

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, September 30, 1953.

The SPEAKER (Hon. Sir Robert Nicholls) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

### QUESTIONS.

#### ACCOMMODATION FOR DREDGING STAFF, PORT PIRIE.

Mr. DAVIS—The following letter from the secretary of the Port Adelaide branch of the the Australian Government Workers' Association has been handed to me:—

Have received information that the Harbors Board desire to work two shifts dredging at Port Pirie, but the department is unable to secure accommodation for approximately 40 employees. I have been informed that the Mines Department has a hostel at Port Pirie which is not used, therefore I consider that some arrangements could be made to accommodate the employees of the Harbors Board. At the present time the dredging operation is being worked by three shifts, but if accommodation is not secured for the employees at Port Pirie then one shift will have to be stood off because the allocation of money only allows for outports. It will mean that approximately 20 men will be stood down; a number of them are married. Trusting you will take this matter up with the appropriate authorities.

Can the Minister of Marine say whether it is true that the hostel at Port Pirie is not being used by the Mines Department, and, if it is true, will he ascertain from the Minister of Mines whether it could be made available for the men engaged in dredging at Port Pirie?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I will make the necessary inquiries.

#### ABATTOIRS AT TAILLEM BEND.

Mr. WHITE—Recently an agitation was started at Taillem Bend for the establishment of abattoirs in that town to kill for export, and as a result of a meeting a committee was formed to probe the question and push it. Could a copy of the evidence taken by the Freezing Works Committee at Taillem Bend in September, 1944, be made available to this local committee?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I see no reason why it should not be, and I will try to secure a copy for the honourable member.

#### DISPOSAL OF SEWAGE.

Mr. QUIRKE—I understand that some time in the future sewerage treatment works are to be substituted for the present farm disposal system. If this is so, has any consideration been given to using the sludge deposits of the

treatment plants as an activating medium for the composting of city garbage wastes, which at present are wastefully incinerated at the works in Halifax Street, Adelaide? Such a composting system would give a highly valuable organic fertilizer, which would command a good sale value and obviate the necessity for the objectionable incinerator in the city area. As a composting system requires a fair area of land it would be necessary to reserve some portions of the existing farm area at Islington for this purpose. Composting under proper methods has no undesirable features. Has the Government considered this matter, which is receiving so much attention overseas?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The replacement of the Sewage Farm by the proposed treatment plant will make available from the effluent many thousands of tons of valuable fertilizer each year. It does not take into consideration what the honourable member is now suggesting—the removal of the city rubbish destructor. The obligation to remove rubbish has never been a State undertaking, but one which comes under local government. However, I will examine the position to see what is involved in the question. The land as present occupied by the Sewage Farm will not be retained for any purpose of the type mentioned by the honourable member. One of the reasons for having the treatment works elsewhere is that the Sewage Farm is occupying land which has a high sale value for both industry and housing. Some of it will no doubt be sold to offset the cost of the treatment works to be established. It is not proposed to maintain the farm, as a large area of land has already been purchased for the treatment plant, and would be adequate for the purposes mentioned by the honourable member.

#### PURCHASE OF COAL BOARD PLANT.

Mr. DUNNAGE—I notice that the Joint Coal Board has some millions of pounds worth of coal-winning and other machinery available for disposal; also that Mr. Dridan, the Engineer-in-Chief, is being sent overseas to make inquiries about coal-winning plant. Has the Government considered purchasing plant from the Joint Coal Board? Could any of it be used at Leigh Creek, Radium Hill, or anywhere else in the State?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It is true that the Engineer-in-Chief is going abroad, but the reason was a request from the Commonwealth Government that his services be made available for an important conference of the International Labour Organization. Mr. Dridan

will be one of the employers' representatives on construction matters. We are at present embarking on an expansion in the production of Leigh Creek coal which will ultimately cost about £1,000,000 for additional plant. Two officers of the trust have already been abroad making detailed investigations, and have submitted a report on a type of plant more useful for this large project, involving the extraction of 40,000 tons of coal a week for use at the Port Augusta power station. The Electricity Trust is taking the opportunity of Mr. Dridan's visit overseas to get him to examine the report that the officers have made. We have not overlooked the possibility of purchasing some of the Joint Coal Board's plant. A detailed list of it has been supplied by the Commonwealth, and it had been examined, even before it was decided that Mr. Dridan could go abroad, by all our departments to see whether any of it was suitable for our purposes and whether it could be secured. Some of it might be suitable for use at Leigh Creek. Some of it would certainly be useful in other Government undertakings.

#### LOTTERIES AND COMMONWEALTH GRANT.

Mr. PATTINSON—I refer to a report in today's *Advertiser* about the introduction last night of the Tasmanian Budget, and in particular to the remarks of the Treasurer (Mr. Madden), who said:—

Under the Commonwealth Grants Commission's principles, the State was protected financially in the projected transfer of Tattersalls to Victoria and the Government felt justified in presenting a Budget based on the assumption that the revenue in question (£1½m.) would be received "from one source or another."

Arising out of that confident prediction of the Tasmanian Treasurer I ask the Treasurer what is the position in South Australia with regard to the compensation this State receives from the Commonwealth Grants Commission through our not having a lottery? What amount of compensation have we received in the past, and what can he confidently predict we shall receive in the future?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—On the figures the honourable member has quoted the compensation for South Australia should be more than £3,000,000, because our Budget is more than twice as large as Tasmania's. I will refer the honourable member's question to the chairman of the Grants Commission because he, of course, is the only person that would know precisely what compensation he would give us through our not having, or having lost a lottery. Seriously,

I cannot understand the statement the honourable member has mentioned. The Grants Commission works on the basis that it makes a grant to the claimant State. It is computed after taking into account the levels of taxation and expenditure in the claimant State compared with those in the non-claimant States. If we spend more money than the average of New South Wales, Queensland, and Victoria in our Budget the Commonwealth will not make it up, whether or not we have a lottery. If we spend less the Commonwealth would take that into account in connection with our taxation and they would offset it if our taxation were slightly lower. The sum total of our grant is assessed upon the level of our taxation and the cost of our administration services. The question of whether or not we conduct a lottery has no bearing upon the amount of the grant. However, I will refer the honourable member's question to the chairman of the Grants Commission with the request that the £3,000,000 be made available as soon as conveniently possible, this being at the moment an important matter as the Budget is being prepared for introduction to the House tomorrow.

#### CROCKER'S WELL URANIUM FIELD.

Mr. HEASLIP—I have noticed from the press that the United Kingdom desires more uranium and that Crocker's Well has been mentioned as a source of supply. Can the Premier say whether this deposit is likely to be developed?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—An aerial survey of the land adjacent to Radium Hill has shown a very large area in which a high number of anomalies occur. Probably I would not be incorrect in saying that it showed 200 anomalies in an area of about 50 square miles, in which lies Crocker's Well where a considerable amount of work has been done. The type of ore is very satisfactory for cheap treatment, and it would possibly be an open cut proposition. It has a good deal of interest from these two angles, but the work is not yet conclusive and it is not possible to say definitely that another mine of some importance will be established there. Close to Crocker's Well, within two miles of the original area, there are three additional deposits of the type found at Crocker's Well. This indicates at least the prospect of a major activity, but until a good deal of survey work and diamond drilling has been undertaken to get accurate information on quantities and qualities it is impossible to say whether or not a project could be developed. The sale of uranium does not directly

concern my Government, but the Commonwealth Government as the defence authority. I know of no negotiations concerning Crocker's Well at present, nor are they likely because inquiries have not yet reached the stage at which we shall know definitely that it is a project.

#### NURIOOTPA AND ANGASTON SEWERAGE.

Mr. TEUSNER—A considerable time ago I drew the attention of the Minister of Works to the sewerage requirements in the rapidly growing towns of Tanunda, Angaston, and Nuriootpa. I understand that a topographical and general survey was made of the district by departmental officers with a view to preparing a plan. Can the Minister say whether it is intended to prepare and present a plan to the district councils concerned, and, if so, what progress has been made in its preparation?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The standard practice is to first prepare the plan and submit it to the district councils concerned to see whether the limitation of rates as assessed by Parliament should apply, and if the councils agree that the rates are reasonable, and that the plan is justifiable and meets their requirements, the plan is then submitted to the Public Works Committee. Some works have already been approved, and many others are under investigation. Because every penny of Loan money allocated by Parliament has been spent each year, in accordance with the priority laid down by Parliament, it is not possible to embark on fresh schemes unless we discontinue some already under progress or start new ventures ahead of those already approved. The position is that the surveys will be completed at the earliest possible date. A scheme will be submitted for consideration and endorsement by the councils concerned, and then it will be submitted to the Public Works Committee as a preliminary to having money appropriated by Parliament.

Mr. Teusner—Is any progress being made?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Yes. More progress has been made than we have money available. It is one thing to have plans prepared and another for Parliament to find ways and means of carrying them out.

#### AGRICULTURAL INFORMATION FROM ENGLAND.

Mr. BROOKMAN—Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on September 1 about arrangements being made for quarterly letters on agricultural development in England to be

sent to the Department of Agriculture, and either published in the *Journal of Agriculture* or released to the press?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The matter was referred to the Department of Agriculture but I have not yet seen a report as to the action to be taken. It is the desire of the Government to meet in some form the honourable member's suggestion.

