

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, July 31, 1957.

The SPEAKER (Hon. B. H. Teusner) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.**NORTHERN DISTRICTS WATER SUPPLY.**

Mr. HEASLIP—This year there has been no intake into the northern reservoirs, namely, Bundaleer, Beetaloo, and Baroota. During the past few years the supplies in these reservoirs have been supplementing the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline. I understand that at present Murray water is being pumped into the Bundaleer reservoir. Can the

Minister of Works say what will be the effect on the reticulation of the areas served by these reservoirs in the event of there being no intake there?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—I cannot predict what would happen; I can only give the honourable member details of the present water supply and what we are doing in relation thereto. If no further intakes occur it may be necessary later to take restrictive measures, but, according to a report supplied by the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the present position is as follows:—

This winter, as yet, there have been no appreciable intakes into the three main reservoirs supplying the northern portion of the State and the quantities stored in them compared with the same time last year are as follows:—

Reservoir.	Capacity. Gall.	Stored 29/7/56. Gall.	Stored 29/7/57. Gall.
Beetaloo	819,000,000	353,300,000	533,500,000
Bundaleer	1,401,500,000	1,378,600,000	523,900,000
Baroota	1,371,400,000	1,191,400,000	774,000,000

The position in the Beetaloo and Baroota reservoirs is fairly satisfactory but the storage of a little more than 500,000,000 gallons in the Bundaleer reservoir will not be sufficient to meet full summer requirements of the district it supplies plus the northern portion of the Yorke Peninsula scheme. Since the first week of this month, River Murray water from the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline to the extent of a little more than 40,000,000gall. per week has been fed to the Bundaleer reservoir. Unless an appreciable intake is received, River Murray water will continue to be pumped into this reservoir and on present indications, sufficient should be available by the middle of October to almost meet summer requirements with the aid of the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline. As to the summer requirements from the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline, that will depend largely on seasonal conditions from now on. I can give no further predictions than are contained in the report.

DEBT COLLECTING AGENCIES.

Mr. LOVEDAY—About July 23 two men, who were alleged to be partners in a debt collecting agency, were charged with fraudulent conversion. I understand that a letter dated June 12 from people who had had dealings with this agency and who had not been able to get money due to them from the agency, was addressed to the Premier requesting him to take notice of the fact and consider the expediency of legislation for the compulsory registration of debt collecting agencies, similar to the registration of land agents. Can the Premier say whether he will be introducing such legislation this session?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have received a report on the matter, but it has not yet been considered by Cabinet.

SMOKING IN FOOD SHOPS.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—Will the Premier have the suggestions made by Dr. Poynton regarding the prohibition of smoking in food shops examined in the interests of health?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have received no report from the health authorities that there is any more serious disability in regard to smoking in food shops than in any other shop, but will have the matter examined and advise the honourable member.

ARCHITECT-IN-CHIEF'S FACTORY.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Last year the Public Works Standing Committee recommended that the erection of a new factory for the Architect-in-Chief's Department at Netley be proceeded with. I am concerned about the interests of the employees involved, who are also perturbed on the question of their housing conditions, which in some instances might have to be changed, apart from the fact that the department can become more efficient if the men are working under more modern conditions, as they will be in the new factory. Can the Minister of Works say when the work is likely to be put in hand?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—The Treasurer will be introducing the Loan Estimates within a few days and it will contain particulars of works to be undertaken.

BARLEY STORAGE.

Mr. GOLDNEY—Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of June 27 as to the result of the experiment carried out in the bulk storage of barley in South Australia?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I have now received the following report from the general manager of the Australian Barley Board:—

The board decided early in the 1955-56 season to establish bulk silos at Port Adelaide, Wynarka and Owen, to make experiments in the keeping qualities of barley stored in bulk. The supply of these silos and their erection was delayed to the extent that they were not available to take deliveries of barley direct from growers' farms for the purpose of experimentation, and the first barley was not stored in them until late in January, 1956. The experiments conducted in the 1955-56 season were regarded more or less as a pilot run, and the results gained from that season were inconclusive. However, in the current season, namely 1956-57, barley was put in all three silos which came direct from growers' deliveries, and it is not expected that conclusive results will be arrived at until towards the end of 1957. The procedure adopted is to extract fortnightly samples of the barley at two-foot levels in the silo for the purpose of taking moisture, temperature and germination tests. It can be stated that the behaviour of the barley in all silos up to the present time has not been abnormal.

MARKETS CLAUSES ACT.

Mr. BYWATERS—Does the Government intend to bring down further amendments to the Markets Clauses Act this session? Does it intend to review the whole of the Act in view of the fact that it was originated in 1870?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—It is true that the Act is very old, but I point out that amendments to the Act were made last year, and as far as I know no further amendments are proposed.

SUBSTITUTION OF BUSES FOR TRAMS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—My question arises out of questions asked yesterday concerning the Tramways Trust's programme of changing over from trams to buses. I noticed in the Melbourne newspaper article to which the Premier referred that Mr. Risson, the head of the tramways board in Melbourne, said that it is questionable in that city whether it is more economical to run diesel buses or electric trolley buses. I find trolley buses far more comfortable, and I ask whether the Tramways Trust has recently considered substituting not diesel buses but electric trolley buses for trams in Adelaide.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will get the honourable member a report on that topic.

WHIPPING OF JUVENILES.

Mr. HUTCHENS—According to press reports, in the Port Adelaide court recently two boys were ordered a whipping under section 308 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, and I understand from reading that section that the sheriff may with the approval of the Governor, determine the type of instrument to be used. I ask the Premier, as Acting Chief Secretary, has this order been carried out and can he say what instrument was used?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I cannot inform the honourable member whether the order has been carried out, but I do not think it has. On the advice of the Crown Solicitor, if the Government carried out that order it would have to declare a certain type of flogging instrument. As one of the boys was only 12 years old—the other was somewhat older—the Government had some doubt whether, if those boys had been tried in the Children's Court, they would have been ordered that punishment. The Government decided that the Attorney-General should investigate the matter and see whether it was advisable to carry out that type of punishment on such young children. We do not desire to make our reformatories a place where children are hardened, but, if possible, places where children will be encouraged to behave better instead of absorbing the criminal atmosphere. I have no recent knowledge of the matter so I speak with a little diffidence on the conclusions the Attorney-General came to in his discussion with the Crown Law Office and the magistrate concerned, but I fancy the decision was that no declaration should be made.

NORTH ADELAIDE RAILWAY CROSSING.

Mr. COUMBE—Last session I asked that consideration be given to the introduction of automatic crossing gates at the North Adelaide railway station, but without success. This is one of the few existing railway stations which has manually operated gates. A terrific amount of traffic uses that crossing, and undue hold-ups occur, especially with the new increased service to Elizabeth, Gawler and places further north. Will the Minister ask his colleague, the Minister of Railways, to examine this question with a view to providing automatic gates at this crossing?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—I will bring down a reply as soon as possible.

SCHOOL DENTAL SERVICES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—When school children require dental treatment, is it the policy of the Government to recommend that they go to the dental hospital, or is there any means test applied to decide whether parents must send them to a dentist in the normal way?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The honourable member's question involves some detail and I am not quite sure of the answer. The Government has recently extended the dental services for children in outback areas so that the school dental authorities can give treatment where no alternative services are provided. I am not conversant with the procedure followed by schools generally in this matter, and I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

FISHING RESEARCH.

Mr. CORCORAN—I understand that in Victoria, which has a smaller fishing catch than South Australia, there are 100 people employed in the Fisheries and Game Department, 24 of whom are engaged on research work. In addition, Victoria has the advantage of research work carried out in that State by the C.S.I.R.O. Can the Minister of Agriculture say why no research work whatsoever, as far as I know, is carried out in South Australia when it is so urgently needed?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I am unable to comment on the composition of the staff of the Fisheries Department in Victoria, but I suggest that the work done by any department does not depend entirely on the number of people employed. I also point out that the returns indicate that the catch of fish in South Australia continues to increase.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—In Victoria it has decreased.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—It may have, but the facts clearly show that the catch in South Australia continues to increase. According to the newsletter published recently by the S.A. Fishermen's Co-operative Society, almost every important fishing port in S.A. recorded a record year, despite press reports from time to time that create the impression that the industry is suffering because widespread research has not been carried on. I am unable to agree that the industry is suffering in any respect. Year after year we are producing more and our various ports are vying for the honour of having the highest production. The department has undertaken research in a limited way during recent years. We have a good boat for the purpose and, except when there has been a

staff shortage, it has been used on that work. The Chief Inspector recently advised me of the work he proposed to do, particularly new that Cabinet has approved the appointment of one or two additional officers to expedite the work. He proposes to undertake research into several matters including the migration, distribution and growth rate of crayfish and the distribution and extent of sardines or pilchards. We are particularly interested in the latter because of our requirement of live bait for tuna fishing. Experiments will be undertaken in connection with prawn fishing; the plankton content of certain waters; tuna population and the chemical analyses of seawater fish. The department has recently secured from the Queensland Department of Fisheries a prawn net for experimental purposes in South Australian waters. In addition the Commonwealth has announced that it will provide in our southern coastal waters a valuable vessel, costing about £250,000, which will be engaged in trawling experiments in the Great Australian Bight, so I think it is fair to say that the research programme will be furthered and pushed forward in the immediate future.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT.

Mr. LOVEDAY—The Minister of Works advised the Eyre Peninsula Local Government Conference of 1955 through the late Hon. A. W. Christian that when the Local Government Act next came up for amendment an amendment would be included by the Government increasing the borrowing powers of councils and other local governing bodies. Can the Minister say whether such an amendment is included among the amendments to be brought forward this session and, if not, will one be included?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—The Act is receiving Cabinet's consideration at present. I am not now Minister of Local Government and am not aware of all the contents of the proposed Bill, but will see that this question is considered.

RABBIT BURROW DESTRUCTION.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Earlier this session I asked the Minister of Lands a question relating to amendments to the Vermin Act to provide for the compulsory ripping of rabbit burrows. Has further consideration been given to this matter by Cabinet, and has it been decided to introduce a Bill this session?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—It has been considered by Cabinet and deferred, but will be considered again next Monday.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 30. Page 192.)

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray)—Firstly, I congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion. The member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke) went to considerable pains to prepare his speech, and did a creditable job indeed. I think it could be summed up by saying that, as usual, his speech was immaculate. I do not agree with all that he said, but nevertheless I appreciate his sincerity. The member for Eyre (Mr. Bockelberg) also made a worthy contribution from the Government point of view. I believe Mr. Laucke had more grounds to commend the Government than Mr. Bockelberg, who naturally had more complaints to make, but that is quite understandable since most of the present district of Barossa was previously in the Gawler district represented by the present member for Gawler (Mr. John Clark), so many things had been done for the district before. Mr. Laucke was fortunate to follow in Mr. Clark's footsteps. This, of course, was not the privilege of the member for Eyre. I congratulate both these members on their efforts in this debate.

I join with other members in extending my sympathy to the widow and father of our late friend and colleague, Mr. L. R. Heath. We were all shocked at the circumstances that caused his demise, and I know that all members had great respect for him. It was not my privilege to know him very well, but in the short time I knew him I found him to be a very genuine man and very easy to get on with.

A good deal has been said about decentralization by members on both sides. All members have been in favour of it, and that is quite understandable because of the urgent need of such a programme. Members on this side of the House are very sincere in their attitude on this matter. I am not saying that members opposite are not sincere, but they will be given an opportunity to show their sincerity in a motion that will come before the House very soon, and of which notice was given by the Leader of the Opposition today. The Leader, in a very fine address, pointed out the advantage of decentralizing industry in such places as Murray Bridge, Tailem Bend, Port Lincoln and Wallaroo. This subject is nothing new to the Leader, who mentioned it on many occasions long before I came into this House. He has maintained that Labor

believes in decentralization of industry and population, and has been consistent in his remarks, always putting up a good case for it. Mr. Coumbe favours decentralization of industry wherever possible, and, of course, there are many possibilities. He stressed that the placing of most of the population of the State in the metropolitan area would constitute a defence hazard. Mr. Loveday said that atomic warfare should be banned and I agree, but whatever the position we should not have such a crowded metropolitan area, which according to reports will become more crowded. Last night Mr. King spoke a little about decentralization, but in his maiden speech in this House last year he devoted much to this live topic. Last night he said that the population of towns should be about 30,000 so that the necessary amenities could be provided. When speaking on the Address in Reply last year he said:—

Populating means more than adding to the problems and congestion of our capital cities. I would rather see the establishment of a number of smaller towns large enough to be able to afford the amenities now taken for granted by city dwellers, but small enough to afford the pleasures of country life.

Rather than take the water from the river by costly pipe lines to the cities, let us take our industries to the river and build our towns on its banks. If we do not do so, then perhaps other countries whose politics are dictated by their stomachs may wish to take a hand.

For some reason or other he changed his view about the size of towns, but despite that I feel he still believes in decentralization. I found it difficult to reconcile the remarks made by Mr. Hambour for they were confusing and at times contradictory. In answer to Mr. John Clark's interjection about the possibility of more houses being placed along the Murray, Mr. Hambour said:—

Even if that were done, what work could the people apply themselves to? Would they have to get into their Tiger Moths and come to the metropolitan area to work? Members opposite have their heads entirely in the sand. Nobody is more keen on decentralization than I am, but I deprecate the romancing that some members have indulged in. They say that we should build houses on the Murray and that industry will go there. What industry? Members should be more specific. I do not think any member could say that the Government had power to direct industries there. I am sure the Leader of the Opposition would not say that. Later I shall say what should be done regarding decentralization, but my remarks will be on lines entirely different from those of members opposite.

Mr. John Clark—Did he get on to it later?

Mr. BYWATERS—The following statement by him may deal with one of the matters he intended to mention later:—

Water is a big factor in getting people into the country, and it must be taken wherever humanly possible with some degree of economy. I know of specific cases where there would be more people and greater production if water were available.

We already have water available adjacent to the River Murray yet there is still a dearth of industries. On the one hand he says that people would have to get into their Tiger Moths and come down to Adelaide, and on the other that if water were available they would go to the country anyway.

