi-grain operation, has much lower administration costs a bushel than the Australian Wheat Board; it also, of course, handles much more grain.

Two of the three barley boards experience tangible difficulties in securing deliveries that equal farm disposal. The practice of the barley boards is to pay the first advance at the time of delivery. As realizations from sales take place, further payments are made, and the final advance typically takes place some 18 months after delivery.

The boards are finding it difficult to pay sufficient of the higher first advance to the merchants. The level of additional advances is determined by the credit facilities offered to the board. The board's ability to pay a higher first advance is limited because of its inability to obtain credit facilities. This problem would be ironed out if there was a statutory all-States marketing board. The problem of competition with the merchants in regard to initial payments is a very real one indeed. The merchant is able, if he can purchase the barley, to pay the full price of the barley in the initial payment, whereas the board is limited by its credit facilities and can make only the first payment, which is often only three-quarters (or perhaps slightly more) of the full price eventually obtained. This, of course, is causing much over-the-border trading, and this is detrimental to the marketing of barley in all States of the Commonwealth.

In their domestic marketing the boards are, for practical purposes, not in competition with each other. Each has its own geographic market. Their main competitors tend to be the merchants. But again the problem is confined to the East Coast, as Western Australia, because of its isolation, is not affected here to any great degree. In export marketing, how-

ever, the boards tend to duplicate each other's efforts. Their selling and chartering operations are unco-ordinated, and there is no doubt overlapping and disorganization.

The Australian Barley Board sells in Europe through four merchant houses, which work on a commission basis. Chartering of vessels for c.i.f. cargoes is done concurrently with the seller, and in selling to other markets, say the Far East, the Australian Barley Board negotiates directly with the importer concerned, often an importing monopoly as in Japan and China. It will be noted that the Australian Barley Board often deals with the same buyers as the other barley boards and the Australian Wheat Board deal with.

The Western Australian Barley Marketing Board sells in Europe through the grain pool of Western Australia, whose subsidiary operates directly on the Baltic Exchange. Chartering for c.i.f. cargoes takes place jointly with the selling, and is made by the same subsidiary. The grain pool may operate through a chartering broker in Australia as well, and from time to time it undertakes sales missions overseas.

The Queensland Barley Marketing Board does not co-operate with this federation, and direct information regarding its chartering and selling activities is not available. It is understood that the board operates independently of the other two boards and that it handles relatively insignificant export tonnages.

Naturally, the unco-ordinated activities of these three boards, with the accompanying duplication of effort and expenses, means that the marketing activities tend to be more costly. Competition between the boards in overseas markets may result also in an unduly depressed price. Also, competition in chartering would imply a higher expense on invisibles. It might also be noted that during one period of the year the barley boards compete with the Wheat Board for charters, thus putting up the price. While the extra cost resulting from this is difficult to pinpoint, a conservative estimate of \$30,000 a year has been made.

Thus it will be seen that we have a completely ludicrous situation of State boards fighting each other for overseas sales. An all-States barley board would therefore secure advantages over the present set-up. However, the creation of an Australian grain board, to combine wheat marketing with barley and perhaps other grains, is an interesting possibility that ought not to be overlooked.

The Australian Wheat Federation Barley Committee has given much thought to the most economical ways of handling Australia's principal grain crops, that is, wheat and barley. It also examined the grain pool's arrangement, which exists in Western Australia, with considerable interest. It considers that the principles involved could be embodied in combining administration and management on a Commonwealth basis. This could be done in two ways: either an Australian barley marketing board could be created with power to "farm out" routine administration, handling and management to the Australian Wheat Board, or, alternatively, a Commonwealth grains authority could be established.

The amortization of costs over a greater quantity of grain handled would be significant in comparing handling and administration costs between the Australian Barley Board and the Australian Wheat Board. The Australian Wheat Board's administrative costs in 1962-63 were 8.6c a bushel; in 1963-64, on a bigger crop, they were reduced to 7c a bushel; and in 1964-65, with an increased crop again, they were reduced to 6.1c a bushel. The Australian Barley Board's administration costs in 1962-63 were 12c a bushel; in 1963-64 they were down to 10.5c a bushel; and in 1964-65, on a smaller crop, they were up to 11.5c a bushel.

If we compare administration costs only of the three barley boards in Australia for 1962-63 and 1963-64 with those of the Australian Wheat Board, we can perhaps establish the point more clearly. During those two seasons the Australian Wheat Board handled 593,000,000 bushels, compared with 51,000,000 bushels of barley handled through the three State barley boards. Administration expenses of the Australian Wheat Board amounted to .443c a bushel, compared with 1.291c a bushel of the three barley boards. So once again we see scale of operations having a very large influence on overhead costs. This is a factor that cannot be ignored today, when the producer is constantly being told that he must reduce his costs.

I have stressed the advantages of and the need for an all-States barley marketing board. I now wish to present a case for a barley stabilization plan based on lines similar to those of the wheat stabilization plan, which has been of such benefit to the wheat-growing industry and to the gross national income of Australia. The barley industry has a potential and a future equal to few other

primary industries within Australia, due principally to the ready availability of markets, but despite this the industry is facing a crisis. The orderly marketing of barley is being seriously threatened by several factors outside the control of the several boards. Rising costs have adversely affected the barley crop for many years, and it is a credit to its efficiency that the industry has survived to this time with the other systems.