#### MORGAN-WHYALLA PIPELINE.

Mr. HAWKER—In recent years there have been several extensions from the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline, and applications and pending applications for further extensions. Can the Minister of Works say whether the pipeline is capable of supplying big extensions, such as supplies to Caltowie, Jamestown, Woomera, and Clare, and whether it could take additional extensions where water is required in country areas?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I think that might be regarded as an academic question. The quantity of water required will depend on the requirements of the people, and until that is ascertained I cannot answer the question. Up to the present the pipeline has not been overloaded. It has always been the viewpoint of the Government that as development extends we shall need a duplication of the line, not necessarily along the present route. As I have said before, plans are very much ahead of the money Parliament can make available to carry them out. There is a plan to have an alternative route to take more water, using to a large degree some of the present pumping stations.

#### AMENITIES IN FOOTHILLS AREAS.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—Following on the marked trend of people to build in the foothills areas, can the Minister of Works say whether his department has taken into account the water and sewerage needs there on a long term basis?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I would say yes, but I am afraid that would not answer all the requirements of the case. If people build homes beyond the point to which facilities extend they do so knowing that in many cases it must be years before such facilities can be extended to them. In most cases such homes are built beyond the farthest point to which electric light, gas, roads, and other services extend. In many cases that land is bought cheap because of the absence of such facilities, yet immediately the owners ask the public to provide the funds to give the land a value for which they did not pay.

## ROYAL VISIT.

Mr. WHITE—I understand that people from an area for miles around Adelaide are expecting to see the Royal progress through the city and that the committee which is saddled with the responsibility of arranging the Royal progress has allocated certain portions of the route for members of certain public bodies. Members of councils, the elected representatives of a vast number of people, should share in such allocation. Can the Premier say whether arrangements have been made for the allocation of a portion of the route for council members, their wives and families?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will look into that matter and let the honourable member have a reply in due course.

## OPENING OF PARLIAMENT BY THE QUEEN.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following report of the Standing Orders Committee dealing with the new Standing Order No. 35A in connection with the opening of Parliament by Her Majesty the Queen next year:—

The Standing Orders Committee met to consider what amendments (if any) to the House of Assembly Standing Orders would be necessary to enable Her Majesty the Queen to open the South Australian Parliament on March 23, 1954. As a result of its deliberations, your committee has the honour to recommend that the following new Standing Order No. 35A be agreed to:—

## Parliament Opened by Sovereign.

35A. When the reasons for calling Parliament together are to be announced by the Sovereign in person:—

- (a) The Speaker and the House may attend the place appointed for the reading of the Sovereign's Speech without awaiting or receiving any message from the Governor;
- (b) Standing Orders Nos. 38, 39, 40, 41, 43 and 44 shall apply as if every reference therein to the Governor's Speech were a reference to the Speech of the Sovereign;
- (c) Standing Order No. 40 shall apply as if the expression, "the Sovereign" were substituted for the expressions "the Governor" and "His Excellency";
- (d) Subject to the above paragraphs, the procedure shall be the same as when the reasons for calling Parliament together are announced by the Governor.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I move—

That the report of the Standing Orders Committee be adopted.

I think every member will approve of the new Standing Order. I understand the Leader of

the Opposition has personally examined it. Its purpose is to allow Her Majesty to open our Parliament on the occasion of her visit. I am sure it gives every member the greatest satisfaction to think that Parliament will be opened by Her Majesty. We have not previously had the opportunity of having Parliament opened by a reigning Monarch, and the new Standing Order is purely for that purpose.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—I second the motion. As a member of the Standing Orders Committee I have had the opportunity of perusing the new Standing Order, with which I entirely agree. It will be a singular honour and privilege to have Parliament opened by Her Majesty. The new Standing Order is necessary to enable that to be done without there being difficulty in regard to the ordinary formalities.

Motion carried.

## BUILDING CONTROL BILL.

Second reading.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Goodwood)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill provides for the regulation of the use of certain building materials and for the control of the demolition of dwellinghouses. Clause 4 provides that, if the Minister is satisfied that by reason of fire, storm or tempest or similar cause any dwellinghouse has been damaged and that its repair is urgent, he may direct that the seller of the building materials necessary to effect its repair shall supply those materials for that purpose. At present a person would find it almost impossible to obtain galvanized iron to effect such repairs, although no restriction is placed on its use by any person fortunate enough to obtain supplies. I do not wish to impose any rigid control, but merely to see that a person may repair, say, the roof of his home, which surely is more important than the repair of any fence. Under the Bill the Minister would be able to instruct the suppliers to supply galvanized iron in the emergencies mentioned in clause 4. Clause 5 gives the Minister power to purchase and dispose of building materials. Clauses 4 and 5 will safeguard the interests of people whose homes have suffered sudden damage.

Clause 6 prohibits, except under permit, the demolition of dwellinghouses. A number of homes are being demolished in the city of Adelaide to make way for factories, but under the old Building Materials Act Ministerial approval had to be obtained before this could

be done. This clause makes it obligatory on a person wishing to demolish a dwellinghouse to seek the approval of the Minister in charge of housing, who at present is the Premier. Members have been told that Mr. Pollnitz, formerly Director of Building Materials, still has certain responsibilities in connection with approval for the demolition of homes. Although the Housing Trust is recognized as the housing authority in this State and may choose its tenants, bearing in mind the hardship and status of applicants, a number of people, unfortunately, are today living in houses which normally would not be considered fit for human habitation. The trust, with its right of selection of tenants, should not be prepared to offer accommodation to some of these people, so it is not right to say that there is full provision for it to house the people. The Bill provides that prior to the demolition of any home a permit shall be obtained from the Minister in charge. If I asked that those who required materials to repair their homes, which had been damaged due to the causes I have mentioned, should have immediate preference, the Government would probably say that that was impracticable, because so many applications would be received for demolition not only in Adelaide, but in the suburbs, that the trust would be called upon to provide homes for people who are already adequately housed.

The Bill would not have been necessary had the Government not released control over building materials. The Building Materials Act has played an important part in housing the people, but further provision must be made in the direction I have indicated. It might be suggested that imported corrugated galvanized iron is suitable for house repairs, but it cannot be used in conjunction with Australian iron because of the difference in size of the flutes. This even applies to corrugated iron imported from Japan. If a person desired to build, I know of no firm which could meet his requirements for galvanized iron, cement, burned red bricks, or terracotta tiles. He would have to be placed on the long waiting list, and it would be a long time before he would get a home. I am anxious that private people should continue to have the opportunity to build their own home. No-one would condemn such initiative. I do not specify any particular building materials in the Bill. Owing to the foreshore storm earlier in the year the walls and chimneys of some homes were damaged, and without the control suggested in the Bill people will have no guarantee that their home can be repaired with similar materials. It might be

suggested that coloured cement bricks would meet the position if burned red bricks were not available, but such repairs would be an eye-sore. Many houses have not been completed, although permits were obtained after waiting some time for them. The permit system went overboard overnight, and many who obtained permits have not yet been fully supplied with the materials they ordered.

Mr. Lawn—That is the Government's fault.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I do not know whose fault it is, but it is certainly not the Opposition's, because we are not in office. I realize it would be difficult to create a reserve supply of any commodity. It would not be fair to say there should be a certain amount of every type of material in the various stores, but there should be sufficient so that in the event of an emergency the Premier would have power to guarantee a supply to those needing it to build or repair properties.

Mr. Riches—What is the point in limiting the operation of this legislation to 12 months?

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I stipulated that because I had hoped the company operating at Port Kembla would allow shipping other than its own to use the port so that a supply of the necessary materials, particularly iron and steel, could be sent to this State to relieve our shortages. I believe an embargo has been placed on the use of that port. Of course, materials could be shipped from Sydney, but that would entail costly land transport from Port Kembla. I remind the House that the Housing Trust is not in a position to make alternative accommodation available to people affected by the demolition of their homes. Consequently, I ask the Government to sympathetically consider the Bill with a view to doing justice to people affected by the demolition of homes or by shortages of materials.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ESTABLISHMENT OF STEEL WORKS NEAR WHYALLA.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Riches:—

That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the desirability of establishing a steel works in the vicinity of Whyalla and to report to Parliament on steps to be taken to implement recommendations made by the Director of Mines on such an undertaking.

(Continued from September 23. Page 768.)

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh)—I support the motion, and draw attention to the wording, for I believe from the remarks of one member that he completely misunderstood it. Three

excellent debaters have spoken. The member for Eyre made a valuable contribution, although I do not agree with his views. As usual, Mr. Riches went to a great deal of trouble and addressed himself at length to the subject. He quoted from the report *The Present Situation and the Future Development of the Iron and Steel Industry in Australia*, by Mr. S. B. Dickinson, Director of Mines and Government Geologist. When the Premier spoke he apologized for not having been in the Chamber to hear Mr. Riches' speech, but claimed he had read it. However, his method caused me to say to one of my colleagues, "I believe he read it coming down in the tramcar," but I think I did him greater credit than he deserved, because it seemed he was reading Mr. Riches' speech while trying to reply. That is characteristic of the Premier's attitude towards matters raised by the Opposition. I shall refer to some paragraphs of Mr. Dickinson's report. He started by stressing the necessity for the establishment of a steel works. Paragraphs 1 and 3 state:—

The economy of Australia still very largely depends on the profits derived from the sale of the products of her agricultural and mining industries in overseas markets. It is estimated that the demand for steel in Australia in 1960 could reach 5,000,000 ingot tons per annum.