Mr. Hambour—Didn't I advocate a cannery?

Mr. BYWATERS—The honourable member did and I agree with him, but I could go further, as I will later. He went on to say that we should be more specific, so I shall endeavour to be specific. He accuses members on this side of having their heads in the sand. I do not fancy putting my head in the sand; I feel there are better places for it. I realize that to be specific I must quote illustrations, but one of the difficulties that all country members face is that it is very rarely that they know when an industry is interested in coming to South Australia, or even to Australia. I recall that during last session the honourable member, and I also, asked if it would be possible for information to be given to members so that they could put their cases before the leaders of industries contemplating coming to South Australia, but the Premier told us that this would not be possible because these people did not want their business divulged. I disagree with him there because I feel that members could be sworn to secrecy so that the information would not be divulged, but it would give the members an opportunity to state what possibilities their districts had.

Quite inadvertently I heard that an overseas firm was interested in coming to Australia and, in fact, to South Australia, which is commendable. I went to a good deal of research to get the evidence on what they required and to find out the advantages of Murray Bridge for the industry in question. I received a very appreciative reply from the firm which said that at a later date it would contact me and take the matter up further. During my stay in Sydney I went to the Public Relations Officer interested in this firm. He received me very graciously, listened attentively to the points I made and agreed that we had

some very good arguments in favour of placing industries along the Murray River. Incidentally, this is a heavy industry and one I feel would be quite suitable for Murray Bridge or thereabouts. One other thing I was told was that others had naturally heard that this firm was interested in coming to Australia and that they had put in their claims. One of these claims has been made by the Housing Trust officer for Elizabeth, Mr. Phillips. I commend him for it because that is his job; he is a very efficient Housing Trust officer and I daresay he put forward a very good case. I am only sorry that Mr. Phillips is not in the same position in relation to country areas so that he could put up the case for country districts. Nevertheless, it shows that the town of Elizabeth, or the country adjacent to the city, is being placed before these industries very forcibly in order to encourage them to go there rather than to the country.

Mr. Jenkins—Where did the firm eventually go?

Mr. BYWATERS—It has not gone anywhere yet and, as it is still negotiating with the Federal Government, we hope it will come to Murray Bridge. It has been said we cannot direct industry to go to country towns, and I agree; but industry should be encouraged and the facts placed before interested firms so that they will see the potentialities of the various districts. Members should be able to put the claims for their districts, but at present it is the other way around: a concerted effort is being made to sell the Adelaide Plains, to the detriment of our country areas.

Every day on the Adelaide-Melbourne highway we see heavy transports bringing raw materials and component parts from the eastern States, and on the return journey we see the finished products from Adelaide factories being taken to eastern States' markets. Indeed, the number of motor bodies transported through Murray Bridge to Melbourne and Sydney would run into hundreds daily. I believe that the motor body building industry should have been encouraged to establish a plant at Murray Bridge as this would have eliminated the steep lift over the Adelaide hills on a road that is gradually becoming more and more congested.

The people of Murray Bridge have not had their heads in the sand; they have been awake to the position for some time. Indeed, before I became a member they formed the Murray Bridge Industrial Development Committee to collate evidence and to provide facts and figures for industries interested in establishing

plants in South Australia, and they are to be commended for the work they have done. They have gone to no end of bother to prepare useful information for any one interested in establishing industries. They even went as a deputation to the Premier for assistance, but he said it was not possible to establish industries in a place like Murray Bridge because that town had no raw materials, although it had an ideal shopping centre. Although I agree with the latter statement, I believe it has more than that. The deputation did not get very far with the Premier, but in answer to his statement that there were no raw materials in the area, I ask him where are the raw materials on the Adelaide Plains. Indeed, we see the raw materials being transported over Princes Highway through Murray Bridge to Adelaide.

Mr. Loveday—There are raw materials at Iron Knob, yet we have no steel works at Whyalla.

Mr. BYWATERS—True; those raw materials are taken to the eastern States and brought back as a processed product to make ships at Whyalla. I do not put my case for Murray Bridge merely for political reasons, for we frequently hear comments from all sections of the community there as to when industries will come to the area. Indeed, the mayor of Murray Bridge (Mr. E. W. Doecke) recently wrote the following letter to the *Advertiser*:—

Our State Government is doing much for the development of secondary industries and the extension of the metropolitan area and its satellites, but whether the policy of expansion is conducted to the best advantage for the future is questionable. Frequently the expansion of Elizabeth is brought before us. But is the advancement what it should be? Elizabeth, as most of us know, is an extension of the city of Adelaide and is situated on flat fertile farming lands, in winter wet, water-logged and sticky, and in summer a hot, red, dusty area with a limited supply of water.

We also have in our State one of the world's mightiest rivers a distance of about 52 miles by road and 37 miles by air from our capital. On the banks of this stream and in its close proximity are many acres of naturally well-drained land which is not so productive but very suitable for home and factory sites. Also there are the river flats, considered some of the highest producing grazing land in the world, producing millions of gallons of fresh milk and thousands of pounds of beef and veal in normal times. The irrigated slopes of this waterway produce the best fruit and vegetables in our State.

For home builders in this river area there is an endless supply of building stone and water. On this river there are already two

ideally situated towns, Murray Bridge, and Tailem Bend. Let us ask what is real progress and common sense:

- (1) A large capital and its satellite which depends on the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline and the metropolitan reservoirs which cost millions of pounds and which will be inefficient in another generation; or
- (2) A river city which has natural, endless supplies of water, milk, meat, fresh fruit and vegetables and is strategically well situated and has excellent home and industrial sites.

While our Government has done much good work in recent years, I feel that in future generations it will be severely and justly criticized for its lack of progressive foresight.

Apparently other people thought the same as the mayor did and many similar letters were written, some by people in the metropolitan area. Later the *Advertiser* contained a sub-leader that agreed with the mayor's statement, but I disagree with its contention that the mayor's idea was new and too late because of the establishment of Elizabeth. I do not suggest that the growth of Elizabeth be curtailed, because it is now an established town and the member for Gawler (Mr. John Clark) has done much to assist its progress, but I protest against any expansion of the present set-up. After the sub-leader, I wrote to the newspaper saying that for many years the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. O'Halloran) had painted a picture of industries along the River Murray, therefore the idea was not new. Soon afterwards the *Advertiser* sent a reporter (Mr. Bannister) to Murray Bridge and he made an extensive inquiry and wrote two fine articles on the possibilities of the town. One article, headed "Murray Bridge Claim to Right to New Industries," states:—

The satellite town of Elizabeth is a sore point with the citizens of Murray Bridge. They claim their centre has many more natural advantages than can ever be made at Elizabeth. Their enthusiasm for industrial expansion of the river town is staggering. It is above civic pride and above politics. Leading the crusade is the mayor of Murray Bridge (Mr. E. W. Doecke).

"Just look what we have to offer," he said. "We have ample water from the Murray, a road and railway link between two capital cities, endless supplies of milk, meat, fresh fruit and vegetables, unlimited land and materials for building, and well drained fertile soil. Why not bring industry and population to these natural advantages instead of spending enormous amounts of money taking them to Adelaide?"

Mr. Hambidge, representing the Rotary Club, said that the citizens of Murray Bridge resented the statement that the town was simply a nice shopping centre in a rural

district, and I do not blame him for saying that. Others went on to refer to the matter. We had representatives from the Junior Chamber of Commerce, Industries Development Committee, corporation councillors, and many well-known identities. During the afternoon Mr. Bannister sought the opinions of people in the street. He met girls leaving the high school and one, Janice Cailles, aged 15, a prefect at the school, seemed a little worried about the future. She said:—

When I leave school I shall try to find an office job in the town. However, only a few of the girls who leave school each year can do this. Most of them have to find work in Adelaide.

Other students supported her.

Mr. O'Halloran—That is the unfortunate story of any large country town.

Mr. BYWATERS—That is true. It is causing concern and worry to parents of students who have undertaken secondary education, and it happens in all country areas. The position is that the parents have to choose one of two alternatives. The first is to send their children to the metropolitan area, and they may be fortunate in having friends to board with. However, that is not always the position and they may have to send them to people of whom they have no prior knowledge. In this way the children are separated from parental control and often find themselves placed in a cheap boarding house, because that is all they can afford, and that may be undesirable for them. Sometimes the parents sell their home to go to the city, thereby adding to congestion in the metropolitan area, and reducing the population in their country town. Aged retired people sometimes go to live in their house. One welcomes them, but it should not be to the detriment of young couples who have to leave the town and take the future population with them to continue their education.

If this continues, more of our country towns will have fewer people than 500, as was mentioned by Mr. John Clark yesterday. At the Gawler centenary celebrations the Premier predicted that a million people would one day live on the Adelaide Plains, and that is why I have so much to say about decentralization. I protest strongly against the possibility mentioned, because there are so many country areas where it would be more suitable for the people to go. It is expected that there will be a big increase in the State's population and that in another 10 years it will possibly be doubled. If we continue to extend in the

metropolitan area we shall use up some of our best land for home building, when there are other places far more suitable.

Mr. Bannister made another good suggestion when he said that Murray Bridge could be the centre for the South-East. In his article he said:—

After a visit to Murray Bridge and the country around this week, I have come to the conclusion that the case for big expansion put up by its citizens has much to recommend it. The natural advantages of their district are so abundant that it seems sheer waste for them not to be used.

With the South-East of the State developing so rapidly, we are going to need a large new centre. Why not establish Murray Bridge as this centre and save the long drag over the hills to Adelaide? A comparison would be the service Geelong supplies to the Western Districts of Victoria. If South Australia does not supply such a centre we are in danger of losing the trade of the South-East to Victoria. That is a very good point and one which I had not considered before. It is logical that a big centre there would provide a break between Adelaide and the South-East and would be quite a useful centre to the people from that area. Either we extend the already congested metropolitan area or we develop country centres. The metropolitan area could be extended to Gawler and possibly far beyond, possibly reaching to Virginia, Two Wells or Roseworthy. On the other hand, we could extend to other areas which would be far more suitable from an economic point of view. On the Adelaide Plains we have some of the best agricultural land with an assured rainfall, and if these areas are built on the traffic hazard on the already overtaxed highway to Gawler will be increased.

There will also arise the need for more water, and this could involve a duplication or even a triplication of the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline. As the Leader of the Opposition has said, it might require at least two more of these water mains, which at today's cost would involve more than £20,000,000. The alternative is between Renmark and Tailem Bend. All along the Murray River there are admirable sites for industry, there being abundance of water and good cheap land—far cheaper than that on the Adelaide plains. Murray Bridge and Tailem Bend have the advantage of being on the main road and railway between Adelaide and Melbourne.

The Leader of the Opposition has indicated that he will seek the appointment of a Royal Commission to consider the question of decentralization. I hope that it will be agreed to because we should plan for the future. I am

pleased to receive every second month a copy of a journal issued by the Central Planning Authority of Victoria, which considers various questions affecting not only industry but matters of general importance to the State. This body is doing yeoman work, and could well be emulated here.

A suggestion has been made by the Murray Valley Development League for a port at or near the Murray mouth. Mr. Ulrich Ellis has gone to great pains to bring down a full report on the proposal. He has had a diagram drawn to show the proposed location and extent of the port, and the scheme has been examined by competent engineers, who say that such a port is feasible. They have conferred with Holland's ambassador, who stated that the port was quite within the realms of possibility and would be a great asset to the State. Its establishment would encourage industries to commence along the river.

It has often been said that industries are attracted to the metropolitan area because they are near shipping facilities there, and if that is so we have a good argument in favour of establishing a port at the Murray mouth. Various estimates have been given of the cost of such a scheme, and in reply to a question from me the Premier on one occasion quoted an estimate of £15,000,000. Whether that is authentic or his own supposition I am not in a position to say, but the scheme should at least be investigated. The Murray Valley Development League does not say we should just go ahead with it or that the State should meet the whole cost, but asks the Premier to consider the possibilities and consult the Federal authorities on its merits. The following resolution was passed at Murray Bridge at a meeting of the Murray Valley Development League held on May 17:—

That, fully realizing the magnitude and long range nature of the issues involved, the Premier be asked to obtain—or to request the Commonwealth to obtain—a preliminary report on the League's Murray port proposals, say, through the good offices of the Netherlands Government—and that it be pointed out to the Premier that the Netherlands Consul, Mr. G. J. A. Veling, who visited the Murray mouth area and showed films to the League's conference of May, 1956, is now in Holland, and would pursue inquiries on the spot if requested through official channels to do so.

The report and plan to which I have referred are available in the Parliamentary Library but, briefly, the proposal is to have a port near the Murray mouth with an inner and an outer basin so that ships can turn around.

On one side would be a stone and earth wall that would act as a wharf for sea-going vessels, and on the other side diesel barges would be accommodated that would ply to and from various centres. Such a port would serve not only the river area, but also a vast area around Coonalpyn Plains, which has a big potential. The league asks that the South Australian and Federal Governments go into the whole scheme to see whether it is practicable and, if not, to give the reasons. It should not be wiped off without due consideration. We often have to plug away on various schemes before people will listen, so it may be some time before people will listen to the merits of this scheme, but I think that it will receive consideration at some time, and I hope it will not be far distant.

Several areas in my district are without a reticulated water supply. Last year we had a disastrous flood, yet people on both sides of the river are crying out for water supplies. Of course, this does not apply to my district only, for in the last few days numerous questions have been asked concerning water supplies. We have been told that 95 per cent of our population have water on tap. Notwithstanding that 65 per cent of the people live in the metropolitan area I still find it hard to believe that 95 per cent of South Australians have water. If that is the position I say that a large percentage of those without water live in my district. Yesterday the member for Stirling (Mr. Jenkins) asked the Minister to consider water schemes in his district. He said that he and I were interested in a scheme to supply water to the Bremer Valley. I commend this scheme to the Minister because it would have far-reaching results not only immediately through the collection of additional water rates but through the opening up of much fertile land. The Bremer Valley is one of the most fertile areas on the other side of the ranges and should be developed to the utmost. It has been proposed that water be supplied from the Mannum-Adelaide main, which runs through the area. There is already a tank at Tungkillo, and as water will be pumped to that tank on its way to Adelaide there will be no additional cost incurred in storing water that could be reticulated easily down the Bremer Valley. Mains could be extended to serve Callington, Strathalbyn, and other districts, even as far as Victor Harbour if necessary. From what the member for Stirling said yesterday, it seems that water may have to be taken as far as Victor Harbour in the future.