The same situation now applies with barley as applied to wheat a few years ago, inasmuch as unless some type of protection against rising costs is given the industry itself must stagnate. That was the situation facing the wheat industry before stabilization was granted. Barley production would be increased by stabilization, which, with a central marketing authority, would enable and encourage the grain-grower to utilize expensive farm machinery to far better effect. Likewise, the capital investment made by the various States in grain bulk handling facilities would be more fully utilized if the incentive were given to the barleygrower to remain and expand within the industry.

Obviously the principal reason for the reduction in barley acreages has been price, for it can be proved that over the years the barley-grower has subsidized export barley at considerable loss to himself. In the 10 years from 1955-56 to 1965-66, the gross national income to Australia from barley exports increased by about \$230,000,000. It can be seen, therefore, that investment by the Commonwealth Government in a cost of production guarantee on a percentage of exports would be little enough in view of the contribution that barley does and could make to the economic stability of Australia.

Japan is an eager buyer of Australian barley and, in addition to other Asian markets, our barley enjoys a ready market in Europe. However, because of our limited production and because barleygrowers do not have the incentive provided through a cost of production price to exploit these markets fully, potential markets worth many millions of dollars are being lost in respect to the gross national product. Australia's share of the Japanese market is 200,000 tons, yet Japanese imports from all sources amount to 600,000 tons annually. In addition, a stabilization plan would assist the export malting trade in a similar manner as the wheat stabilization plan has assisted the flour millers of Australia.

At present about 4,000,000 bushels of malted barley is being exported, and this potential could be increased.

If the present emphasis on wheat is further accentuated, marketing problems will increase and there will be a greater reliance on such markets as China—a reliance that carries internal political problems as well as commercial risks. On the other hand, a timely introduction of barley stabilization would swing the balance towards barley and, since this grain has a different marketing structure from that of wheat in both its prepared and unprepared forms, a greater spread of markets would obtain and, therefore, the overall risk would be reduced. However, it will be noted from this context that barley is used as stock fodder and for the manufacture of beer, spirits and other products whose markets are primarily in the wealthier countries. By way of contrast, wheat has its major prospects in the lesser developed countries.

Although an increase in barley production would not necessarily bring about a higher consumption rate of barley for malting purposes within Australia, nevertheless, with 10,000,000 to 12,000,000 bushels of barley being consumed by the malting industry annually, the local market is important. As pointed out earlier, almost 80 per cent of the malting of barley is done in Victoria. However, because of uneconomic returns, barley growing in that State has declined to such an extent that Victoria is now the lowest barley producer in the Commonwealth, its present production being between 1,500,000 and 2,000,000 bushels delivered to the board in an average season. This means that Victorian maltsters must pay considerable sums in freight to obtain sufficient supplies of malting barley from other States. However, through a guaranteed cost of production price, there is little doubt that Victorian barleygrowers would be encouraged to grow more barley, thus effecting a considerable saving in freight to Victorian maltsters.

Under the Barley Marketing Act in the marketing and disposing of barley the board must have regard to the reasonable requirements of persons requiring barley for use or consumption in South Australia and Victoria. This means that the board must withhold sufficient barley from export to meet these requirements, and in so doing it can be deprived of a remunerative export outlet. In the 1967-68 season the board withheld from export its entire crop of 7,750,000 bushels to

meet local requirements should the drought have persisted for an undue length of time. By this action the board denied its oversea clients their normal requirements, and forced them to seek supplies from other sources—a very unwise policy at any time. The drought having broken, the board is now able to export its surplus stocks. However, the previous remunerative market is no longer available, so these sales must be made at a lower price. A home consumption price based on a cost of production formula would help compensate for this disability. Of course, the Commonwealth Government would be involved in financing a stabilization plan, but it would have certain attractions in other directions.

Nitrogen-rich soil generally produces good wheat but not the best barley. The best malting barley is grown on poor, nitrogen-deficient soils. It is on this type of soil that much of today's malting barley is found. The recent introduction of the subsidy on nitrogenous fertilizers will, in this case, tilt the balance of advantage towards wheat on nitrogen-deficient soils, and this will help preserve the downward trend in relative barley acreage. The financing of this further shift away from barley will fall on consolidated revenue or the taxpayer. In other words, instead of the Commonwealth paying a subsidy on nitrogenous fertilizers to grow wheat in nitrogen-deficient soils it would perhaps be better if barley were grown on the soils that did not need the addition of nitrogen.

The introduction of barley stabilization, accompanied by the formation of a single marketing authority, could secure meaningful savings in selling and administration costs that would reflect back on the profitability of barley as compared with wheat. A renewed emphasis on barley would permit more barley-wheat rotation to take place, and such rotation has certain agronomic advantages.

What is proposed can be summed up in one sentence: that barley should obtain a stabilization scheme as nearly identical to that for wheat as is possible. This implies the setting up of a central marketing authority; the establishment of a cost of production guaranteed price; and a guaranteed price to apply to all domestic sales and the proportion of exports similar to that obtaining in the wheat scheme. The setting up of a central marketing authority would do for barley what the Wheat Board has achieved for wheat: the elimination of competitive marketing; the elimination of a situation wherein strong buyers can take advantage of a multiplicity of sellers competing

against each other; the realization of economics of scale in administration and marketing; and the enforcement of standards of grading, strict supervision and containment of weed and pest infestation, all of which are so valuable, especially in oversea selling.

A case exists for the setting up of an all-States marketing board and, as time goes by, I believe the States will realize this. I believe, therefore, that this would be of great benefit not only to South Australian barley-growers but also to all sections of the com-

munity, because barley growing is a big industry in this State. It is necessary that it be preserved. With those few remarks, I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.31 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, July 25, at 2.15 p.m.