We are not producing 25 per cent of the estimated requirements for 1960. Before dealing further with the report I want to make it clear that we require the appointment of a Select Committee only to inquire into the matter. The Premier got a wrong impression; he thought we wanted a committee to put into effect Mr. Dickinson's recommendation. South Australian industries are developing, which necessitates steps being taken to establish steelworks. My remarks about paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of the report were supported by the president of the South Australian Chamber of Manufactures, Mr. Gerard. I do not subscribe to all his views, but some of them should be noted. As reported in the *News* of April 16, 1953, he said:—

Because perhaps of South Australia's traditional role as a primary producing State, and of great importance of primary products in the State's economy, the growth of our secondary industries might appear at first glance to be of a mushroom-like character. This may cause some people to consider that it has been too rapid to be lasting, and to harbour some doubts as to whether it can be maintained. That this is not the case, but rather that the expansion has been sound and steady, can readily be seen by studying the

method and character of the growth, and the background upon which the expansion is based.

The Government Statist records that the value of secondary production in 1939 was 35 per cent of the total production in the State, in 1951 it was 33 per cent, in spite of the fact that it rose in value from £13.6 million to £67.5 million during that period. Industrial growth in South Australia is not, as some people believe, the product of the post-war "boom," although it did receive a considerable impetus from post-war conditions. The growth first became evident in 1935 and was actually retarded by the war, to rise steadily thereafter. . . . Both in 1939 and today the number of persons employed in factories in South Australia per 1,000 of the population is the third highest in the Commonwealth, yielding pride of place only to the highly industrialized States of Victoria and New South Wales.

Mr. Gerard advocated the establishment of further secondary industries. It is claimed by Mr. Dickinson that, following on the development of further secondary industries, by 1960 Australia will possibly require 5,000,000 tons of steel. He mentioned the countries where the manufacture of steel had been successful, and indicated that Great Britain had ruled the world when it outstripped all other countries in the production of iron and steel. He said that Germany grew in power because of her iron and steel industries, that Russia and Japan strained every nerve to produce more, and that the United States of America is working along the same lines.

A study of the history of the Broken Hill Proprietary Company works at Newcastle indicates that the motion should be carried so that works can be developed similarly here. A Select Committee could show that there is a greater opportunity for works to be established here than was the case with Newcastle. The works there were established 48 years ago on a swamp, which had to be drained before anything could be done. The plant began operating in 1913 with one blast furnace and three steel furnaces. Now it is one of the biggest integrated steel industries in the British Commonwealth and operates three blast furnaces and 16 steel furnaces. The works cover 474 acres, and have a capacity of 1,000,000 tons of steel a year. The company employs over 8,000 men, of whom about 1,400 are new Australians. In all its activities, including ship building, the company employs 17,230 men, and the salaries and wages bill is more than £15,000,000 a year. I was given this information when I was a member of a party which was shown over the works recently

by Mr. Butler, the manager. Paragraph 11 of Mr. Dickinson's report said:—

11. South Australia provides 99 per cent of the total iron ore production of Australia. Its known reserves of high-grade ore are not unlimited, but are adequate to support a new steel plant of 750,000-1,000,000 tons capacity for a period of 30 years.

This valuable ore is sent away from South Australia. The three blast furnaces at Newcastle use each week 220 tons of limestone, 1,200 tons of iron ore and 700 tons of coke from 980 tons of coal. The two former ingredients come from South Australia, the iron ore from Iron Knob, near Whyalla, and the limestone from Rapid Bay. The dolomite used at the Newcastle works comes from Ardrossan. At Newcastle there are 14 open hearth furnaces, five of which have a capacity of 135 tons and nine of 125 tons. Each furnace on the average uses each week approximately 1,167 tons of molten iron, 417 tons of scrap iron, 133 tons of iron ore, 83 tons of limestone, 33 tons of dolomite and 20 tons of other materials. In the main, the materials come from South Australia. In discussing this Bill on September 23 Mr. Christian raised an important point when he said:—

I remind the honourable member for Stuart that by the Broken Hill Pty. Co.'s Indenture Act, 1937, we gave away for all time our rights in our iron ore resources.

I now want to refer to remarks made by the Hon. R. L. (now Sir Richard) Butler, Premier and Treasurer of the time, when the Broken Hill Proprietary Company's Indenture Bill was discussed in 1937. He said, as reported on page 1079 of *Hansard*:—

It has been my privilege to introduce many measures to this House, but none has given me greater pleasure and none has been of greater significance or importance to South Australia than this Bill. . . . Over and over again throughout my travels abroad I found that the tendency was not to centralize defence, but to decentralize. That is a policy which must ultimately be adopted throughout Australia. . . . The opposite course seems to have been the policy pursued in Australia; in fact, it has only been during the last year (mainly due to the attitude of South Australia) that not only the Commonwealth, but the larger States, realized the danger of continuing this policy of centralizing industries in practically two States of the Commonwealth. . . . At the same time, South Australia is not without blame in the matter. We have lost many industries through lack of efficiency, initiative, and capital.

We appeared to have some hazy idea that the establishment of secondary industries would imperil the primary industries. There was failure to realize that these two great industries should go hand in hand, and that so long as

the primary industries are made our first consideration those engaged in that industry have everything to gain and nothing to lose by the establishment of secondary industries. Fortunately, that was all a passing phase, and today I am pleased to say that irrespective of whether a person lives in the country or the city he is convinced that the future of this country depends on the expansion of secondary industries just as much as the primary industries. This applies not only to South Australia, but to the Commonwealth as a whole. . . . There is in my opinion no country in the world richer in all kinds of raw materials than is Australia.

I have pleasure in asking members to ratify the agreement with the Broken Hill Pty. Coy. Ltd., for the establishment of a branch of its works at Whyalla. No words of mine are necessary to show the significance to South Australia of the proposals. I have only one regret, and that is that our old friend, the late Mr. J. C. Fitzgerald, is not alive to see the realization of one of his dreams. Hardly a session went by when he did not make some reference to the necessity of iron and steel being manufactured in South Australia. During my many discussions the directors of the B.H.P. have always been tremendously sympathetic to South Australia, and have always expressed the hope that some day they would be able to do something on a large scale for this State. It was that desire which led me to write to them asking whether they would be prepared to establish a branch of their works here. Although for some time prior to this the company had been making investigations, it immediately set aside a large number of its staff to formulate a definite scheme, and after some months of negotiations we succeeded in reaching the agreement which is now before the House.

It is generally realized that iron and steel are key industries, and that wherever they are established other industries must ultimately follow. If steel works had been established in South Australia I am certain that the sheet steel industry would have been located here. Even now I am of the opinion that if the B.H.P. ultimately manufactures strip steel here a branch of the sheet steel works is within the bounds of practicable possibility, more particularly as the motor body industry is the biggest user of such steel. It is tremendously important, and the actions of the whole world reveal it, that whenever a steel works is established 101 other industries grow up around those works, especially subsidiary industries. I am certain that the establishment of this blast furnace will be followed by the establishment of steel works, and I can visualize the development in this State in connection with secondary industries. I am sure that every member will approach the question with that aspect in view. Not only should members consider what it gives to us today, but what it will mean to South Australia in the future. It means a lot today to have a firm prepared to spend approximately £1,500,000 on the works set out in the agreement. Ultimately we can look for the establishment of steel works. No matter to what part of any country we may

go, it will be found that once a blast furnace has been established for the manufacture of pig iron, steel works ultimately follow. That is a natural corollary.

The position is that blast furnaces for producing pig iron do not of themselves require a great deal of water and no large Government water schemes are demanded for this purpose, in fact none; but it has been found in practice that the establishment of blast furnaces is commonly followed by the installation of coke ovens and steel works, and these latter establishments require large quantities of water. . . . Clause 13 is the only clause in the agreement that deals with water, and it is somewhat nebulous in its operations. It reads:—

In order to assist the company to further extend its work by the establishment in the vicinity of Whyalla of coke oven plant and/or works for the production of steel, rolling mills, and other plant, the Government on being notified by the company that it is prepared to establish any such works will use every endeavour to provide the company with a supply of fresh water at the site of such works sufficient for the full requirements of the company at such fair and reasonable price as may be mutually agreed upon.

The company estimates that as time goes on it may require to use about 500,000,000 gallons per annum, or 10,000,000 gallons a week.

Mr. Lacey—We would have to put the water question beyond doubt.

The Hon. R. L. Butler—That is so.

The Hon. G. F. Jenkins—If we carry out our part of the undertaking the company should carry out its part.

The Hon. R. L. Butler—Yes. The company realizes the force and reasonableness of our arguments. . . . The directors of the company say that they would not like to attach their name to an agreement which they might not be able to carry out. They said that they were prepared to relieve us of any guarantee and not to give a guarantee, on the clear understanding that an immediate investigation was held into the problem and that when they informed the Government that they intended to establish steel works an assurance would be given that the best endeavours would be made to provide an adequate water supply. We shall not only get a return by way of royalty, as there is taxation to be taken into consideration, apart from the value of employment and the payment of huge sums in wages and salaries.