Callington is a township of about 100 people. It was at one time a prosperous town because of its copper mines, but they have been closed and it is now more or less a place of retired people. Of course, it has some business people and others who work in nearby localities, but recently, through the efforts of the progress committee, it was supplied with power by the Electricity Trust. The residents were jubilant at getting electric power so that they could enjoy one of the amenities enjoyed by people in the city.

As a result, there were numerous inquiries for blocks of land on which people could build homes, but these ceased when they found out that there was no water in the area. They will not go there because of the shortage of water. The hotelkeeper, the baker, and many other townspeople at Callington have to cart water for domestic purposes throughout the summer. This has been a very dry year, and water for domestic use is still being carted. If water were laid on I believe quite a number of people would shift to that area, because it is in such a lovely setting with hills on both sides. It is an ideal spot for people who are in semi-retirement and desire to have a little interest in land. I would like to see that water scheme become a possibility so that they could be provided with such a long needed requirement.

The member for Stirling (Mr. Jenkins), raised a good point yesterday when he mentioned the barrages and the possibilities for tourists. He said that people could come up the bitumen road through to Strathalbyn and to Victor Harbour if a few miles of road were put down. I would like to see a bitumen road from the main Adelaide-Melbourne road through Callington to Strathalbyn. I know people come one way and go back the other and enjoy the trip, but unfortunately the roads are very bad and a number who make the trip the first time change their minds about going over them again. If they were sealed, it would be an added advantage for people in my electorate who desire to go to Victor Harbour for the day or for holidays. Apart from that, it would open up a good deal of the land in that area.

The Town Planner, on a recent visit to Murray Bridge, impressed me greatly by the amount of knowledge he had acquired in his short time in South Australia. He seemed to have his finger on most problems relating to town planning, and he had some very good ideas in relation to planning for the future, one of which was decentralization of popula-

tion. He told me that applications were coming in almost weekly for the subdivision of land in what is now vegetable growing areas. As a consequence, vegetable growers are moving out into areas such as Virginia and the vicinity of Murray Bridge. He pointed out the potentialities of vegetable growing along the River Murray, and I agree with him wholeheartedly in that respect. I have seen some of the best vegetables possible grown on that sandy country adjacent to the river.

Murray Bridge has another quite big industry in glass house growing. About 300,000 half-cases go away annually from that area to the eastern States, and that does not include cucumbers, which are also grown. Some people think that system uses too much water and results in a drag on the domestic supply. However, I can assure them that that is not so, because people who grow under glass do so when there is not such a big drag on the domestic supply; the growing season is mostly from this time of the year until November. Even if it did, I believe the tomato and gherkin growing industry can grow to such an extent that consideration should be given to putting in a bigger water scheme, because this industry is a useful asset to Murray Bridge and other places along the river.

In answer to a question of mine the other day the Minister of Works informed me that the pumping cost from Mannum to Adelaide was a little over 8d. a thousand gallons and in the township of Murray Bridge it amounted to 1s. 1d. a thousand gallons. That is quite understandable, because the cost of electricity is cheaper to a big unit as at Mannum than it is at Murray Bridge. All things being equal, it is only commonsense to say that Murray Bridge could pump water more cheaply than what it costs to make these lifts over the hills. The Electricity Trust, by supplying a large quantity of power to the Mannum pipeline, can charge a cheaper rate. I do not think that should come into it; it is all one department, whether it be Murray Bridge, Mannum or anywhere else, and the same rate should apply to all users. I maintain that then it would cost less to pump water around Murray Bridge and some of the low lying areas adjacent to the River Murray.

I wish to refer briefly to river crossings by ferry, because I feel that an anomaly exists in that regard. Primary producers use the ferries without charge, but people in industry or other business have to pay. During the flood period people from Tailem Bend who crossed

the river to help fight the flood were charged a fare, but when residents of Jervois travelled to the Tailem Bend side, as primary producers they crossed free of charge. Something should be done to provide free transport for people residing in the area who find it necessary to cross the river to their place of employment. I would like to hear the opinion of other river members with regard to this anomaly.

The Premier claimed yesterday that tram fares were dearer in Sydney than in Adelaide. He may have been looking at it from the overall picture and I cannot contradict him there, but when I was in Sydney recently I travelled on the trams and paid 3d. for what seemed quite a long section, whereas it is 6d. for one section in Adelaide. It seemed to be working very well in Sydney, because there were two conductors on every tram and they appeared to be kept at quite a high pressure to do their work. Wherever we entered the trams we found them well patronized, and I think that was possibly because it was only 3d. for a city section.

The member for Chaffey (Mr. King) referred to the Murray River flood and commended the Government for all it did. Most of what he said was true and, in the main, the Government did everything possible: any deficiencies can be attributed to a lack of experience of such flood conditions. I pay a particular tribute to Mr. Sims, the secretary of the Flood Relief Committee. He was brought back from retirement for this work and has ably carried it out. At all times he has been most co-operative and has gone to no end of trouble to assist. He has expedited the allocation of the funds entrusted to him—funds donated by the people of South Australia. Mr. King said that sufficient money was made available to some families to enable them to pay a deposit on new homes. I dispute that. The maximum amount paid out to any family which lost its home was £300, and that is by no means sufficient for a deposit on a new home. The Murray people have big hearts and are tackling the problem. Many are building one or two rooms to live in until they secure sufficient finance to build further. I support the motion.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide)—Once more the master has spoken. Suddenly, when there is an opportunity to speak on behalf of the people they represent in replying to the Speech with which His Excellency was pleased to open Parliament, Government members remain silent. They have an opportunity to thank

Sir Thomas for his review of the past 12 months and for his promises for the next 12 months as contained in the Governor's Speech, which he wrote, but seemingly they have developed lockjaw or paralysis of the tongue. Last year the new Government members criticized the Government and our prophecy that they would toe the line within 12 months has proved correct. Last year the member for Light (Mr. Hambour) sought the appointment of a select committee from this House to inquire into all Government undertakings and all departments of the Public Service. I well remember interjecting that within 12 months he would see the light and that his master would have him on the mat. That has obviously happened. In reply to a recent interjection of mine as to whether he supported the Government he said "Entirely." Last year I appreciated his criticism of the Government but warned him that he would be brought to heel. He has spoken to this motion, but has entirely supported the Government. Why has the master told the remainder of his supporters to shut up?

Mr. Jenkins—Speak up; we can't hear you!

Mr. LAWN—The honourable member can hear me, but we have not heard him. He apparently has developed lockjaw.

Mr. Jenkins—I spoke yesterday.

Mr. LAWN—I apologize. What I meant to say was that the member for Stirling spoke but did not say anything.

Mr. Coumbe—You talk a lot, but say nothing.

Mr. LAWN—The only time we hear Government members is when they interject. Why don't they get up and speak? Don't they think this motion is worth supporting? I certainly don't: I oppose it. I am not so much opposed to clauses 2 and 3 of the Address in Reply, but oppose clause 1, which states:—

We, the members of the House of Assembly, express our thanks for the Speech with which Your Excellency was pleased to open Parliament.

What have we to express our thanks for? There is no mention in the Speech of industrial legislation. There is a suggestion that the Government may introduce a Bill to provide for long service leave. I would not be surprised if the Government did so before the Wallaroo by-election on August 31, but that is all it will do by then in the matter. This State has the least progressive industrial legislation of the Commonwealth. On one occasion when the Premier introduced legislation to provide increased compensation for workers

and I told him he proposed less than the Australian average he threatened to withdraw the Bill. The Premier from time to time commends South Australian workmen for being the highest producers in the Commonwealth, yet they receive the worst deal in industrial legislation. There are other types of legislation missing from His Excellency's Speech. I have nothing to support in the speech prepared by Sir Thomas Playford. I have wondered why Government members have been told to keep out of this debate.

Mr. Hambour—Who said they have?

Mr. LAWN—I say that. The honourable member has spoken, and possibly that is the reason why members opposite have been told to keep quiet. They have not the happy knack of studying His Excellency's speech before they get up to speak, and forget that the speech is really the Premier's speech. Members on this side can see the contradictions between what Government members say and what their leader says. We can see the justification from the Premier's point of view when he tells his supporters to keep out of the debate. Possibly the member for Light (Mr. Hambour) might have been one of the reasons for that because, by the time he had spoken, several members of his party had made statements that I know the Premier and the Government were not pleased about. Since he has spoken, members opposite have developed lockjaw. In paragraph 6 His Excellency said:—

In primary production the season of 1956-57 was notable for a number of remarkable records, some of which are these:—A record harvest of grain (73,000,000 bushels).

In the past I have stated what the member for Light has said and he has denied it, and as I always like to be fair and not misrepresent a member, I shall draw attention to what appears in *Hansard*. The Premier had advised the House that there had been a record wheat harvest. When the member for Light was speaking on this debate I asked him whether he approved of selling wheat to Red China. I do not know whether I took him unawares, but I would not think so. He said in reply:—

Yes, and we are also selling wool to that country. The farmers grew less wheat, and this year the wheat harvest is down about 60 million bushels, but I think we shall finish with a surplus of about 30 million bushels.

Although the Premier in his speech said that under his dictatorship there had been a record harvest of grain, one of his supporters said there had been a drop of 60,000,000 bushels. It is no wonder to members on this side that the Premier turns around and says "Shut up and get out of the House."

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—You are giving Commonwealth figures on the one hand and State figures on the other.

Mr. LAWN—Nobody was talking about Commonwealth figures, unless the Premier was.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—You are. You said production has dropped by 60,000,000 bushels, but that is the Commonwealth figure.

Mr. LAWN—I only quoted what the member for Light said. He could easily have said whether he was speaking on Commonwealth or State figures, but he would not know. I have quoted from *Hansard* what he said. Obviously everybody who heard him thought he was talking of State figures, and that proves my point that he is an embarrassment to the Government. The Minister would not have had the opportunity to excuse him—

Mr. Hambour—I do not want to be excused.

Mr. LAWN—The Minister cannot explain the other point I made, that last year Mr. Hambour wanted a select committee to be set up to inquire into all the activities of the State because the Public Service was wasting money. He said that members should do some work instead of amusing themselves. The Minister cannot get him out of that one because he made that statement. This year I asked him—

The SPEAKER—Order! Would the honourable member resume his seat? I ask the honourable member to address himself to the Chair and not to members opposite.

Mr. LAWN—I am sorry, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Hambour—We do not have a straight jacket applied like members opposite; we can speak our minds, but obviously you cannot.

Mr. Jennings—Members opposite have not got minds.

The SPEAKER—Order! There are too many interjections.

Mr. LAWN—I appreciate interjections, Mr. Speaker. I now draw attention to a sad matter—the tragedy that occurred on the Hilton Bridge last Saturday afternoon. Mr. Fred Walsh, who was previously the member for Thebarton, spoke on many occasions over a period of years about this bridge, and asked numerous questions relating to it. I have only represented the section on the western side of the city since March, 1956. In my first speech following the general elections of 1956 I drew attention to this and other bridges on the western approaches to the city. The Government has not done anything about this bridge, which is not considered safe by motorists who

use it, and since this accident the newspapers have made a special investigation into its condition and into the fencing. One would gather that a very careful inspection had been made and photographs were taken. In an article in the *News* of July 29, the police roundsman gave the following information:—

On the northern side over which the car plunged, there are four rusty panels of 5ft. x 3ft. galvanized iron in the remaining 24 panels. Two half-panels are rusty. There are two 2ft. long holes made by rust, and the edges of the gashes tear like cardboard. There is one 6in. long hole. Long and thick splinters of wood come easily away from the railing.

From below could be seen cracks in the concrete foundation. A sagging wire mesh fence over a steep embankment flanked the approach to the bridge. On the southern side of the bridge is a 3½ft. high wire mesh fence with timber uprights. Reinforcement at the bottom has crumbled for 15ft. In the wall beneath the bridge is an inches-wide crack down the entire length of 12ft. In one place the gap is 5in. wide.

Members have made representations previously about the condition of the bridge and if they had been heeded perhaps this last tragedy would not have occurred. I again ask that the representations be noted, as well as the points raised by the *News*. I hope the Government will soon rebuild and widen the bridge. I want now to compare one of the activities of the Housing Trust with that of the State Bank. I have never favoured the building by the trust of homes for sale. In reply to a question on July 23 last the Premier indicated that since 1949-50 the State Bank has assisted 6,440 people to purchase a home; the cost to the bank was £9,288,781, or £1,442 7s. 1d. a house. In the same period the Housing Trust helped 10,883 people to purchase a home at a cost to the trust of £3,993,068, or £366 18s. 2d. a house. The last figure seems to be on the low side, but from inquiries I have made it seems that it is correct. The purchaser pays to the trust a larger deposit than to the bank and the balance of the money has to be obtained from a financial institution, and then, if there is a shortage, the trust grants a second mortgage. This means that people who purchase a home from the trust are able to finance the deal by finding practically all the money themselves or raising it on first mortgage. The bank apparently assists the poorer section of home seekers, whereas the trust aids people who can find practically all the money required. The trust should not sell houses. I prefer to see it concentrate on building homes for rental, allowing the bank to handle houses

for sale. Many people want to purchase a home, and I do not want to discourage that, but it should be done through the bank.

Mr. Quirke—Have you worked out what a person would pay a week in rent and what he would pay in buying a home?

Mr. LAWN—No.

Mr. Quirke—There is not much difference; about 5s. a week.

Mr. LAWN—That is a debatable point. I know a considerable number of pensioners who are finding it well-nigh impossible to pay rates and taxes on their homes. Again, if people own homes close to their work and are transferred elsewhere they have to dispose of them and in many instances do not realize the full value. When rates and taxes are taken into account there is more to be considered than merely the actual weekly payments by a person purchasing a home through the State Bank. Moreover, if a person who had the money to purchase a home were able to get a rental home whilst waiting at least he would be provided with accommodation, whereas now neither the seekers of rental homes or purchase homes are being satisfied.