In 1937 this House was led to believe that the B.H.P. would establish a steel works in South Australia and it therefore supported the Broken Hill Proprietary Company's Indenture Bill and handed over for 50 years the rights to many of our ores. South Australia has fulfilled its part of the contract, and the B.H.P. should fulfil its part, but after 15 years nothing has been done to establish a steel-works. Mr. Christian reminded Mr. Riches of the difficulties associated with his motion but, on being asked whether he had read Mr.

Dickinson's report on taconite, he said that he had not. Mr. Dickinson claims there are tremendous deposits of taconite in this State. Not long ago a party visited the United States of America in an effort to ascertain the method of treatment of taconite, but they were chased away. More recently, the Director of Mines returned from that country with knowledge of the method of treatment, and said in his report:—

In the Middleback Ranges there are enormous developments of sediments containing 25 to 40 per cent iron. A very approximate calculation indicates that there is at least 5 billion tons of iron-bearing material above the level of the plains surrounding the Middle Back Ranges. Similar material is now being exploited in the United States of America, particularly in the Lake Superior region, where the decline in production of high-grade ore is being off-set by the production from low-grade taconite.

We have been assured that the B.H.P. has made no claims on this ore, and therefore the motion should be carried so that we may act before it is too late. In opposing the motion the Premier made many excuses and said that the Commonwealth Government would not agree to the establishment of a steel works as part of a defence programme. He suggested that the Snowy River scheme was not part of the defence programme, but I remind members that that huge scheme comprises seven dams and seventeen major power stations and most of those stations are being built underground so that they may be protected in the event of air attack; therefore the scheme must be considered as a defence measure. The Premier said that the State was not in a position to finance a steel works. The Premier said:—

My Government always has been and still is most anxious to develop the steel industry in this State. If I desired to go in for the type of self-praise we sometimes hear in other Parliaments, particularly over the air, I could say that my Government was responsible for the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline and for the establishment of the shipbuilding industry at Whyalla. . . . My Government has never been backward in any enterprise to help the development of Whyalla. When money was sorely needed and materials very scarce because of war requirements, my Government laid the pipeline to Whyalla, which was one of the greatest engineering feats ever accomplished in this State.

It can be claimed that previously we have found money when it was more scarce than it is today. In reply to a question by Mr. Riches earlier in the year the Premier said:—

We have been engaged in an intense exploration of the Middleback Ranges, and have carried out an extensive boring programme to



see if it is possible to locate iron ore deposits capable of being developed. I discussed the matter with the Chancellor of the Exchequer when I was in Great Britain and I have it on the highest authority that if worthwhile iron ore deposits can be located problems of finance can be easily ironed out.

Yet, in his speech on the motion, when he was pressed by Mr. Riches, the Premier read a letter which came indirectly from the British Chancellor of the Exchequer which, in my opinion, did not indicate that finance was not available. The Premier said he hoped that the letter would not sound pessimistic; it was given to indicate what was happening in the United Kingdom. The Premier went on to say:—

That letter clearly indicates that people in Great Britain are not able at present to give assistance in this matter, that they are engaged developing their own plants, and that that is utilizing all their resources.

It is evident to any thinking person that the facts were anticipated long before the letter was received by the Premier. In his report Mr. Dickinson made it clear that England had for some time been working on a programme for the development of steel. The facts are that because of pressure from the steel industry the Chancellor has been told he should not encourage the development of steel works in South Australia.

Mr. Lawn—Why should we be controlled from overseas?

Mr. HUTCHENS—That is the point. It is obvious from the remarks of the then Premier (the Hon. R. L. Butler) when explaining the Broken Hill Proprietary Company's Indenture Bill that the company is not now carrying out its part of the agreement. The then member for Murray, who is now our Premier, took a very dim view of the proposition, and it is as clear as the morning sun that the then leader of the Government gave away our rights, leading the House to believe that the company would establish steel works in South Australia. Because of his monopolistic control of his Party, the Premier now takes another attitude and puts the State in second place. The facts are that this industry, which was promised 16 years ago, has not taken shape, and therefore the House should subscribe to the humble motion of the member for Stuart to see whether the suggestions of the Director of Mines are worth adopting. The select committee could investigate the question of providing £100,000,000 for the project, and if that amount was considered too great it could recommend accordingly. Let us consider the

welfare of the State and have an inquiry before it is too late and the iron deposits are lost.

Mr. Brookman—You have not told us where the money is to come from.

Mr. HUTCHENS—I draw the honourable member's attention to the following paragraph in Mr. Dickinson's report:—

In the three years 1949-50, 1950-51, and 1951-52, Australia imported the equivalent of 762,000, 1,119,000 and 1,138,000 tons of ingot steel at prices up to 100 per cent above those for Australian steel. These imports do not include steel imported as fabricated products, such as buildings, factory plant, houses, etc. The total premiums paid as a consequence of a shortage of Australian manufactured steel would have more than financed a new steel works of 1,000,000 tons capacity.

I believe that is the full answer to the honourable member's interjection, and I hope we have now enlisted his support for a sound South Australian outlook on the motion, which I commend.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga)—I am afraid I have not the enthusiasm of honourable members opposite for select committees. I have had first-hand experience of committee work. It will be remembered that I was responsible for introducing a somewhat similar motion for the appointment of a select committee to inquire into certain health problems, and I remind honourable members that although the ink on that committee's report is starting to fade its recommendations have not been implemented. As chairman of that committee I thought its recommendations were quite good; I could not fault them. However, my experience cured me of my youthful impetuosity to get things done in a hurry. From the speeches on the motion today it would appear it is a move in the right direction, but I remind members that it will result in nothing being done during any investigations and thus delay any action being taken. No Government would take any action until the inquiry had ended. Some members who were in the House when the original Bill was being considered might have had something different to say had they known what the future held. I am not at all critical of the motive behind the motion, but only suggesting that there might be other means of getting more immediate results achieved. The member for Hindmarsh had much to say on a topic that was referred to in the 1937 *Hansard*, and I shall also refer to it. All members should bear in mind what has happened in the years since the agreement was

made with the Broken Hill Pty. Coy. for the development of our iron ore deposits. First, we had World War II., which absolutely disrupted any programme that may have been set, and there have been factors since the conclusion of the war over which the company has had no control but which have removed any possibility of the fulfilment of the undoubted intention to establish steel works in South Australia. I do not think that those in the company concerned with policy would quibble about that statement.

Mr. Riches—Don't forget that they have put works at Port Kembla since the war.

Mr. SHANNON—I am not criticizing the matter brought forward by the honourable member, but am pointing out that certain factors have intervened over which the company had no control and which have vitally altered its outlook towards establishing steel works in South Australia. The economy of a young country like Australia is absolutely dependent upon the development of its resources, particularly its heavy industries, and what has happened in older countries of the world is a guide if we did not know it otherwise. I hope that we are all Australians and not merely South Australians; in other words, that we think of this as one country and not as six.

Mr. Lawn—It should be.

Mr. SHANNON—Members opposite have, on occasion, suggested that unification was the line Australia should pursue and I believe there are some who still hold that view. I disagree with them, but as Australians we are vitally interested in the economical production of all requirements for the development of this country, including steel.

In justification of the remarks attributed to the Hon. R. L. Butler, quoted quite correctly by the member for Hindmarsh, I also say that members of this Chamber felt at the time that it was not a bad agreement if we were to get the programme of development of our iron ore deposits which then appeared likely. Although I have not refreshed my memory by reference to *Hansard*, I believe I am right in saying that that thought was generally held by members of both Parties. That it has not come about is bad luck for South Australia as a State; we have not had the extra employment and the use of our own primary iron ores here, but the bad luck story applies to others as well as ourselves. I think there cannot be the slightest doubt that if we set about establishing steel works on present day costs we would have to expect a higher price for steel.

Mr. Lawn—Does the honourable member think prices are going to drop?

Mr. SHANNON—I shall not attempt to prophesy, but on evidence tendered by the Public Works Committee on public projects in the last few months there is a tendency towards a fall in prices, and a much stronger competition in tenders. These are signs of the times and some indication of what the future may hold in store, but it would be almost impossible to estimate what the establishment of a steel industry in this State, with all its concomitants, would cost. A hundred million pounds has been suggested to the Premier, but I believe that to be only a crude guess. I do not think that any firm estimate has been attempted, but there are one or two things about the increased cost of establishing industries which have come to my notice and which may be some guide to members as to what would be the increased cost of establishing the industry here above what it cost at Port Kembla. The superphosphate companies, some five or six years ago, agreed that if a deep sea port were established at Cape Jaffe they would set up a superphosphate works there. They believed it would be an economic project, on the basis of the tonnage required in the South-East, to erect works there and distribute the superphosphate direct throughout the South-East. Ultimately, however, the companies were forced to revise their estimates and they found that current costs had increased to about two and a half times the former figure.

Mr. Davis—Does that apply to all industries?

Mr. SHANNON—I am saying that it would be some justification for the Broken Hill Proprietary Company's not building steel works in South Australia. I believe that the Director of Mines thought that we should do something to stir up public opinion in South Australia with regard to the utilization of our own resources within the State, and the member for Stuart has only taken the text provided by the director. I find no fault with that. Although earlier I said that I was an Australian before I was a South Australian I can see no harm, but, on the contrary, a lot of good, in using our raw materials as near the source of supply as is economically possible that is desirable in the interests of the whole of the Commonwealth. This is a problem which other countries have faced. Certain North American States have almost a monopoly of steel production, largely because of the propinquity of the raw materials to the site of

manufacture, so I feel that the Director of Mines, if he has done nothing else, has done something useful in stirring up the problem which affects this State so much. He has pointed out that we have huge deposits of lower grade iron ores in almost unlimited quantities and that in America—where I believe they are going as far afield as Venezuela for iron ore—they are developing some of their own low grade ore. I believe there is a field for a thorough investigation and I do not think the Director of Mines is unmindful of that. He is pursuing it diligently and I do not think that any motion passed by this Chamber would hurry him one iota; in fact, it might slow him down. If I were Director of Mines I think I would say in the circumstances that the matter could stand over until the investigation was completed. I am convinced South Australia's interests would be best served by an approach to the Broken Hill Proprietary Company on a Governmental level to do everything within its power to utilize our resources here. Everyone knows that the ships carrying the iron ore to New South Wales return in ballast and it appears to me that the establishment of a re-rolling mill at Whyalla would be of advantage to the company and certainly to South Australia. I admit that this is but half a loaf, but we would get the manufactured steel made in our own State and would not have to depend on all the vagaries of shipping, weather and wharves, and all the other interruptions which have denied South Australia the quota of the steel manufactured in New South Wales to which she is supposed to be entitled—I think 11 per cent of the total output.

We have received less than our quota, but with the establishment by the B.H.P. of a re-rolling plant in South Australia we could overcome that difficulty. The ingot steel would be transported in the company's own vessels returning to Whyalla. Just because Father Christmas does not bring me all I want and my stocking contains only a leather ball and not a rocking horse, I am not going to be foolish and throw away what I do get. We should ensure that we do not injure our prospects of getting something out of this suggestion.

Mr. O'Halloran—You mean "out of this motion."

Mr. SHANNON—This motion would, in effect, be a stay of proceedings and nothing would happen in the interim. If a committee was appointed it is doubtful whether it would report by the end of this session. In all probability a resolution would have to be passed

giving the committee permission to sit indefinitely or to present its report next session. Because of that, I oppose the motion. I have no complaint with its objective, but Mr. Dickinson's idea was to stir this matter up.

Mr. Davis—To stir the Government up.

Mr. SHANNON—I do not think the Government requires it. During the last few weeks Mr. Pollnitz has been considering the possibility of improving steel supplies.

Mr. Riches—You are not suggesting that he is inquiring into the manufacture of steel?

Mr. SHANNON—No, but the Government is alive to the need of obtaining steel and Mr. Pollnitz is doing his utmost to ensure the receipt of our requirements. I do not think any member of the Opposition can suggest that the Government is unmindful of this position.

Mr. Davis—The Government says nothing about it.

Mr. SHANNON—During question time the Premier supplies information about problems in all electorates.

Mr. Riches—It has been contradictory in the last three weeks.

Mr. SHANNON—Notwithstanding the Premier's reply three weeks ago about the financing of the proposed steel works, it is news to me that millions of pounds can be promised without a thorough investigation into the economics of a project. If the Premier is correctly reported in *Hansard*, it amazes me that the Chancellor of the Exchequer could be so rash as to promise taxpayers' money from the Old Country on a project the economics of which have not been examined.

Mr. Riches—The Premier does not deny that he has been correctly reported.

Mr. SHANNON—I would be amazed if a large sum of money could be expected from overseas for an entirely new project in this country without a thorough investigation of the economics.

Mr. O'Halloran—All the motion suggests is that a Select Committee should gather data about the matter.

Mr. SHANNON—I do not think the appointment of a Select Committee is the proper approach to the question. I do not believe we can enter into competition with the B.H.P. without abrogating our agreement. In 1937 the State gave the company certain rights over iron ore deposits for 50 years. If any member thinks it possible to establish a steel works in competition with the B.H.P. using low-grade ores I remind him of the Yampi Sound deposits which, although of somewhat similar richness in iron to our deposits in the north of

Eyre Peninsula, have to be used in conjunction with high-grade iron ores in the B.H.P. works at Newcastle and Port Kembla. If we had to use low grade ore the project would be much more costly. Any company desiring to establish a steel works in South Australia in competition with the B.H.P., which has the cream of the ore available to it—

Mr. Riches—How about establishing a steel works in co-operation with and not in competition with the B.H.P.?

Mr. SHANNON—I am suggesting that the B.H.P., through its own resources, should do something to carry into effect portion of the policy we envisaged when we agreed to the 50 year lease of iron ore deposits.

Mr. Riches—Why doesn't it?

Mr. SHANNON—I do not know. A select committee would only delay the matter and any move the B.H.P. might even now be considering would be held in abeyance pending the report of the committee. If the B.H.P. wanted an excuse for not doing something, the appointment of a select committee would provide it. Mr. Dickinson's report has brought to the notice of the B.H.P. what, in his opinion, should be done for the development of steel works in South Australia. I think that will achieve more than anything this House can do. Australia owes a tremendous debt to the B.H.P. which has provided cheaper steel because of agreements we have entered into. It has played the game with those who desired the development of this young country and no other organization has done as much. Because of our agreement we have a friendly basis on which to approach the company, and I want to retain those relations. The company would be more amenable to such an approach than it would if an inquiry were commenced. The motion must, of necessity have some critical angle and for those reasons I oppose it despite the fact that I have sympathy for the motive behind it.

Mr. DAVIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (ELECTORAL).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 23. Page 779.)

Mr. CORCORAN (Victoria)—I support the Bill, which includes a basis of reform that is long overdue. It is obvious that the electoral system has developed discrepancies that require to be eliminated. I expected that this matter would be mentioned in the Governor's Speech,

and was very disappointed that it was not. It remains for the Party with which I have the honour to be associated to lead the way, as it has done for the past half century. The Australian Labor Party has remained the one constant figure in Australian politics. Over a long period it has not found it necessary to change either its name or its principles. It stands today as it always has—the defender of democracy and the only political instrument whereby the Australian people may achieve a better way of life. Possessing an essentially democratic constitution, Labour's efforts are constantly directed towards reforming and democratizing our Parliamentary institution in order that the majority may rule and that the people may speak effectively through their Parliament. When I said the need for electoral reform was obvious I had in mind the fact that although the Labor Party won the last election it did not win the Government. Over 60 per cent of the people voted for Labor candidates, who gained an over-all majority of 47,000 votes, but Labor is not governing this State today.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—How do you arrive at those alleged facts when several districts were not contested?

Mr. CORCORAN—If the Minister's interjection does anything at all it adds more fuel to the fire and makes more patent the enormity of the present electoral injustice. Reform is urgently needed, for we have a system of electoral boundaries, designed by the Liberal and Country League to ensure continuance of power, which amounts to nothing less than political dictatorship and prevents the people from changing the Government. There are 447,000 electors in the 39 House of Assembly electorates. This means that each electorate should contain about 11,500 voters, but in the 26 country divisions there are only 169,000 electors with an average of only 6,500 to a division. On the other hand, the 13 metropolitan electorates have 278,000 voters, an average of about 21,400. In 1936, when the single-electorate system was first adopted, the discrepancies were nothing to be alarmed about. The numbers in the various divisions did not exceed or fall much below 20 per cent of the quota, and that did not matter much, taking into account geographical features and other points, but in 1953 thirteen of the 26 country seats were out of line. The average number in country seats is now 6,500, but Stuart has 10,800 electors and Victoria 10,300. On the other hand, Frome has only 3,600, Young 4,200, and Newcastle 4,000.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—How many in Wallaroo?

Mr. CORCORAN—Don't try to use camouflage to cloud the issue. Members opposite have been endeavouring all through the discussions to use camouflage and have dodged the vital issues. They should confine their remarks to the provisions of the Bill. Adelaide has about 12,000 voters, Glenelg 27,000, and Port Adelaide 30,230.

Mr. Lawn—Port Adelaide has far too many.

Mr. CORCORAN—Yes, 41 per cent above the average for the metropolitan area.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—How many electors are there in Adelaide?

Mr. CORCORAN—There are 12,011, which is 43 per cent below the average. Surely members opposite do not blame us for fighting for the principles of democracy in view of all that has been done towards that end by our fighting forces in two world wars. We should not try to belittle democracy: it is too sacred for that. The member for Torrens referred to the Bill as an absurd piece of legislation. Probably he knows nothing about it. If so, the fact that he has passed that judgment does not count for much. Members on this side object to his statement, because the Labor Party brought this Bill down. We waited for the Government to do something, but it has done nothing. We treat this Bill very seriously. The brains and wisdom of every member on this side have been concentrated on it. The Leader of the Opposition, whose political background compares favourably with that of any other member, has paid particular attention to the necessity for electoral reform. When he is subjected to remarks such as those made by the member for Torrens it is my duty to defend him to the best of my humble ability.