During the last session the death occurred of one of the visiting magistrates to our gaols and prisons and no-one appeared to know anything about the matter until after the appointment of his successor had been gazetted. I ascertained by question from the Premier that the Government does not advertise such vacancies either in the press or the *Government Gazette*. They are known only to the prison authorities, and the Comptroller of Prisons apparently makes a recommendation to the Government that a certain appointment be made. The Premier said that on the last occasion only one application had been lodged. It appears to me that the whole system is wrong. Why does not the Government announce a vacancy so that any Justice of the Peace who considers he has the necessary experience and is prepared to do the work might apply? All other positions in the Public Service and the Railways Department are advertised and any officer may apply for the vacancy. It is not a happy thought to know that police officers who have had the job of arresting and prosecuting criminals later in life become the magistrates to try them. Inspector Noblet is a case in point, though I make it clear that I am not making any particular reference to him. As a police officer he must have been engaged in the arrests and trial of prisoners, yet when he retired from the Police Force he became a visiting magistrate and tried the very same

people whom he had contacted during his work as a policeman. A number of citizens who by no stretch of imagination can be regarded as supporters of the A.L.P. have made representations to me on this. They are opposed to the whole principle. They feel that whoever has to carry out this work should be above reproach and not an ex-police officer. They also say that applications for the position should be called openly so that all and sundry who desire to do so might apply. The Premier said that the Justices Association has made no representations to him on the matter. They, on the other hand, say that they are an impartial body and should not make representations to the Government. However, as the Premier says they may do so I suggest that they should be invited to submit a panel of names of members of their association who are competent and prepared to carry out this work. It is a non-Party question and I place it before the House and the Government trusting that it will be considered favourably and that when the next vacancy occurs some better procedure will be followed.

I now wish to touch on the lack of oversight and the waste of Government money in regard to Government offices. Last year when the Government purchased Foy and Gibson Building at a cost of about £450,000 I raised the matter by way of question, and have done so again this year. I asked the Chairman of the Public Works Committee if the matter of Government offices was before his committee and whether he could give me any information regarding costs. His reply is recorded at page 28 of *Hansard*, 1956-57. He said that two projects were under consideration, one consisting of three floors of offices with and without parking space on the ground floor, and the other five floors of offices with and without parking space on the ground floor. I am only interested in offices without parking space because that allows a fair comparison to be made with the Foy & Gibson building. Mr. Shannon said that to build three floors with no parking space would cost £210,450 and five floors without parking space £284,680. In reply to a series of questions this year the Treasurer said that the purchase price of the Foy & Gibson building was £452,500, the cost of alterations already effected £140,000, and the estimated cost of alterations yet to be carried out £39,000, making the total cost of that building £631,500. The total cost per 100 square feet of the Foy & Gibson building is therefore about £400 compared with £600 for a 5-storey building

and £700 for a 3-storey building in Victoria Square. As this difference in costs is far outweighed by the other factors in favour of a new building block, it is not necessary to seriously consider the extra £200 per square involved.

Yesterday in reply to my question on notice the Treasurer said the Currie Street school, Martin Building and Richards Building were being vacated by Government office staffs and that the offices adjacent to Victoria Square would be used by other departments. It appears to me that the Government is merely spread-eagling Government offices all over the city and has no plan for their future centralization, whereas there would be some justification for the present transfers if it were intended to build a 5-storey building in Victoria Square to make permanent accommodation available. The Treasurer also said the Government departments were expanding, so in 12 months' time not only will these buildings be overcrowded, but the Government departments will again occupy Richards Building and Martin Building and be looking for more accommodation in the city. The best interests of the Public Service could be served by the centralization of Government offices, and on the score of costs it would be preferable to build a new office block in Victoria Square where it would be easily accessible to the public.

The system adopted by the Playford Government concerning the announcement of increased charges in respect of public utilities must be peculiar to this State, for in other States such announcements are made by the Treasurer when introducing his Budget. A few months ago the South Australian Housing Trust announced an increase in rents; recently the Electricity Trust announced increased charges for the hire of electrical appliances; and about a fortnight ago the Tramways Trust announced an increase in tram and bus fares. No doubt the Railways Department will shortly announce an increase in its fares and I do not know what is to be done about freight rates. None of these increases are mentioned in the Government's Budget for the Government has the happy knack of setting up trusts and boards beyond the jurisdiction of Parliament so that any increases in charges do not have to be inflicted by the Government, whereas a reference to such increases in the Treasurer's Budget Speech would enable Parliament to debate them. That is not possible in this

House because South Australia has a political dictatorship. In this State if the Tramways Trust increases its fares the Government does not get the blame for it does not run the trams and buses.

Mr. O'Halloran—It pays for them.

Mr. LAWN—Yes, we have paid for them time and time again. The Electricity Trust is doing a good job, as is borne out by statements in the Auditor-General's report, but if the trust increased the charge for the hire of its appliances or for power and light, the Government would not get the blame: the increases are imposed by a trust over which Parliament has no control and they are not discussed in Parliament. The same thing applies to rail fares. The recent increase in tram and bus fares will have an impact on the public generally, and a most severe impact on pensioners, who will now experience difficulty in finding the increased fares for a ride to the beach or the city. For several years I have asked the Government to consider granting to pensioners concessional fares on trams and trains under a system similar to that operating in New South Wales where the pensioner is either charged a half-fare or a single fare for a return trip, but the Government has always rejected my request out of hand. I was therefore pleased yesterday when the Treasurer said he would refer the matter to Cabinet. I hope he is not treating this matter as a joke simply because of the Wallaroo by-election in the offing. It should not be treated as a political expedient. After the election I do not want him to come back and say that the Government had considered the matter, but because of the cost the State's economy could not stand it. I will not accept that. On previous occasions when I have asked questions on the matter they have been rejected out of hand, and therefore I was pleased with the response I received yesterday. I hope the Government will concede concession fares to pensioners, whether they travel on trams or buses. This would be greatly appreciated by this section. Members opposite appear to have been stricken with lockjaw, but I hope they will make representations to the Government in support of my request.

I know it is easy to level cheap criticism against the Tramways Trust, but it has its problems, the same as other transport systems. Mr. Tapping questioned whether, if our railways were offered for sale, any organization would attempt to purchase them, especially if

it knew that their charges would be controlled. This would not appeal to private enterprise, as it demands an open go. The Government has closed certain lines, and if private enterprise were in control it would force the users of other lines to pay sufficient to make the project a success, otherwise it would go broke. Higher fares are reflected in the basic wage figures. When the Arbitration Court reviews the basic wage yearly, as it intends to do, it will have to consider cost rises during the previous 12 months. Mr. Bywaters referred to the low tram fares in Sydney compared with those in Adelaide. The court would take that into consideration when assessing the basic wage. This necessarily would have an effect on the economy of the State and also the cost to industry.

I shall quote figures relating to the Tramway Trust's policy of changing from trams to buses. A booklet has been issued by an organization dealing with the various electric traction systems, and it includes figures for all States concerning the revenue and costs of trams and fuel and trolley buses. The figures relate to costs per vehicle mile. For trams the revenue amounted to 61.98 and costs to 78.93, a difference of 16.95. For fuel buses the revenue was 38.49d. and costs 57.10, a difference of 18.61, and for trolley buses the revenue was 51.19 and costs 61.69, a difference of 10.50. These figures disclose a loss per vehicle mile for all systems of 15.88d., and that trolley buses show a smaller loss than any other form of transport handled by the trust, with the trams showing the next smallest loss, the highest loss being on fuel buses. I have consistently opposed the changeover from electric to diesel power. As I said in the House previously, when the change was proposed, we have our own coal supplies at Leigh Creek and can make our own electricity for trams and trolley buses. It will not be long before we will have atomic energy, which will be cheaper still. If the trust is to continue its present policy, we will be dependent on overseas supplies of fuel and rubber for tyres and tubes. The previous claim made by Opposition members is justified. The figures that the Leader of the Opposition quoted proved that the Tramways Trust was wrong when it made an estimate of the money it would need from the Government over a certain period. The figures I have just quoted on the cost of running vehicles also prove that the trust has made a mistake. Recently, I heard a talk over the air about turning on the water tap, and the speaker asked listeners

whether they realized that much planning lay behind a water supply. He claimed to be an opponent of Socialism, yet the supply of water by the Government is Socialism. Paragraph 5 of the Governor's Speech states:—

The Government continues to make its contribution to the progress of the State by attention to power, water, housing, transport and other basic services, and by promoting conditions favourable for development.

That shows that the Government provides services not only for private citizens but also for private enterprise. If an industry wants to establish itself in a particular locality the State sees that houses are built for its employees. For instance, many houses have been built by the Housing Trust in Whyalla. The provision of electric power is one of the principles of Socialism. Paragraph 13 of the Governor's Speech states:—

The Electricity Trust has had another satisfactory year. Sales of electricity are now at the record annual rate of 1,000,000,000 units, producing an income of over £10,000,000. Consumers have increased by 11,000, making a total of 226,000.

I recall that the former member for Burra and the present member for Rocky River said that they opposed Socialism, but when the Adelaide Electric Supply Company Limited was taken over by the Government they asked it to influence the trust to supply power and light to their constituents. One can hardly say that the Electricity Trust undertaking is an example of Socialism, but it is nearer Socialism than the company was. According to the Auditor-General's report the trust has not been a burden upon the taxpayer, because for 1955-56 it showed a surplus of £410,786. The Leigh Creek coalfield showed a surplus of £27,124. If those undertakings had not been under the control of the Government and had not been administered in the interests of consumers many country people would not enjoy the benefit of light and power. Further, consumers would be paying much more for power than they are today. Of course, the surpluses shown by both undertakings would be much greater if run by private enterprise, but this would be achieved at the expense of the consumers.

Mr. Hambour—Do you credit the Playford Government for that?

Mr. LAWN—No. If Labor were in power these undertakings would be under the control of this Parliament, not under a board.

Mr. Hambour—What is wrong with that?

Mr. LAWN—I have already explained that. These undertakings can increase charges to the

consumer without reference to Parliament. In other States charges cannot be increased unless ratified by Parliament, but in South Australia we have a political dictatorship which merely sets up boards and trusts that tell the people that charges will be increased from a certain date. However, Parliament is asked for Loan money, and even grants, to assist undertakings such as the Housing Trust, Electricity Trust and the Tramways Trust.

Paragraph 15 of the Governor's Speech refers to land settlement and development, and this is another State undertaking. The State makes land available for settlers, though I do not know that the scheme is all that could be desired. I would not expect any scheme to work satisfactorily under this Government, and even if Labor were in power it may not meet the wishes of all people, but my point is that people have been settled on the land by the State. Paragraph 16 says that the State is draining large areas of land and making it fit for settlement. Private enterprise does not do such things, but it is quick to collect the benefit of the State's developmental work.

Paragraph 17 deals with the Woods and Forests Department. The Auditor-General's report for 1955-56 drew attention to the fact that the department had a surplus of £305,000 for that year. That does not constitute a drain upon the State by a socialistic undertaking which grows timber and owns sawmills, and then of course there is the subsequent benefit to the State of the cellulose industry. The State is providing timber to private enterprise and its citizens and making a surplus of £305,000 in one year. The Auditor-General pointed out that for the year ended 1954-55 the department contributed £80,000 to general revenue, and for the year ended 1955-56 it contributed £120,000. When the opponents of socialism refer to railways they should bear in mind the point made by the member for Semaphore (Mr. Tapping) that they are rendering a service to the people where private enterprise is not, and secondly that they are not the beginning and end of State socialistic undertakings. Not all Government undertakings are run at a loss, and they render a greater service than one would find under private enterprise.

Before concluding I will give a very good instance of private enterprise compared with State enterprise. I recently visited a fair-sized factory in company with the owner and was conducted through on a tour of inspection. A workman who saw us coming straightened his back and looked at us, and to

my surprise the owner immediately began castigating him. I was quite taken aback, and the workman must have wondered what hit him. I said to the owner, "What did you tell that man just now?", and the reply was, "I told him to hurry and get on with his work." I said, "What right have you to tell him to hurry?", and the owner said, "I pay him to hurry." I asked, "How much do you pay him?", and he replied, "£3 a day." My next question was: "Where do you get the money to pay him?", and the reply was, "I sell products." I said, "Who makes the products?", and the reply was, "He does." I asked "How much worth of products does he turn out daily?" and the owner replied, "£7 10s."

Mr. Shannon—When do we come to the 64-dollar question?

Mr. LAWN—I then said, "The workman is paying you £4 10s. a day for you to tell him to hurry." The owner replied, "Well, I own the machines." Naturally my next question was: "How did you get the machines?", and he said "I sold products to buy them." I then asked him, "Who makes the products?", and the reply was "Shut up! he might hear you." There it is! That is what workmen under private enterprise have to look forward to. The Labor Party has never demanded a public inquiry or a select committee into the ramifications of private enterprise and sweated labour. I have worked in private enterprise and know something about it.

Sir Richard Butler's Liberal Government was the last Government in Australia to introduce legislation for the 44-hour week. Our railway employees left the jurisdiction of the State Industrial Court and went to the Federal Court because that was the only way they could obtain a 44-hour week. Every other State in Australia passed industrial legislation such as one week's sick leave a year, and subsequently one week's annual leave. They improved upon that by passing legislation for a fortnight's annual leave, and finally they provided for long service leave. Only a few years ago this Government told us that long service leave was not a question to be handled by politicians but was a matter for the court. The Premier recently told the Trades and Labor delegation, "You have me in a cleft stick; you are forcing the position on me." That was an admission that South Australia is the last State to fall into line with the progress of other States in industrial legislation.

We are always hearing that there should be

inquiries into this and that, and that we should get out of this and that and leave it to private enterprise. The Government's attitude is that it is all right for the State to assist private enterprise when it needs it but that that is where its association should begin and end. I disagree.