Mr. Jennings—Particularly when those remarks came from the source they did.

Mr. CORCORAN—Yes. It was evident the member for Torrens did not know much about the provisions of the Bill. He claimed the Labor Party was thoroughly and justly discredited in the eyes of the public. He is wrong, but how does he reconcile that contention with the fact that the Labor Party governs in five of the six States? If our electoral system contained any principles of democracy Labor would be in charge in this State, too. I want the member for Torrens to answer my question, but he is not here. If the people have elected Labor Party Governments in five States it certainly does not show the Party has become discredited or lost

prestige. In South Australia we had an overall majority of 47,000. Does that justify any suggestion that our prestige has suffered?

Mr. Lawn—Mr. Travers may have a constipated mind.

Mr. McAlees—He was told to keep away today.

Mr. CORCORAN—He referred to the Bill as a new-fangled, fantastic idea, and said we had brought it down to re-establish ourselves in office. He forgot we have had proportional representation as a plank in our platform for as long as I can remember. The Labor Party has been pressing for this system for many years. The Gunn Government endeavoured to introduce proportional representation, and so did the Hill Government. I think the Hon. W. J. Denny introduced such a Bill. It proposed a system based upon the Federal divisions, with seven electorates, each returning five members. That measure was defeated in this House because a constitutional majority was not obtained. When I was a member previously efforts were made to adopt proportional representation. What is wrong with it? It is the fairest system of all. I am not worried about electoral systems in France, Sweden or Russia. I am concerned about South Australia's system. One outstanding feature of proportional representation is that it grants representation to the minority. We should try it and see how it works. Probably members opposite have a deep sense of appreciation of the principles of democracy, but they do not want to give credit to the Labor Party for bringing down this Bill allowing some adjustment in our electoral boundaries. Perhaps the Premier has something up his sleeve and will bring down a Bill later. He must know how the people feel about our electoral system. They are expecting reform. If they do not get it with proportional representation they may be looking for an increase in the number of electorates and an adjustment in the number of voters in each. It is impossible to convince the people that an electoral system that allows a minority to rule is sound. At every opportunity I will try to bring the present unjust system before their notice. I make no apology for that, for I am a defender of the principles of democracy and have had something to do with the fight put up to maintain them.

Mr. Stephens—You are prepared to trust the people.

Mr. CORCORAN—Yes. I am not trying to rob the Premier of any credit he is entitled to. He has had the responsibility of looking after the destiny of the people in this State

for some time. He has probably done a good job, but that has nothing to do with this Bill. One Government supporter said that so long as we were going along all right there was no need to worry about the electoral set-up, but the Opposition says that the set-up needs altering. Proportional representation has been part of our policy as long as I can remember, so we should not let Mr. Travers get away with the statement that we are trying to introduce something new in order to retrieve our reputation. We have no need to apologize, whether it be in Commonwealth or State affairs. We have had no opportunity in South Australia to show what we can do. Even if members opposite have the ability to govern, they are very conceited about it.

Much has been said about the Queensland electoral set-up, but I am not concerned about it to any extent. There is no obligation on me to defend the electoral set-up of any other State or country, when I advocate the acceptance of the principle of one vote one value. The Premier said that the Queensland electoral set-up implied that the Labor Government did not observe the one vote one value principle. The Queensland system does represent a departure from the principle of one vote one value, but not a disregard for it. No matter how the system operates the voice of the majority of the electors prevails. In Queensland the majority rules; in South Australia it is the minority. The Premier did not mention this: he left it to me to do so. It is not possible to provide in Queensland for the absolute implementation of the principle. Because of practical difficulties it can only be approximated. For example, if the enrolments of two districts were made exactly equal at any given time they would differ almost immediately afterwards. The system is based on the principle of one vote one value, as modified by the need to take into consideration such matters as dispersion of population, geographical features, occupational interests, etc. In accommodating these matters, the electoral system provides for four zones according to density of population, etc. They are the Brisbane, Coast, Northern and Western zones. The quota for each zone has been determined according to the number of seats and the population. According to the enrolments at the 1953 elections the position was as follows:—

	No. of seats.	Total enrolment.	Average enrolment.
Brisbane .. .. .	24	299,000	12,500
Coast .. .. .	28	282,000	10,000
North .. .. .	13	106,000	8,200
West .. .. .	10	50,000	5,000

The total number of seats was 75, the total enrolments 738,000 and the average enrolment 9,800. If we consider the position from the point of view of city *versus* country we find that the metropolitan area is represented by 24 members, and that the total enrolment was 299,000—about 40 per cent of the electors received about 32 per cent of the representation. The rest of the State is represented by 51 members, and the total enrolment was 439,000—about 60 per cent of the electors received about 68 per cent of the representation. Here in South Australia 62 per cent of the electors are in the metropolitan area and 38 per cent of the electors in the rest of the State. The general tendency in country areas is to support Liberal and Country League policy. Mr. Travers has more respect for broad acres than for people. The Labor Party considers the people, and that is what we have set out to do in the Bill. We have met with much opposition from the occupants of the Treasury benches. We hope something effective will result from our move and that the principles of democracy will ultimately prevail. The Legislative Council is an undemocratic and autocratic institution. It is more autocratic than the House of Lords. Am I right or am I wrong? If I am wrong, I hope I will be enlightened. Members on this side are charged with the task of trying to get adopted an electoral system under which we can gain the Treasury benches. We are entitled to say that members opposite are grimly hanging on to the present electoral system in order to ensure continuity of power. Labor has never had the privilege in this State of being in power. It has never had a majority in the Legislative Council.

Mr. Lawn—Why?

Mr. CORCORAN—Because of the method of election. Only about one-third of the people who vote at Assembly elections can vote at Council elections. If a Bill passes in the Assembly it can be thrown out by the Council. The efforts in this place can be nullified. Is that one of the principles of democracy for which we fought? When I enlisted during the World War I, I was told that I would be participating in a war that would end wars and make the world safe for democracy. I want to see that eventuate and I will not be silent whilst things go contrary to it. I want members to rally to my S.O.S. and to help my Party in its present move. Another anomaly in connection with the Council is that no person under 30 years of age can become a member. Is that proper?

Mr. Travers almost lined up members on this side with the Communists. I take strong exception to that. It was something he had no right to do. If he reflects on the matter now he will realize that no-one has done more in this country, and had more success in ousting Communists, than have the great Australian Labor Party and the various trades unions. I do not think that at the time he realized the significance of his remarks. My Party does not stand for Communists. It has worked tooth and nail, and more diplomatically than the Commonwealth Government, on this matter. Mr. Menzies promised to pull down the Communists, but he did nothing. He did not intend to do anything. The member for Torrens referred to the socialistic policy of the Labor Party. We stand for partial socialization. If a public utility is not functioning in the best interests of the people we think it should be socialized and used for the benefit of the people. The Premier did something like that in taking over the electricity supplies. On that occasion he had Labor support; in fact, but for Labor support in another place the Electricity Trust of South Australia Bill would not have been passed. Labor has also supported him in the development of Radium Hill. The attitude of the member for Torrens is that, when the Playford Government is responsible for socialization, that is statesmanship, but when Labor implements such a policy it is socialization. The Labor Party is not associated with the Communist Party, and members on this side do not appreciate accusations that it is. Mr. Travers should let Labor members know where he stands in this matter. He said that people had no faith in the Labor Party, but I remind him that Labor has had no opportunity to demonstrate its ability in this State for the last 20 years, but it has had opportunities in the Federal arena and has left no doubt in the minds of Australians about its ability to govern during the most critical period in our history. Early in the war, Mr. Menzies failed to carry on, and who came to the rescue? That great Labor leader, John Curtin.

Mr. John Clark—With a minority Government.

Mr. CORCORAN—Yes, and he was followed by Ben Chifley. They fought the war on the financial resources of Australians and did not have to go overseas for capital. If this Party is given a chance to govern in this State it will do a better job than the present Government. Even if Government members cannot give full support to this Bill they should do what they can to put our electoral system on a

more democratic basis. At the moment our cause may not look hopeful, but Government members should consider the facts I have mentioned, let them weigh heavily on their minds, and not forget the sacrifices made for the maintenance of democratic principles in this country. Then, I feel, they will ultimately get in behind the Labor Party and support the Bill.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River)—As one of those ancient gentlemen, lacking in conscience, referred to by the member for Norwood, I oppose the Bill. I do not wish to cover any of the ground already covered, nor to speak at any length, but as a country member I have the right to speak and to take some time in putting my point of view. Mr. Corcoran and practically all other speakers supporting the Bill talked about a majority in this House elected by a minority. We have been told that at the recent State elections 60 per cent of the electors voted for Labor and only 40 per cent for the Playford Government, but I cannot see how that was so, for many members were returned unopposed—a fact which should be considered if any realistic estimate is to be made. Many Liberal voters in Adelaide voted for Mr. Lawn, the Labor candidate, because they did not wish to vote for a Communist candidate and had no Liberal candidate for whom to vote.

Mr. O'Halloran—And Labor supporters voted for the Premier against a Communist.