I hope that this motion for adoption of the Address in Reply will be lost, and that the Government will give serious consideration to this matter and not treat it as a joke as it has done in the past. I hope that next session it will produce a speech in which not only members on this side of the House but Government supporters can find more consolation. We might then find that members will be pleased to get up and express their views. I oppose the motion.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra)—Like other members I am very appreciative of the efforts of the mover and seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. Apart altogether from the mover's very splendid effort, I congratulate him and sympathize with him too, for the consistent way in which he has sat through this debate. Occasionally he has had to leave, such as now, but in the main he has upheld his responsibility in this Chamber by remaining in his place through most of the debate. I join with other members in extending my sympathy to the bereaved relatives of Sir George Jenkins and Mr. Heath. The tragic death of Mr. Heath surely emphasizes the need to do something to reduce the appalling death roll on our highways. Something must be done to improve the position. More people are killed on the roads in Australia than were killed in any year of the two wars that engulfed the world this century. This situation is not peculiar to Australia: it is a world-wide problem. I hope Australia can, by legislative enactment or otherwise, give a lead to the rest of the world in combating this problem.

Sir George Jenkins has passed to his reward. I was associated with him for many years. He always did everything possible to assist a member to do his job well. That, of course, is one of the attributes of a great man, particularly when he holds such a high office as that of Minister of the Crown. I congratulate the Premier on the high title of chivalry Her Majesty has been pleased to confer on him. Very often the essential elements of our State life which are criticised would not exist at all but for the Premier's foresight. We must concede that and should do so ungrudgingly.

I was not present to hear the opening

speeches of this debate, but they gave me great pleasure in reading. However, from the subsequent debate it is apparent that there is a lifelessness in our political life. The Address in Reply debate affords an opportunity for every member to speak about things in general, and particularly those pertaining to his own district. Up to the present this debate has been particularly lifeless, although I shall not hazard a guess at the reason. I would prefer more vitality and life in this debate which was given such a splendid opening.

His Excellency's Speech refers to past achievements and proposed activities and includes a resumé of Government undertakings. We have not heard much about the development of our natural resources. However, they have been developed and today are standing this State in good stead. The industry at Nairne is of great assistance to primary production through the production of superphosphate. Our mineral resources at Radium Hill and Leigh Creek are being developed. Although the Government sponsored these workings, the fact remains that most of them were considered by this Parliament and to that extent this House may congratulate itself upon their development.

Whilst the Governor's Speech claims that there has been a great increase in wheat production, the Opposition has contended that the *per capita* production has not kept pace with our population increase. That is quite true. We should be doing everything possible to increase production, but in so doing must consider many factors. The production of butter and pig meats is exacting and there is a tendency these days, with higher prices for other forms of primary production, to neglect the dairying industry and treat it as a sideline. As a result that production has not kept abreast of our population increase. These factors must cause some perturbation in the minds of people who think of the future. Today there is a tendency to reaggregate small farm areas into larger areas. We have recently witnessed the spectacle of outlandishly exorbitant prices being paid for small areas of land to be added to extremely large holdings, to the disadvantage of people who required, say, 75 acres to add to their existing 200 acres. That is entirely wrong, but it is happening all over the State, and as surely as it happens the production of stability lines, such as butter and pig meat, comes down. Wool production will go up although wheat production will not

necessarily increase, but production of all the other things inevitably comes down. There is power to prevent re-aggregation like that, and it should be applied.

Mr. O'Halloran—In what Aet does that reside?

Mr. QUIRKE—I am not certain; I think it applies only to leasehold, but it should apply to all land. Inside the 24in. or even 18in. rainfall line, there is not much warrant for one person having thousands of acres, because that brings production down. Vast quantities of processed milk, such as powdered, condensed and skim milk, are used in country towns.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—That comes from somewhere, though.

Mr. QUIRKE—I am not concerned about where it comes from, but where it goes.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—It has to be produced.

Mr. QUIRKE—I know, and skim milk is a by-product of other forms of manufacture, but these products are being used by people who do not produce any milk, notwithstanding that they hold thousands of acres. They produce wool and mutton, although not as much beef as they should. I think many of these people would admit that. I maintain that this State's productive capacity is only just starting, and I am not speaking in a purely critical way. In my youth we had to milk cows and look after pigs because they kept the pot boiling, and we automatically did these things. In those days farmers used horses, but when the younger generation came along, along came the tractors. I am not complaining about their use, because I realize that they save a lot of work, but I do complain that the bigger the area owned by each farmer the less the likelihood of his worrying about pigs and dairying.

Mr. Heaslip—You can over-produce dairy products. Isn't it better to produce something you can export and get a price for it?

Mr. QUIRKE—I want enough production, not over-production, but we are not catching up. The member for Hindmarsh (Mr. Hutchens) quoted Dr. Forbes on this matter, and I recommend what he said to every member, because it is what I and others in the country have been advocating for a long time. I do not advocate over-production that might result in a crisis; I want people to produce enough and to have an area of land that will enable them to do these things—an area, in fact, that makes it necessary to do them in order to keep up the production of this country. However, the bigger the holding the less the likelihood of people running cows and pigs.

Mr. Stephens—Is there too much undeveloped land in South Australia?

Mr. QUIRKE—Yes, but the honourable member would be surprised to find how little land in the good rainfall areas is undeveloped. Even big stations in the north are working their country remarkably well, quite differently from the old days, and they are carrying heavy stock in association with sheep. They know, because many are students of these things, that by doing so they are bringing about greater soil fertility.

Mr. Heaslip—You would not suggest that their holdings should be subdivided, would you?

Mr. QUIRKE—I do not suggest that any holding producing to its maximum should be subdivided, but I know, as does the honourable member, that thousands of acres are not producing nearly their capacity because the farmers don't have to so produce.

When I was a member of the Land Settlement Committee and visited the South-East I spoke to one man who had a vast area of country that the committee was going to look at because it was regarded as underdeveloped. I said, "Why haven't you developed your land?" and he said, "Why should I? I have plenty of land. It will carry half a sheep to the acre, so it will carry many sheep. Why should I worry to develop it? I have enough." I say that man had no right to the land. He had the title to it, of course, but if someone else wanted to use it he should have been asked to give it up. That is precisely what the Land Settlement Act of 1948 was intended to do.

Mr. Hambour—Has it been done?

Mr. QUIRKE—No, not yet. It was to become operative nine years after its passing, but although this period is nearly up nothing has been done.

Mr. Heaslip—Many of those large holdings have been sold for development, haven't they?

Mr. QUIRKE—They have. Vast drainage schemes have been carried out in the South-East, and once the drains are operating all the land will be subject to a drainage rate, which will force sales of land. I am not greatly concerned about this, because no matter what Party is in power, land tax values will go up as the value of land increases, and values are increasing now. It may interest members to know that in places like Booborowie small holdings are rated at from £25 to £35 an acre. Perhaps that is the way it is supposed to work: that is an unobtrusive

way of forcing the sale of land, but it is a mighty effective way, and there is nothing wrong with it.

Mr. Brookman—Are you talking about land tax?

Mr. QUIRKE—Yes, and it is getting higher all the time. The man who has built up land and then has to give up some should receive full value for it. There should be no victimization under a "grab land" policy. We cannot bring about diversification of production when we have large holdings. It is said that millions of people are to be settled on the Adelaide Plains, but how are we to feed them under the present system of holding land? I hope the people will not go on to the plains. We should not herd so many together like buffaloes. Let us put a million of them in the River Murray Valley, where they will be better served than on the plains. Put some of them along the coast towards Port Wakefield. The traffic problem in Adelaide is becoming greater every day, yet it is proposed to make the position worse by building satellite towns within a few miles of the city. Why not settle some at Peterborough? Other people will say, "Why go up there?" but those who live there think it is all right. Then there are Quorn, Port Augusta, Murray Bridge, Jamestown, Clare, Burra, and other towns. Centres of population should be spread over the State, which would bring about smaller holdings of land. We would have dissemination of population and land being held by a greater number of people.

Mr. Heaslip—You said you did not want to subdivide land, yet you are now supporting it.

Mr. QUIRKE—I said I did not support the subdivision of land that was being worked properly. If we put, say, 30,000 people in one place the land nearby will automatically become subdivided. Today Mr. Lawn castigated the Government. It is the duty and responsibility of the Opposition to oppose but I do not join with Labor members entirely when they suggest that because something is wrong the Government is to blame. The Premier and the Government are not to blame because sufficient butter will not be available to feed our people, or because the price of bacon is 6s. a pound, but there must be some reason why these things happen. We can criticize destructively, but we should also criticize constructively. We have a wheat stabilization plan and it is proposed to have a plan for dried fruits, but I do not think that is a

plan at all. We are up against many things when we try to get stability in industry. This is how the dried fruits proposal works. There is to be a cost of production price and a floor price. The floor price is to be £10 less than the cost of production price. Under the proposed scheme when the price is above the cost of production to the extent of £10, this amount is to be retained by the grower. All money received in excess of £10 above the cost of production price is to be paid into a pool, but the price to the grower must fall £10 to the floor price before any subsidy is paid and then only paid to the floor price and not cost of production. I do not think that is a stabilization price at all; at any rate it is a poorly conceived scheme. The cost of production may be £98 and £90 received by the grower for the whole five years of the plan and the plan would be completely inoperative. Such a scheme is no good at all. The number of growers of dried fruits is comparatively small, whereas the number of growers of wheat is large and they get an entirely different scheme. If people are to get costs of production we should give it to them under a proper stabilization scheme. At this stage I will not say how it is to be done, but there is a remedy, and a cost of production price can be stabilized without bringing about an upward spiral in costs.

Today Opposition members look for amenities for their constituents, and they accuse members on the other side of opposing their desires. Members of the Labor Party will say that something is necessary and the members on the other side will say it cannot be granted because it cannot be afforded, so there is a stalemate. If it is justice and the other man cannot pay for it how are we to get justice unless the economy of the country is a just one? Today we have no such thing. We get nowhere with counter accusation and vituperation from both sides; we never have and we never will. Why cannot the Government or the Opposition put up a tangible scheme for alleviating these things so that we can discuss it on its merits? One member on this side said that the only answer is socialism, but, as has been proved everywhere it has been tried, whatever tyranny there is under private enterprise is merely exchanged for the tyrannous despotism of socialism under a bureaucracy. We cannot cure the ills of one system by adopting another that does not even pretend to have the answer.

We have been told that we have a vast system of water reticulation in South Aus-

tralia and that is true. It is very good, but it has not gone far enough and there is one question that we shall have to answer pretty soon. The Mannum-Adelaide main is nearing completion and I have no criticism of it; without it there would have been a lot of thirsty people last summer, but when is the duplication of the Whyalla main going to take place? Because, if we get a drought one of these days there will be a lot of people who will be very thirsty indeed. I have been told that it will cost £5,000,000 but that would not matter a bit provided we could get the money. I presume that if we had £5,000,000 we could get the steel and the men to do the work; we are not short of good welders and artisans. All we are short of is £5,000,000. I wonder whether, if the demand in the north were sufficient, we would be able to get this sum. I noticed in the Governor's Speech a reference to a proposed extension to Peterborough. Will that supply come from the existing main or is Peterborough to be dependent upon the duplication, for if Peterborough gets it there are others who want it just as badly and who would be quite happy to take it. There is a growing realization among primary producers that, even at the prices charged today, water is the cheapest commodity on the farm because without it you get nothing.

I now wish to refer to some aspects of education, particularly school transport. We have this tremendous service all over the country, and, of course, the greater the service the more we have to provide because the more the people want it. I am not arguing against it, but let us have some uniformity. If a vehicle capable of transporting 40 children over a certain distance costs £3,000 for heaven's sake pay the operator a fee commensurate with his outlay for the sake of the safety of those 40 young lives. What we are getting today are vehicles the roadworthiness of which is in proportion to the amount we are paying the operators. Private contractors charge 9d. a ton-mile, so if a vehicle carries six tons it earns 4s. 6d. a mile. We expect to operate a vehicle capable of carrying 30 or 40 children at from 1s. 9d. to 2s. a mile, and it simply cannot be done and anyone who attempts to do it puts on the road a vehicle that he bought second-hand and worn out for about £800. I look with great disfavour upon this attitude. The department calls tenders and one man puts in 2s. 3d., another 2s. and a third 1s. 9d. If I were considering the tenders I would imme-

diately wipe out the 1s. 9d. man and examine the others because my experience has been that a roadworthy vehicle fit to carry 30 or 40 children would cost at least £2,500, and a man who thinks that he can operate on the basis of 1s. 9d. a mile is completely in error. It just can't be done and anyone who attempts to do it simply puts on the road a worn out vehicle. Let us fix standard charges commensurate with a good type of vehicle and get rid of these nondescript junk heaps now in use.

Mr. John Clark—That is not possible under the tender system.

Mr. QUIRKE—Of course it is absolutely impossible.

Mr. O'Halloran—Would not the solution be for the department to provide the vehicles?

Mr. QUIRKE—It could, but I think in that case that they would certainly cost more than some of the rat traps that are running around the country today. I am not proposing to put forward the answer in its entirety, but I say that these vehicles should be standardized and a fair rate fixed commensurate with the cost of suitable vehicles, so that the operators will not be tempted to run them into a decrepit condition before replacing them.

Mr. Hambour—The Highways Department pays a flat rate of £8 a day and the first 36 miles are free. Any mileage in excess of that is paid for at the rate of 2s. 0½d. per mile.

Mr. QUIRKE—That is a reasonable price, but the rate I refer to is that paid on short contract carting.

Mr. Jenkins—That is heavy rough work compared with school bus operation.

Mr. QUIRKE—The school bus rate should be more like 3s. a mile. After all, it costs something to put the vehicle on the road and the operator is entitled to expect a return from a commercial vehicle. The rate should be sufficient to cover all charges on the vehicle and I object to the practice of entrusting the lives of young children to the operator of a vehicle that has been worn out by somebody else.

Mr. Hambour—You want a set basis?

Mr. QUIRKE—Yes, and the sooner we get it the sooner we will achieve comfort and safety for the children. I do not criticize the department on its arrangements for transporting children to school, for the organization is splendid. I consider, however, that the vehicles may be viewed with considerable suspicion and I would like to see better standard vehicles placed on

the road because the young lives are precious. One of these days a vehicle with no steel top will turn over and we will be saddened by what happens. As there will be plenty of opportunities later to deal with the cost structure when financial measures are before the House, I shall content myself at this stage with supporting the motion.

Mr. STEPHENS (Port Adelaide)—I join with other members in extending sympathy to the relatives of the late Mr. Larry Heath whom I knew for many years before he became a member. I also knew Sir George Jenkins for many years. The State could ill afford to lose those two gentlemen for they worked on behalf of the people of this State and helped considerably in the proceedings of this Parliament. I have also been reminded by previous speakers of the extension of the term of office of His Excellency the Governor. This State has been fortunate in the persons who have filled that office over the years.

Paragraph 7 of His Excellency's Speech deals with the damage done by last year's disastrous River Murray floods and the cost of rehabilitation. Both this Government and the Federal Government helped the settlers and a generous public played their part, some by financial assistance and others by physical effort; but although we all appreciate the good work done in repairing the damage, I wonder whether anything has been done to prevent future damage. It seems to me that all we are going to do is to build up these places and that they will be washed out by a later flood. Some time ago I asked the Premier whether the Government intended to do anything to prevent future flood damage. I felt that something should be done, but the Premier's reply was disheartening for he said that we could not prevent the floods and that the same thing would occur later. He said that a certain scheme might reduce the effect of a flood, but that on the other hand it might also increase it; but it seems to me that the Premier said, in effect, "We will have to let the floods come and then do the same thing again." I believe, however, that our engineers are well able to prevent future damage. True, we cannot stop rain falling and water coming down the river, but something should be done to prevent future damage. Some time ago I suggested the construction of a channel from the upper Murray to the seaboard so that, by the use of locks and reservoirs, the floodwaters could be diverted direct to the seaboard.

After I had mentioned the matter in this House a gentleman spoke to me about it.

He said that if levels were taken from Loxton to the seaboard it would reveal where this channel could be built. Such a project would prove useful not only during floods but also when there was a shortage of water. This scheme could result in the opening of much country through which the channel ran and result in large areas being irrigated. It is all very well for people to say it could not be done, but the same thing was said about the man who claimed that water could be taken from Perth to Kalgoorlie. The papers criticized him and said he was a madman, but it was done and it has made Kalgoorlie the fine city that it is. If water can be pumped from Perth to Kalgoorlie, surely we could run the water from a selected part of the Murray down to the sea, and with a few locks and reservoirs it could result in much good to the surrounding country, to the benefit not only of the local people, but to the whole State, because of the greatly increased production. I believe that prevention is better than cure. Could not some of our young engineers be asked to report on the project and see if something could be done along the lines I have mentioned? I do not say that I am right, but I feel there is much in the suggestion.

Let us also consider the position along our seaboard, where much damage is done by high tides. Regularly our seawalls and jetties are extensively damaged. We build them up again and await another flood tide to do similar damage, whereas if we made a proper job of it in the first place this yearly expense would not be involved. I feel that a good engineer could report on this project, which would result in much money not being wasted every year or two.

Then we have the question of bush fires. I admire the work done by our voluntary fire fighters and the Government, but many bush fires could be prevented if the right thing was done. I believe that many of our bush fires are indirectly the result of some people holding too much land out of use. On one occasion I drove to Melbourne while a bush fire was in progress and where the owners had burnt off along the road and inside their fence there was no fire damage, whereas further on, where these preventive steps had not been taken, great destruction had occurred. Often motorists are blamed for causing bush fires by throwing out cigarette butts, but the chief trouble is that too much land is held out of use. It would be much

better if the owners were compelled by law either to use the land, or the Government took it over and allotted it to someone else who would use it. This has been done before and it could be done again. We remember that the Government took over the wharves, but I am afraid that it is now inclined to pass them back to private enterprise.

We are all pleased to notice the great improvement in railway finance. I am not anxious to see our railways making big profits or, as a matter of fact, to see them make any profit. It was never intended that they should make profits, but they were built to render a service to the people, and incidentally they have done it. Some members complain about railway costs and have not a good word to say for our service, but they forget that their land has been greatly increased in value because of the railway running through their district. I was surprised to hear one person admit that because he was a primary producer and he thereby paid lower registration fees for his motor vehicle, he was prepared to use his truck to carry his goods and thus compete against the railways. It was never intended that he should so compete. When a man is prepared to do that, he is not loyal to the Government or to the railways, which have rendered a marvellous service to the State and will continue to do so. I should like some honourable members who are always complaining about railway freight charges to consider what would be their financial position but for the railways going through their district. This has increased the value of the land, and that results in additional revenue from land taxes. Some of the revenue collected in land taxation should be used to meet the expenditure of the railways because much land would not be paying taxes if it had not been for the railways. We should realize that not one Government institution would be losing money if it were not for the huge interest Bill. I have asked questions about the interest commitments of various departments, but it is hard to get that information.

I have been associated with South Australian wharves and worked on the wharves for many years. When I was working on the wharves and when I was secretary of the Drivers' Union I was frequently on the wharves. In those days they were owned by the South Australian Company and John Darling Limited, but they were in a disgraceful state. There was insufficient shed accommodation and cargo often had to be stacked in the open and

sheets used to cover it. On one occasion I had to pull the men off a boat in the interests of safety. Instead of the piles holding up the wharves the wharves were holding up the piles. On another occasion, when the earthworks alongside Copper Company wharf collapsed, three horses went through the wharf and were drowned, but fortunately the shunter was able to grab the hook boy and save him. The wharves are now under the control of the Harbors Board and they compare favourably with those in other States.

Last year I complained that there were no cranes on the wharves, and I am pleased that the Harbors Board is installing cranes to assist wharf work. The Wharves Resumption Bill was introduced in 1912 by Mr. Butler (Sir Richard's father), who was Premier of the State, but it was not proclaimed until 1914. Many members complained bitterly about that socialistic measure, as they called it. However, a Liberal Government was in power when it was passed and since that time the Harbors Board has been continually improving the wharves, but that would not have been done if the two companies I have mentioned had retained control of them. Government supporters of that time said that too much money was being spent on dredging the river, but the owners of the wharves did not pay anything for dredging, though they got the benefit. The improved wharves have been a great asset to the State, notwithstanding that some members referred to the Wharves Resumption Bill as a socialistic measure. I have heard it said that the greatest Socialist in South Australia is our Premier. That has even been said in this House by some of his supporters when they have been opposing some of his Bills.

I had to fight very hard to get two measures through this House. I strongly opposed certain portions of the Marine Bill, and at last had it altered. I think that Mr. Justice Abbott was Attorney-General at that time. I was associated with the Nelcebee-Gerard case, and eventually the Government saw eye to eye with me. As a result, compensation was paid to the captain who had his licence taken from him. It took me seven years to get my motion for free milk for school children through the House. At last it was carried by one vote, but when I asked the Premier if he would act on the decision he said, "No." However, a Federal Liberal Government implemented the policy I advocated and today free milk is being distributed in our schools. When the Federal Government took that action there was

not one complaint from any member, but it is interesting to read what many members said when opposing my motion. We were even told that milk was bad for children. It was said, amongst other things, that milk carried disease, but when the Bill was introduced by the Prime Minister it was passed and not one member of this House has ever criticized it since.

When the Electricity Trust Bill was before this House the Premier and his Government received some very strong opposition from members of the Government Party and a great deal of support from members of the Labor Party. That Bill would never have been passed had it not been for the full and loyal support of the Australian Labor Party. When the Government claims credit for the Electricity Trust they should be fair and admit that it would never have come into existence had it not been for members of the Australian Labor Party.

Mr. Jenkins—They were liberal-minded.

Mr. Hutchens—More liberal-minded than those who did not want it.

Mr. STEPHENS—Liberal members caused the first Bill to be rejected. The Opposition has been liberal-minded both in words and actions. A division was taken on the Bill when it was before the House in 1945, and it resulted in 29 ayes and six noes. Not one member of the Labor Party voted against it, all those opposing it being members of the Liberal Party. The Bill was rejected in another place on the casting vote of the President; five Labor members and four Liberal members voted in favour of it, nine Liberal members opposed it. I do not wish to mention any names nor reflect on the President of the Legislative Council, but merely point out that he gave his reasons for voting against it in the same way as the Speaker gave his reasons here when he had to cast his vote against my motion for free milk. He gave his casting vote against the Bill because of what had been done in years gone by.

A special session of Parliament was subsequently called, and when the Bill was reintroduced and brought before this House 29 members voted for it and five against it; not one Labor member voted against it. This was a socialistic measure and Liberal members were speaking against it, but the whips were cracked and the men who had previously opposed the Bill gave in and voted for it. On the third reading in the Legislative Council eight members voted for it and seven

against it. Of the eight members who voted for the Bill, five were Labor members, and it is therefore true to say that the Electricity Trust Bill would never have been carried had it not been for the Labor Party. One of the members who voted against the Bill in another place is today a member of the Cabinet.

The Wharf Resumption Bill has been a successful piece of legislation and has made a wonderful difference to shipping in Port Adelaide. It did no harm to anybody except the big shareholders of the South Australian Company and John Darling Limited. The Minister of Education and yourself, Mr. Speaker, being members of the legal profession, will have read something of the case of *Richardson v. The S.A. Company*. When that case was before the court we discovered that the shareholders of the South Australian Company were nearly all resident in England.

I asked the Premier several questions a few days ago with regard to the proposed dock for tug building at Port Adelaide and was disappointed when he said "No" to all my questions. In spite of his replies I can say without fear of contradiction that the Adelaide Steamship Company, which is a part of the company which is to build this yard for the dock, has had a lease of some of the wharves in Port Adelaide for a number of years. I tried to discover whether the Government had the power to re-lease that land after taking the wharves over, but I have not been successful. I hope it will not allow our wharves to be whittled away, nor will it allow private enterprise to take them back and allow the position to return to what it was before the Wharf Resumption Bill was passed.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

Mr. STEPHENS—Many of the Government's undertakings are referred to as socialistic. Whenever the Government has taken over a service it has benefited the people. When it proposed entering the forestry field there was a hue and cry about Socialism and opposition was expressed. That venture now benefits the State. I wonder what would happen if our water supplies and sewerage schemes were conducted by private enterprise, which is only concerned with profit making. The Government has become socialistic only to serve the public. The Leigh Creek coalfield is another successful Government undertaking which was originally opposed by many people. Where would we be today were it not for our public hospitals? If we had

to depend on private hospitals we would be in a bad way because private hospitals exist only for profit-making and not to provide a service for the public.

Many years ago a Government insurance department was established. I have previously referred to this matter and have quoted figures related thereto. In 1924-25 this department made a profit of £9,825 which was paid into general revenue. In 1925-26 the profit was £14,018; in 1926-27, £15,108; in 1927-28, £14,224, and in 1928-29, £13,923. Although this department was a successful financial venture, immediately there was a change of Government the department was closed for outside business. It has been estimated that had that department continued normal operations the profits therefrom would have been sufficient to pay for all our hospitals. That department was closed in order to assist shareholders of private insurance companies to make profits. Members opposite may condemn socialistic industry, but not one would be prepared to suggest that any Government undertaking be handed over to private enterprise. Private enterprise operates for profit: Government enterprise for the benefit of the State.

The Electricity Trust has aided decentralization more than any other body and has rendered a worthwhile service to the country. If our citizens were told that the undertaking was to be handed back to private enterprise there would be a rebellion. Prior to the establishment of the trust I approached the company for an extension of the service to Kilburn. The company wanted the residents to pay for the costs of the extension and to guarantee to use so much power. The trust does not do that, but makes extensions because they are required. Would any member opposite be prepared to advocate returning to private enterprise any of the Government's socialistic schemes?

The member for Light (Mr. Hambour) reminded me of the old saying by the mother who watched the soldiers go past, "Everybody is out of step except my little boy." He criticised everybody, and supported nobody, saying that everybody was wrong, not only the Leader of the Opposition, but the Government. He even went so far as to say that he was wrong, when he said "I am not suggesting that I am right." Neither would anybody else. I conclude by hoping that the Government will decide to close more monopolies and give them back to the people so

they will be able to render a service to the State instead of being carried on as profit-making concerns.

Mr. DAVIS (Port Pirie)—I join with other members in expressing regret at the tragic death of the member for Wallaroo, Mr. Heath. Like other members, I was greatly shocked at the accident that caused his death. I know that many people in his district will miss his helping hand, and all members will miss his presence from this Chamber. I also regret the passing of Sir George Jenkins, who was a member of this House for half his life time. His death was not such a shock to us because we were all concerned about his health for a long time; nevertheless, we regret the death of a man we all respected very greatly.

I congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion. The mover delivered one of the best speeches I have heard in this Chamber for a considerable time. However, although his speech was given with great sincerity it was a story we have heard from year to year, and one which is becoming a bedtime story to members on this side. Year after year we have heard what the Government is going to do, but unfortunately never does. I think most of these matters will be put into operation in the same year as the deep sea port in the South-East, and we will all be old men before that eventuates.

The seconder gave interesting figures relating to his district, and I was very pleased to find that he was not altogether satisfied with what had been done there. Of course, he expects that in a few years there will be 5,000,000 sheep on the West Coast, but I think he was counting rabbits instead of sheep. Nevertheless, I hope he is right, because I appreciate what an important part sheep play in our economy. Strange to say, the only things for which he eulogised the Government were because of the efforts of my party, all of which could be called Socialism. He did not mention Socialism, of course, but called it Liberal legislation. When legislation is introduced by members opposite it is not called Socialism, although we know that it is. We appreciate what the Electricity Trust has done for this State, what water has meant to people in the north and what the Leigh Creek coalfield has meant.