Mr. HEASLIP—The Leader of the Opposition agrees with me, but most other Labor members have adopted that type of argument as an indication that the majority did not support the Playford Government.

The Hon. T. Playford—Probably a large percentage of the voters in Port Adelaide were Liberal, but voted for Mr. Stephens against a Communist candidate.

Mr. HEASLIP—Yes, and the same may be said to apply to Hindmarsh. I cannot see how it can be said that a minority returned the Playford Government.

The Hon. T. Playford—Following the argument to its logical conclusion some members opposite should be sitting on this side.

Mr. Jennings—We should all be.

Mr. HEASLIP—The member for Victoria said that the present electoral boundaries were designed by the Liberal and Country League, but that is quite incorrect, for the Liberal and Country League had nothing to do with the formation of boundaries. That matter was left to an independent tribunal outside the jurisdiction of this House.

Mr. Stephens—They were told 26 seats were to be in the country and 13 in the city.

Mr. HEASLIP—The honourable member is implying something which is not true.

Mr. Stephens—It is quite true, and you know it.

The SPEAKER—I do not think members may argue about what each of them knows on the matter.

Mr. HEASLIP—I was particularly surprised to hear Mr. Corcoran say that Liberal members were opposing the Bill so as to ensure their retention of office, and that Labor was supporting the Bill to put the Opposition into power.

Mr. Jennings—In accordance with the wishes of the people.

Mr. John Clark—You are not quoting Mr. Corcoran in full. What he said will be in *Hansard*.

Mr. HEASLIP—Yes, and it will be of no value if it is wrong. I believe there is a need for electoral reform, but I cannot support the Bill because I do not agree with its undemocratic principles. I will not have proportional representation.

Mr. Shannon—Many Labor members do not want that.

Mr. Riches—It suits the Liberals in the Senate at present.

Mr. HEASLIP—The member for Norwood said that it was wise to get an independent view of the basis of a democratic Constitution. I do not know why he quoted Dr. Finer in support of his argument, for I agree with his statement, which supports my case. Dr. Finer said:—

What is to be adopted as a fair electoral system? It is the division of the country into constituencies sized according to convenience and equity. Convenience implies that the constituency should not be too large for the maintenance of personal contact between candidates and voters. Equity implies that the constituencies shall be as nearly equal in population as possible. When this principle is applied, not once and for all, but continuously as the distribution of population changes in times of mobility—when it is applied simply and without management—then it can be taken that in the long run there will be no undue advantage to any Party and no disadvantage to any by reason of this cause alone.

I agree with those statements and consider that there may be need for electoral reform in South Australia because of the change in the incidence of population since 1938, but I cannot support the Bill because it would give the very opposite to the "fair electoral system" mentioned by Dr. Finer. Before

embarking upon any project I try to look ahead and see where it will land me. There are 449,000 electors for the House of Assembly, and under the Bill nine districts with five members each are to be created, which would be approximately 50,000 electors in each. Let us consider the position on Eyre Peninsula and the north of the State. We would start off with Flinders, where there are 7,000 electors; Eyre, which extends to the Western Australian border and has 5,000, and continue northward to Stuart, which also joins the Western Australian border in the west and the Northern Territory in the north, with its 10,000 electors. Then we go to Newcastle, which also extends to the Northern Territory, with its 4,000 electors, continue to Frome, which extends to the New South Wales border with 3,660 electors, and further south we embrace Burra with 4,000 electors, this district extending far to the east, and then we have Rocky River with another 4,700 electors, and Pirie with 8,500. In order to get sufficient electors for one district as proposed in the Bill we must include Young with 4,000 electors. The aggregate of electors in these districts is 52,720.

Mr. Riches—You have that position in the Legislative Council at present.

Mr. HEASLIP—Exactly. Under the Bill we would have Eyre Peninsula and the whole north of South Australia with five members to represent them. With five members under proportional representation it would mean there would be two Liberals and three Labor, or two Labor and three Liberals. In effect, you are going to ask two men from one Party to represent the vast area of 345,000 square miles. If that is democratic, I do not know what the word means.

Mr. Hutchens—What is the objection to a member representing both metropolitan and country electors?

Mr. HEASLIP—I do not object to that, if it can be worked geographically, but a member could not represent both Port Adelaide and a large area extending to the Western Australian border. Under proportional representation, if there were three Labor and two Liberals for one district, the Liberals would try to represent the West Coast extending from Spencer Gulf to the Western Australian border, and also Port Adelaide, which is an industrial area. For instance, for Port Adelaide to be joined up with Rocky River, which is 100 miles away, would be ridiculous.

Mr. Hutchens—Don't you think you have seen a bogeyman which does not exist?



Mr. HEASLIP—What I have referred to is definitely opposed to what Dr. Finer suggests and what Mr. Dunstan believes in. Multiple electorates have been tried and abandoned, and I do not know why an attempt should be made to revive them. I believe in one man representing a district and being responsible to it—one man one job—and yet members opposite suggest that there should be five men for one job. The idea of “one vote one value” may be ideally democratic, but in practice it just does not work. Under it we would have the situation of the whole of the north of South Australia and Eyre Peninsula with 52,000 electors represented by five members, and Glenelg with 27,000 electors and Goodwood with 25,000, an area of less than 40 square miles, having the same representation. Would we encourage decentralization by having five men to represent 345,000 square miles, with another representing 40 square miles? With that kind of representation I am sure I could never properly represent the people who sent me here. An attempt is being made to do something which is impossible and I therefore oppose the Bill.

Mr. FRED WALSH (Thebarton)—I support the Bill. One gratifying thing about its introduction is that it has resulted in an interesting and lengthy debate. I am sure that the House, without prejudice, will agree that the speeches made on this side have been excellent. Not one could be considered poor, but I cannot say the same for speeches from the other side of the House. With apologies to Sir Winston Churchill I suggest that never has so much been said by so many that meant so little. When the Premier followed the Leader of the Opposition I do not believe he attempted to explain the position as he honestly felt it should be explained. By facetiousness he attempted to turn the debate into a joke and he attempted to ridicule the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. That attitude has been continued by other Government supporters in opposing the measure. Both the Premier and Mr. Travers referred to Dr. Evatt and his association with the United Nations. Members opposite take every opportunity to criticize and belittle the achievements of Dr. Evatt. The Premier referred to Dr. Evatt's influence among the smaller nations who attended the United Nations Conference. As one who was associated with the Australian delegation at the first conference in San Francisco in 1945, I say that Dr. Evatt did not seek to organize the small nations. They were

more or less a leaderless band confronting the strong forces of those representing at least four of the five so-called great powers. Because of his principles Dr. Evatt was forced to associate himself with the smaller nations.

The Hon. T. Playford—What you say is that what I said was correct.

Mr. FRED WALSH—No. Dr. Evatt did not seek to organize the small nations. They rallied to the principles and policies he enunciated. I defy anyone to suggest that Dr. Evatt did not play a leading part at that conference. In the *New York Times* of June 8, 1945, under the heading “Australia Played Big Parley Role in Fight for ‘Liberalized’ Charter” it is stated:—

Outside of the “Big Five,” no country has been more assiduous than Australia at the conference. Dr. Evatt and his delegation came here with a definite programme for the improvement of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. They have fought for their ideas, and for the “liberal” ideas of other countries which they have adopted, with great tenacity. They did not try to set up a “bloc” of smaller nations, but many of the latter rallied around Dr. Evatt's leadership. He is the only Foreign Minister here who attends every committee meeting, and he fights at every one to the very last ditch in support of the Australian viewpoint.

Dr. Evatt's most decisive victory perhaps was in pushing through, against strong opposition, the Australian demand to strengthen the Economic and Social Council in various respects, especially the pledge to be taken by every member nation to pursue the objective of full employment in keeping with the Australians' advanced social philosophy. He was instrumental in the successful fight to carry the Canadian-Australian amendment giving wider jurisdiction to the General Assembly in which all member nations will have an equal vote, and setting up machinery to prevent disputes that reach the Security Council, which will be dominated by the “Big Five,” from becoming “frozen” as the cases of aggression against China, Ethiopia and Czechoslovakia were frozen in the League of Nations. The Assembly will have power to discuss all matters in the sphere of international relations and will be able to become “the town meeting of the world.”

The Hon. T. Playford—That completely proves the case I submitted.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Do the Premier and his Government subscribe to the principles embodied in the charter of the United Nations? I feel confident they do, but there is a difference between the General Assembly and the Security Council. The Security Council has the power and authority and comprises the five great powers, which are permanent members, and six other powers as may be appointed by the General Assembly from time to time on a

two-yearly basis. That brings me to the question of the veto. When the Premier was speaking the member for Burnside interjected and attempted to imply that Dr. Evatt supported the veto. Dr. Evatt was opposed to it from the beginning and was responsible to some extent in getting a modification of the veto in so far as it applied to procedural matters. A tribute is paid to Dr. Evatt in the *New York Post* of June 19, 1945, under the heading "*Herald-Tribune Credits Evatt with Compromise.*" It reads:—

In Bert Andrews' *Herald-Tribune* story—moved to page 16—it is predicted in the head: "New Formula May End Issue Over Assembly. Big Five Agree on a Draft; Leaders Press for End of Parley by Saturday." Andrews writes of Minister of External Affairs Evatt of Australia who has emerged as one of the most important figures at the conference. It was Evatt "who came up with the compromise" that may end the dispute. In the same paper John C. Metcalf writes a piece under this head: "Evatt Acclaims Small Nations' Role in Charter, Australian Foreign Minister Reviews Parley and Bids Russia Join Pacific War." Evatt's role as a leader of the small nations' delegation is well understood, but his comment on the Pacific war was enlightening: "We have the right to expect that the nations of Europe should take the same interest in the Pacific war which we have taken in the European war," he was quoted as saying, not mentioning Russia, although the implication was clear.