I know that the Leigh Creek coalfield has been a great asset to this State and we would have been in great straits at times but for its existence. I am pleased that the Premier has given to people there something that other country residents do not have—sewerage. He

has promised time and time again that he will do something about sewerage for country towns, but we have found that he will only do something for people who produce coal. He should realize that other country towns deserve the same consideration as Leigh Creek. I live in one of the oldest country towns in the State, one which has been a great money spinner, but it has not received any consideration from the Premier in this matter. Port Pirie was one of the first towns for which a sewerage scheme was approved by the Public Works Committee, but there is no likelihood of its ever having sewerage. It is quite true that it has a water supply, but that was because of pressure by the B.H.P. It was found necessary to take the pipeline past Port Pirie, otherwise we would not have had any River Murray water. It was only when the B.H.P. Company made certain promises to the Government that the pipeline was constructed. I listened attentively to Mr. Hambour's remarks and I wondered why he rambled so much. During his ramblings he said he was stunned by a statement by the Opposition, but actually he was stunned during the whole of his speech. He accused the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Hutchens and me of not knowing what we were talking about. He tried to take me to task following on an interjection I made and said it was one of the most foolish remarks he had ever heard. If that is so, then he has been in the dark all his life. Industries have not received any encouragement from Liberal Governments to go into the country. It seems that when an industry comes to South Australia it must be established in the metropolitan area; otherwise it receives no encouragement. Can Mr. Hambour indicate one industry, apart from the uranium plant in Port Pirie, that has been set up in the country?

Mr. Hambour—Plenty of industries have been assisted by the Government to operate in the country. Mr. Loveday will give the honourable member some information on that matter.

Mr. DAVIS—I am not asking Mr. Loveday; I am asking the honourable member. Because the honourable member represents the district of Light he thinks he is enlightened but he makes untrue statements about the establishment of industries. He ridiculed the idea of establishing industries along the River Murray.

Mr. Hambour—No.

Mr. DAVIS—He said that if industries were established along the River Murray the people concerned would come to Adelaide in their

Tiger Moths. That is one of the most foolish statements I have ever heard because the workers will never possess Tiger Moths. It takes them all their time to own push bikes. Industries should be established in the country. Members ask where the labour will come from, but if industries are set up in the country the labour will follow. When a country man is out of work and has nothing behind him he has to pick up his swag and take to the track.

Mr. Hambour—You are living in the past.

Mr. DAVIS—The honourable member would not know anything about a swag because all his life he has been living in luxury. He does not know anything about hardships. When I have been carrying my swag on the track I have passed many men. Many times I would have been happy to have a doze by the roadside when I have had to lie there through exhaustion.

Mr. Hambour—Exhaustion from what?

Mr. DAVIS—It is not a pleasure to remind myself of my younger days. Some members think it a joke because I carried my swag looking for work.

Mr. Hambour—You did not look for it. It found you.

Mr. DAVIS—In those days people would not employ me because of my union activities. From the utterances of Mr. Hambour I take it that he is opposed to migration, and I am opposed to it, too, when we have so much unemployment in our midst. Surely the first responsibility of the Government is to see that our own people are employed. True, we are anxious to populate Australia and I am always willing to welcome the New Australian, but the Government must cater for South Australians first. The number of unemployed is increasing daily and before we ask people to come to Australia we should see that all our own people are employed.

I hope that this Government will give further thought to the establishment of industries in country areas. It breaks one's heart to see the northern ghost towns where shops and hotels are closed and few people live. Why are they ghost towns? This Government is responsible for encouraging country people to come to the metropolitan area to find employment and a greater number will drift to the city if this Government does not rise to its responsibilities. The population of the metropolitan area is increasing and that of the country decreasing, which should prove to the

member for Light that there is something wrong with the policy of the Government he entirely supports. The honourable member accused members on this side of romancing, but he is the greatest romancer I have seen in this House. Indeed, when he came here he put himself forward as the big man among the Government backbenchers. He was going to revolt against the Premier, but the Hon. Thomas Playford soon pulled him into gear and he has now become a very good boy.

Mr. Lawn—What gear did the Premier put him into?

Mr. DAVIS—Bottom gear. He is a very obedient servant today. Industries such as the motor body building industry should be established in country towns. Indeed, Port Pirie would be ideal for such an industry. At present many motor bodies are loaded at Port Pirie on to ships bound for Western Australia and many more are sent by rail, whereas if such an industry were established at Port Pirie the finished product could be transported by rail or sea, which would be cheaper than hauling it all the way from the metropolitan area.

Recently I have become greatly concerned about the lack of interest shown by this Government in the district I am proud to represent. Members are probably getting sick of hearing me draw their attention to the condition of the Port Pirie wharves. I am concerned not only for my district, but for the whole State. I am particularly concerned about the State's economy because of the talk of our ore trade being lost. It has been said that a certain industry will start in New South Wales and take some of our ore. It would be very expensive for any firm to take ore to Sydney for shipping overseas when it could be shipped from Port Pirie, shortening the distance of transporting by about 200 miles. There is the danger of our losing this trade unless the Government does something to the harbour and wharves at Port Pirie. As I have said over and over again, it has promised to spend £1,500,000 to deepen the harbour and provide improved facilities, but nothing has been done. The wharves are inadequate to accommodate the ships and the water is not deep enough to enable them to be fully loaded.

The Premier said recently that Port Lincoln and Thevenard had priority over Port Pirie in the establishment of wheat bulk handling facilities. I do not deny it is essential to have the ways and means of handling our wheat, but I remind the Premier that a few weeks ago I received a visit from the chairman

and the manager of Bulk Handling Co-operative Ltd. which is anxious that a silo should be built at Port Pirie at the same time as one is being erected at Thevenard. It would be no use erecting the facilities there if ships could not be fully loaded, and they said they were not going to build a silo there unless something was done to the harbour. I am becoming much concerned about the loss of trade in Port Pirie, and if no silo is built there there will be no shipments of wheat, and if it were also to lose the ore trade, Port Pirie would become a ghost port and nothing would be exported from it except perhaps small quantities of wool. As Port Pirie has played a very important part in the State's economy, it is deserving of immediate attention.

Some time ago I was promised that Bluebird railcars would be placed on the Port Pirie line, but their introduction was put off. I have now received a letter from the Minister of Railways notifying me that one of the problems relates to the carriage of mails and goods on the present train. I am not so very much concerned about having a Bluebird car on the run, but I am concerned about having a fast train operating between the city and Port Pirie. If the Railways Commissioner or his Traffic Manager think they cannot do the job with a Budd car, I would respectfully suggest that they put on a diesel train and cut out many of the stopping places. There are seven or eight which could be deleted, except in a case of emergency. My two colleagues who also travel on the train agree that the time could be reduced by almost an hour. All we want is a faster and better train. Originally it was recognized as the second best train in Australia, but today often old discarded coaches from the Melbourne express or even suburban coaches are used. Therefore, I appeal to the Government to give this question of an improved train service further consideration. If the railways are to pay they must give satisfactory service, and I feel sure that if a reasonably good train were provided to Port Pirie large numbers would travel on it. Business people would be able to visit Adelaide in the morning and return the same night, but today the trip takes too long. I sincerely hope that the Government will face up to its responsibilities and give the people a fair deal, particularly those living in the country. I support the motion.

Mr. STOTT (Ridley)—I congratulate the members for Barossa (Mr. Laucke) and Eyre (Mr. Bockelberg) on the manner in which they

respectively moved and seconded the motion. They dealt with subjects with which they are familiar, so naturally they spoke with great conviction. I join with other members in expressing deep regret at the death of Sir George Jenkins. He did a mighty job as Minister of Agriculture, particularly at meetings of the Agricultural Council, where his practical knowledge of agricultural matters was a great help to Ministers of other States. The late member for Wallaroo (Mr. L. R. Heath) will be sadly missed in this Chamber. Although we did not hear a great deal from him in this House he did much for his district.

I am pleased that the Premier is doing his best to make arrangements for the Queen Mother to visit South Australia early next year. I commend the Minister of Education for sponsoring Education Week. It is an excellent idea to demonstrate to the people, particularly those in the country, what education is doing for this State. I know that many members are doing their utmost to make this week a great success. The Minister is battling with education problems. One is that in many rural districts it is often difficult to get adequate and safe transport for school children. At times there is insufficient finance available to ensure that adequate transport is provided. The Government should be more generous in tackling this problem. The school transport system has become an integral part of education in country districts, for the smaller schools are being closed and area schools established. A few years ago some of those tendering for school transport contracts did not have modern, safe buses. In my district one bus was condemned by parents because it was in poor condition. The Minister should not encourage such tenderers, but should engage those who have good vehicles, even if it costs more. We must realize that petrol, tyres, and repairs are very expensive nowadays, so the Government should be more generous in approaching this problem.

Hire purchase has been discussed by previous speakers. No-one can deny that we have had credit restrictions, but if one accepted statements made by the Chairman of the Associated Banks of South Australia (Mr. A. West) one would believe there have been no credit restrictions. However, the annual report of the Australia and New Zealand Bank admits that there has been too much credit restriction. Further, the general manager of the Rural Bank of New South Wales was so outspoken on credit restrictions that he said the policy has gone haywire. Should we believe the

manager of the Australia and New Zealand Bank, the manager of the Rural Bank of New South Wales, or the chairman of the Associated Banks of South Australia? I am not opposed to hire-purchase as such, for it has become an integral part of the economic life of the State, but I do not agree with the policy of credit restriction. A week or two ago the Federal Treasurer (Sir Arthur Fadden) said it is still necessary to apply some credit restrictions and he appealed to private banks not to be so generous in making advances because inflation is still with us.

Mr. O'Halloran—Have they been generous?

Mr. STOTT—That is what Sir Arthur Fadden said. Credit restrictions were imposed for the purpose of controlling inflation. In other words, too much money is being spent and restrictions on advances put a lid on inflation. A person can walk down a street in any capital city without any money at all and buy any goods he likes under hire-purchase if he is prepared to pay an interest rate of between 10 per cent and 18 per cent. There is plenty of money available in Australia today at exorbitant rates of interest, but none is available at ordinary bank overdraft rates.

Mr. Corcoran—Especially for housing.

Mr. STOTT—That is the policy today, and it is ridiculous. I know of a farmer who purchased a utility, and his interest charges are the equivalent of 36 per cent. We have all been told that the usurers in the temple were thrown out, but they are still with us today. I do not attack any particular bank and never have done. What I criticize is the policy of banks investing their capital to bolster further these hire purchase companies, and so are able to obtain high interest rates by getting the benefit of their capital in the hire-purchase companies and not being able to advance money at 5½ per cent.

Mr. Quirke—Do you blame the banks?

Mr. STOTT—I am coming to that. I admit that it is only ordinary business. Why is it that the banks today are in a position to, and encouraged to, invest more money in this way? The E.S. & A. Bank has put £2,000,000 into its own hire-purchase company, and practically every other bank has now followed suit as a matter of policy. We know that the policy over the last few years of the Commonwealth Government and the banks of Australia through the Central Bank has been that in order to control this inflationary policy the Central Bank has withdrawn surplus deposits from the private banks and deposited them in

the Central banking system; it is only giving the private banks interest at the rate of 10s. per £100 on the amount of money deposited in the Central Banking system. The banks have protested to the Commonwealth Government through the Loan Council over the years about this policy, but to no effect. Now the E.S. & A. Bank has said, "If you will not let us use our surplus funds and you are placing them in the Central Bank and only giving 10s. per cent on the money, we have to look elsewhere in order to get a greater earning capacity with our money." As a result it uses its surplus capital and invests it in these hire purchase companies which give a greater return of interest than the banks can charge on their ordinary overdraft rates.

I have never blamed the banks entirely. I am attacking the stupid attempt to control inflation. The present policy does not control inflation and has made no contribution to the control of inflation whatsoever, because while we restrict money at 5 per cent and allow hire-purchase companies to charge 18 per cent there is no control of inflation in any way. The time has come when Parliaments must control the interest rates under hire-purchase because it is getting out of hand. We are rapidly reaching the stage where Premiers going to Loan Councils and asking for, say, £120,000,000 for more schools, roads, bridges and so on, are told by the Federal Treasurer that the States will have to be cut down because there is too much inflation. Members of this Parliament are finding that our State Treasurer is now being bent over the wheel of finance. If the Federal Treasurer were told that it was time the Commonwealth Government gave a lead to the States in this matter of hire-purchase, he would reply, "Well, it is nothing to do with me but is a matter for the States; I have no legislative power to control hire purchase companies." That is true, but I forcibly remind the Treasurer that we have a Loan Council which controls all the financing operations of all Governments, and if the policy is wrong and therefore creating further inflation the Loan Council should instruct the Commonwealth Government to give a lead to the State by saying, "This hire-purchase is making a contribution to inflation; what about doing something about it?" No such lead has been given by the Commonwealth Government to the States in regard to this vexed question of exorbitant interest rates. I do not say that we should stop it, but hire-purchase generally is getting out of hand.

Mr. O'Halloran—Only getting out of hand?

Mr. STOTT—It is out of hand. I do not say we should stop it, because it has become an accepted method of buying goods. I do not object to a person putting a certain amount down as a deposit on goods, but I object to the exorbitant rates of interest he is compelled to pay. This is the place to voice opinions on the matter, and what I am putting to the House is my firm conviction. The Treasurer should take up the matter in an endeavour to control interest rates. People are unable to get adequate advances through ordinary sources of banking, but if they go to certain estate agents to buy a block of land on terms they have to pay a flat rate of 8 per cent interest. That means in effect that if a person paid off the total in six months he would still have to pay the 8 per cent flat rate over the whole period, because he cannot get terms under any other conditions. Some finance corporation is obviously providing the finance for purchasing the land on which to build homes. Next he must find a builder. He uses his land as security, but if the builder cannot secure sufficient finance through ordinary banking sources he must go to a finance company and borrow at 10 per cent. This all adds to the cost of the home. We should seriously consider this question of hire-purchase interest rates before we reach the stage when the general public refuses to subscribe to Government loans offering just over 4 per cent interest because they can receive 9 or 10 per cent interest from custom credit companies. People will not invest in electricity and gas loans when they can get 10 per cent from other companies. Unless a firm stand is taken the time may come when we will be told that certain works cannot be undertaken because sufficient finance is not available.

Mr. Corcoran—What is your solution of the problem?

Mr. STOTT—The Loan Council should examine this matter and determine a broad policy limiting hire-purchase interest rates. I understand the Trades and Labor Council has entered the hire-purchase field. I believe that council proposes a co-operative system which I strongly favour, but I hope the interest rates will be comparable with general overdraft interest rates.