The fight for the veto nearly wrecked the conference and it was not until the last couple of days that the Russian delegate received instructions from Moscow to accept the position as suggested by Dr. Evatt. Had it not been for that, it is quite possible the conference would have broken up, the charter would not have been signed, and there would never have been a United Nations. They broke down after continual cables between their own delegation and Moscow, and to suggest that Dr. Evatt did not oppose the application of the veto is not in accordance with the facts.

The Hon. T. Playford—The argument was that in the United Nations Council small nations have precisely the same say as large nations.

Mr. FRED WALSH—That may be true, but there is no analogy between the United Nations organization and this Parliament.

The Hon. T. Playford—In other words, it is not a system of proportional representation.

Mr. FRED WALSH—There is no analogy because it would have been impossible to get those small nations together if they knew they would be dominated by the larger countries.

The Hon. T. Playford—Exactly.

Mr. FRED WALSH—But it applies only to the General Assembly which has no power; the most it can do is to make recommendations to the Security Council.

The Hon. T. Playford—The General Assembly selects six members, which is a majority of the Security Council.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Yes, but the minority dictates the decisions of the Security Council, because any one of the five Great Powers can veto any decision. Everyone will agree that it is farcical to have a country like Nationalist China as one of the Big Five. It actually represents no-one, but still has the right of veto and because "His Master's voice" has spoken China will follow the lead. Although the decisions of the United Nations can be taken as a guide to world opinions it is the Security Council which has the power and authority.

I was absent interstate on the last two occasions when the Bill was debated, but on reading *Hansard* I was surprised to see how many times Mr. Geoffrey Clarke interjected. I now come to the member for Mitcham who, as usual, had a lot to say in ridicule and condemnation of the Labor Party. I would not expect that he would give any support to our policy or principle, but as usual he went out of his way to criticize Labor and as usual did not say much, although he took a long time to say it. He referred to the 1938 elections, a matter to which I think the Premier also made reference. He said that 15 Liberal and Country League, 15 Independents and nine Labor candidates were returned. That is perfectly true, and it is also true that Labor as a result of the machinations of overseas financial interests, found that the unity of the Party was affected; we were somewhat disorganized in the 1933 elections with the result that the Labor Party did not enjoy its usual proportion of the support of the electors. In between those periods, of course, the Labor Party was united. A strong feeling was aroused against the Government of the day, not so much because of its policy, but because it had grabbed itself a five-year term of Parliament. That strong upsurge of feeling resulted in the return of many Independents, but in the main they were supported by Liberal-thinking people; there were no Labor people among them, unless it was the ex-member for Murray, and there is an element of doubt in my mind about this. The others were all Liberal-thinking people, even if they were not all associated

with the Liberal Party. We can all remember the propaganda carried on by Messrs. Queale and Bagot of Citizen League fame; their catch-cry was that the Government was losing face and that the only way to re-vitalize it was to capture the imagination of the people by an infusion of independent thought. 'What became of Bagot? He simply drifted out after he had done his job, just as did Captain Campbell, the Leader of the New Guard in New South Wales at the time of the attack against the Lang Government. Most of these Independents have drifted into the Liberal Party. Certainly not all of them were Labor Party supporters because once people do things like that to they get the brush-off.

The Hon. T. Playford—What does the honourable member mean by the "brush-off"?

Mr. FRED WALSH—I do not think that the Premier is so unsophisticated as not to know what I mean. Following the 1944 elections, after the appointment of the Speaker the Liberal Party had to depend on the support of the Independents, and on every occasion when a vital vote was taken the Independents rallied to the support of the Government.

Mr. Dunks—They knew when they were right.

Mr. FRED WALSH—I can tell you why; it was because they were all appointed to committees and were under some obligation to the Government.

The Hon. T. Playford—Does the honourable member think that Independents should not be appointed to committees?

Mr. FRED WALSH—I will come to that later. If the same position arose today I believe the Independents would do the same thing again—at least some of them. Now I come to the remarks made by that mountain of intelligence—though his speech does not indicate as much—the member for Torrens. I regret he is not here today. I believe his speech was more bitter than it reads, but he attempted to blind everybody by science.

Mr. Dunks—Why not tell us something about the Bill?

Mr. FRED WALSH—I will do the same as the honourable member did. I am glad the honourable member is not in the Chair now, otherwise I would have been sat down long ago. I have worked under many chairmen in my time, but the member for Mitcham is the world's worst.

Mr. DUNKS—On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, that is a personal reflection on me.

The SPEAKER—The Chairman of Committees takes the remarks of the member for Thebarton as a personal reflection on him, and I ask the honourable member to withdraw them.

Mr. FRED WALSH—In deference to you, Sir, I withdraw them.

Mr. DUNKS—Mr. Speaker, his remarks were made against me, not you. I ask that the honourable member withdraw unconditionally.

Mr. FRED WALSH—I will withdraw them. Members on both sides of the House often interject, and if they cannot take what is coming to them that is a reflection on them, though I am not referring to the member for Mitcham now. The member for Torrens said the Government retained office here because the people did not like the objective of the Labor Party. Like the member for Victoria, I ask how the Labor Party, whose aims and objectives are the same all over Australia, is today governing in five States if the people do not like its objectives? The majority of people voted for Labor candidates at the last Senate elections here. That proves they accept Labor's principles and that they prefer them to those of the Liberal and Country Party. The Federal Liberal Government is now making frantic efforts to woo the people, having in mind next year's House of Representatives' elections. However, it will have to grant many more concessions than those contained in its Budget before having any hope of defeating Labor next year. The member for Torrens referred to the 1921 Brisbane conference, at which the present objectives of the Labor Party were formulated. He said:—

South Australians are not unmindful of what occurred at the Brisbane Triennial Conference of the Labor Party, on October 12, 1921, when militant industrialists and the I.W.W., singing the *Red Flag*, substituted a new objective for that already existing.

That conference was held 32 years ago. I believe the member for Torrens is now 53, and I doubt whether he had a vote at the State elections at that time. I cannot imagine that he took much interest in politics then, seeing he took so long to stand for Parliament. His next remarks were aimed at trying to associate the Labor Party with the Communist Party. He knows little about the Labor Party or the Communist Party. I will give a garden party if any member has ever heard a Communist singing the *Red Flag*. Communists do not like the words or the tune. They sing the *Internationale*. However, the *Red Flag* was sung in the early days of the Labor Party, and it was certainly a rousing working class song. Then

the member for Torrens referred to the late Mr. Theodore, who was at the Brisbane conference. Mr. Travers stated:—

The late Mr. Theodore foresaw the reaction of the people, for he said, "If the conference carries a socialistic objective it is going to be the end of the Labor movement. It will no longer be the Labor movement of Australia. Why not call it the Communist Party? Is there any difference in the objective and the policy of the Communists?"

There were hardly any Communists in existence in those days. That was about the time the Communist Party was created.

Mr. Shannon—No, it was created in 1917.

Mr. FRED WALSH—That was the Bolshevik Party. The Communist Party was created later. Perhaps if the Russians had stuck to the Bolshevik Party they would be better off than they are today. What proof have we that Mr. Theodore said all this? The member for Torrens did not quote from anything. Anyhow, Mr. Theodore was no authority. He exploited the Labor movement and got into power on the back of it. I do not doubt that Mr. Theodore did a good job in the war years as head of the Allied Works Council, but I hate to associate him in his later life with the Labor Party, because he had no affinity with it. He sacrificed its principles.

Mr. Brookman—What about in 1921?

Mr. FRED WALSH—At that time he was a prominent member of the Queensland Government, but even if he passed the remarks attributed to him by the member for Torrens that is no more advantageous to Mr. Travers' argument, because time has proved how wrong he was. The Labor Party has been in office

in every State since that time; in fact, for 30 years in Queensland. The Australian Labor Party has an objective. The Government Party does not possess one. Every movement should have an objective. The official interpretation of the Labor Party's objective in regard to the socialization of industry, production, distribution and exchange is—

The Australian Labor Party proposes socialization or social control of industry and the means of production, distribution and exchange, such socialization or social control to be achieved to the extent necessary to eliminate exploitation and other anti-social features of industry and anti-social features of the processes of production, distribution and exchange, in accordance with the Principles of Action, Methods, and Progressive Reforms set out in the Federal platform of the A.L.P.

Members should absorb that before unduly criticizing the Labor Party. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted and debate adjourned.

#### DOG FENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from Legislative Council without amendment.

#### AGENT-GENERAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

#### LANDLORD AND TENANT (CONTROL OF RENTS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Committee's report adopted.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.44 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, October 1, at 2 p.m.