Mr. Dunstan—They will be lower.

Mr. STOTT—That will be better. I strongly favour co-operative effort which is

the answer to the present exorbitant interest charges. Young people are attracted to hire-purchase primarily through trying to keep pace with their neighbour. A girl friend obtains a refrigerator on hire-purchase and it is not long before the young wife does likewise. The present methods of re-possession are entirely wrong. A person may pay a deposit on some article and maintain regular payments, but unfortunately sickness may intervene and he gets into financial difficulties. At present the company can re-possess the article and the hirer loses everything.

Mr. O'Halloran—He sometimes gets a bill as well.

Mr. STOTT—Yes, and that is wrong. He should receive at least the secondhand value of the article. The Minister of Agriculture and the member for Adelaide have both referred to wheat and barley production. It is interesting to note the actual production figures. In 1950-51, an area of 1,847,791 acres of wheat was sown for a yield of 30,936,044 bushels or an average of 16.74 bushels an acre. In 1951-52 the acreage sown was 1,613,126 for a yield of 27,300,839 bushels or 16.92 an acre; in 1952-53 the acreage sown was 1,543,762 for a yield of 33,918,689 bushels or an average yield of 21.97 an acre; in 1953-54 the acreage sown was 1,528,377 for a yield of 30,409,231 bushels or an average of 19.90 an acre; in 1954-55 the acreage was 1,689,103 for a yield of 31,462,737 bushels or an average of 18.63, and in 1955-56 the acreage was 1,609,029 for a yield of 28,891,524 or 17.96 an acre. I do not want to weary the House with a lot of figures, but those I have given show that fewer acres have been sown while the average yield per acre has become higher and higher, which proves that we have better methods of farming, better fertilizers, we use lights on tractors and sow pastures to clover, thereby increasing the nitrogenous matter of the soil. All these things not only give a greater yield, but produce grain of a higher quality. That is why we want farmers to eliminate the types of grain that have not a high protein content so that the overall quality of our wheat will be improved.

Recently the Federal Parliament passed what is known as wheat research legislation under which growers will contribute a farthing a bushel to the Wheat Research Fund, which has been set up to improve the quality of wheat and generally to make research into this industry. I do not want to take away the Minister of Agriculture's thunder, because

he will probably make some announcement about the matter in relation to this State in the near future, but I point out only that this levy will make a very great contribution towards improving the yield per acre and the quality of wheat sown. I believe that some States will be putting up this matter at a technical conference to be held in Canberra on August 13.

This State should be divided into zones so that we will know what types of wheat have been sown, and what types yield the best protein content, so that we will know the best types to sow in each area. Of course, some varieties might produce grain of a low protein content in some areas, but a much higher content in others. In this case, the farmers in the latter parts could sow this type of grain with great success. In this way we would get the best quality grain from each area.

The progress made by the South Australian Bulk Handling Co-operative has been mentioned during this debate. Members might accuse me of being biased on this matter, and perhaps I am, but I would like to indicate the progress this organization is making. It has been operating since October 1955, when it took over the Ardrossan silo. This installation now handles a considerable quantity of wheat, nearly all of which is going under contract to New Zealand. The people there are now insisting that all the wheat they receive from the Australian Wheat Board must come through Ardrossan. When a delegation from the Wheat Board visited New Zealand last year and made investigations into the quality of wheat, the millers said that they were happy about the wheat from Ardrossan, but did not want any from Victoria. If members study the figures they will find that the protein content of the Victorian wheat is the lowest of all States.

The Bulk Handling Co-operative has put through over 6,000,000 bushels at Ardrossan. Since commencing operations it has constructed a silo of 330,000 bushels at Paskeville, 500,000 bushels at Bute, 300,000 bushels at Hoyleton, a 500,000-bushel horizontal silo at Balaklava, and structures of the same size at Snowtown and Brinkworth. At the end of last year a vertical concrete silo was constructed at Nantawarra with a capacity of 440,000 bushels. It has already been asked why this organization changed from the horizontal to the vertical concrete type silo. The Minister explained the reason very well; it is, in effect, that when the company commenced operations it made inquiries from competent engineers in other States

and in its own employ to ascertain estimates of the cost of vertical concrete silos, and found that they would cost between 8s. and 10s. a bushel. The horizontal type was then estimated to cost 3s. to 4s., and as a result that type was built. Subsequently, a contractor came from another State and asked why we did not construct what he regarded as the last word in silos—the concrete vertical type. He was told that the cost was too high, and he then said that he could design something that would compare favourably in price. The company told him to go ahead and to bring over the plans so that it could look at the designs and estimates. He did this, and gave us a design of the type of installation that has been constructed at Nantawarra at a price comparable with the horizontal silo. It uses a new type of machinery with one belt. The company has started to build a 1,500,000-bushel annex at Wallaroo, and when that is completed I would like the Minister of Agriculture to arrange a party to inspect it. I have seen bulk handling facilities all over the world, and I think that when this is completed it will be the most modern silo in the world comparable with the throughput. I have seen silos in America. At Hutchinson the capacity is 60,000,000 bushels, at Baltimore 150,000,000, and at Wichita 120,000,000 bushels. Ten tons of wheat can be emptied in about 10 seconds. That type of equipment could not possibly be installed at Wallaroo where the throughput is only 7,000,000 bushels. The State must be pleased with the type of silo to be established at Wallaroo. It will receive 1,500,000 bushels this harvest. The company is building concrete vertical types at Owen, Mallala, Red Hill and Crystal Brook. There is to be a change of type at Mallala where the soil in the railway yard will not take a silo 100ft. high. The company has had to spread the silo to 45ft. wide by taking it over more ground, and making it lower. Engineers carried out the tests and found that the soil would not carry a silo 100ft. high.

Probably at the end of September the company will start operations at Port Lincoln. Much depends on the work of the Harbors Board. I have nothing but praise for the work it has already done at Port Lincoln. The company could not commence building its silo there until the board had done its work and if the same tempo is continued it is expected that the company will be able to commence at Port Lincoln in September next. An endless belt is to be established there and it may not be ready until 1958, but so long as it is ready four or five months after the completion of the

silo it will be all right. Following on the redesigning of the harbour at Port Lincoln bulk handling of grain will help make Eyre Peninsula a more important part of the State. Thousands of acres are being cleared. A few months ago when I flew to Ceduna I was amazed to see from the air that these acres had been cleared, which indicates that there will be a greater cereal and fat lamb production.

To ship 8,000 tons of barley or wheat within 30 hours it will be necessary to speed up the railway service. More grain should not be produced unless there are proper shipping facilities. Later, as finance permits, the company will extend its programme to other parts of the State. With good years and the tolls coming in, the company will not hesitate to build silos elsewhere. Some people in the Port Adelaide division say they will have to wait some time before getting silos, but that is because wheat is not shipped in bulk at Port Adelaide. Silos may come there sooner than expected. The company has entered into a splendid arrangement with the flour millers, who are working well with South Australia Bulk Handling Co-operative Ltd. When the flour millers are ready after the conversion of their plant, the company will build silos in that division. The flour millers will then be able to get their wheat in bulk. The milling industry is an important adjunct to the wheat industry and the fact that it is working well with the bulk handling company augurs well for the economy of this State.

I now come to the very controversial matter of section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution and I want members to study the points I raise. Ever since Federation section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution has caused more litigation than any other section. I raise this matter now for two reasons. Firstly, a committee has been appointed by the Federal Parliament to report on any necessary alterations to the Commonwealth Constitution and it is therefore up to members of this Parliament, and anybody else interested, to place facts before that committee and suggest ways in which section 92 and other sections have affected wheat and barley marketing plans. As a layman, I believe it is a mistake to believe that the wheat stabilization and barley marketing legislation are valid; in reality they seem to be valid only because they have not been attacked in the High Court by some litigious individual invoking section 92 to invalidate the legislation.

Let us see the practical application of such legislation. Last year a Victorian maltster

came over the border into South Australia as far as Lameroo and bought up to 28,000 bags of barley which, according to the wording of the State legislation, should have been compulsorily delivered to the board. He took that barley back over the border and used it for his own purposes in his malthouse. Legal opinion is that once that barley went over the border into Victoria it came within the four corners of the Victorian barley marketing legislation, which also states that barley must be delivered to the Victorian Barley Board. How can a man with any legal knowledge say in those circumstances that the State legislation is still valid and that that man could not succeed in a court action merely because he did not deliver to the board? In the light of previous High Court and Privy Council decisions on section 92 that man must succeed by invoking section 92 if the Victorian Barley Board takes him to court. Section 92, in effect, states that trade across State borders shall be free, which means that the barley and wheat marketing legislation is not immune from legal attack.

Mr. Quirke—Both those Acts refer to a product grown within the State.

Mr. STOTT—That is so, but it does not matter. If you grow it in South Australia and I want to go across the border and take it back into Victoria, I can invoke the aid of section 92.

Mr. Quirke—But the Victorian Act has no relation to the South Australian Act.

Mr. STOTT—Possibly, but legal opinion is that the Victorian legislation says, in effect, that any barley must be delivered to the Victorian Barley Board.

Mr. Quirke—Doesn't that apply only to barley grown in Victoria?

Mr. STOTT—It does not matter in this case for the clause is wide in its scope. I now quote from a document I prepared, which states:—

According to the history of the Constitution, section 92 is the oldest piece of the Constitution. It was insisted on by Sir Henry Parkes in laying down four basic principles to be adopted in drafting the Constitution, one of which was:—

That the trade and intercourse between the federated colonies, whether by means of land carriage or coastal navigation, shall be absolutely free.

The words of this resolution were incorporated with very slight alteration into section 92. For many years this was accepted by the High Court as a command addressed to both Commonwealth and States to adhere absolutely to freedom of trade and intercourse among the

States. However, in *Fox v. Robbins* (8 C.L.R. 115) a Western Australian law requiring a higher licence fee for the sale of wire manufactured in other States was held to be interstate protection and a breach of interstate free trade, and in the case *R. v. Smithers* (16 C.L.R. 99) a New South Wales Criminal Prevention Act which prohibited the entry from another State of persons convicted of an offence punishable by one year's imprisonment (though he had served his sentence) was held to be an infringement of the right of free intercourse.

However, in the *McArthur v. Queensland* case (28 C.L.R. 530) with Gavin and Duffy J.J. dissenting, the court adopted the view that section 92 did not bind the Commonwealth but that its operation was limited to free interstate commerce by the States. The reasoning contained in the judgment briefly was that "absolute free" was a phrase admitting no qualification, and that it must mean that interstate trade was free from any Government regulation whatever. But since the Constitution gave the Parliament power to make laws with respect to interstate trade there would be a contradiction in terms if section 92 were construed and were read as addressed to the Commonwealth, whereas it must be read as addressed to the States only.

That is a complete *volte face*. In the case of *Roughley v. N.S.W.* (42 C.L.R. 162) the question arose whether a licence fee imposed by a New South Wales Act for carrying on the business of agent could be endorsed against an agent whose sole business was to sell New South Wales produce grown in and forwarded on behalf of people resident in other States. This Act of New South Wales was held (Starke J. dissenting) not to be a breach of section 92 on the grounds that the fee was imposed not on an act of interstate trade but on the business of acting as agents in the State for the sale in the State of an article of interstate trade. Mr. Justice Starke's dissenting reasons seem to be founded on the fact that the very foundation of the business was an agreement with members outside the States, therefore transaction of interstate trade and commerce.

In *ex-parte Nelson* (42 C.L.R. 209) the question was whether section 92 invalidated the Stock Act (1921) of the State of New South Wales, which authorized the Governor in Council to prohibit by proclamation for any term the introduction of any stock from a State in which there was any reason to believe that a disease was carried into the State by the stock imported. On the Judgment the court was equally divided but held by the casting vote of the Chief Justice that the Act did not violate section 92 as it was a quarantine law whose legislative enactment was not to regulate interstate trade but to protect from disease. Isaacs J. in strong dissenting judgment, said that "absolute free" and "absolute prohibit" were irreconcilable and that the Act was a thinly disguised assumption of complete power over interstate trade.

These words of the judges are important. Then followed a series of cases on the limitation of the scope of section 92. First there is

the well known wheat case, *N.S.W. v. the Commonwealth* (C.L.R. 54). The Wheat Acquisition Act, 1914, of New South Wales, empowered the Government by notice in the *Gazette* to declare that any wheat specified in the notice was acquired by the Government and became the absolute property of the Government, wheatgrowers interests being converted into a claim for compensation. The judgment stated the Act dealt not with trade, but with ownership, and held that the State possessed the sovereign right of acquisition from the owner, notwithstanding any engagement from contracts the owner may have entered into to sell, even though it was sold over the border interstate.

Following this case and the consequent judgments, it encouraged the States to evade section 92. In the case *Foggitt Jones and Co. v. N.S.W.* (C.L.R. 357) it contested the prohibitions contained under the New South Wales Meat Supply and Imperial Users Act 1915 of selling the company's pigs over the border into Queensland. The court held that the Act was in effect an attempt to prevent the owners of the stock, whilst still remaining owners, from removing them across the border, and so was a contravention of section 92. This was a complete *volte face* of the high court.

However, six months later in the case *Duncan v. Queensland* (C.L.R. 556) the case was contested of meat supply under the Imperial Users Act of Queensland, and prevented the Queensland Government from moving stock out of that State. It was held that section 92 was not contravened. If this change of the High Court ruling had remained unchallenged, the effect would have been to wipe out completely section 92. Then four years later in the wellknown *McArthur* case the *Foggitt Jones* case was held to be right. Then came the famous case, *James v. Cowan* (C.L.R. 386). The ruling of the High Court in the wheat case inspired the South Australian Government by legislation to support the acquisition by the State in support of the growers of dried fruit for the A.D.F.A. dried fruits marketing scheme. The principle of this Act is well known and in brief the fruit was acquired by the Minister of Agriculture to regulate sale both for Australian production and export. The quota was fixed to be sold from each grower on the Australian market and for export. The High Court, with the precedent set down in the wheat case, held that the acquisition did not contravene section

92, but on an appeal the Privy Council overruled the High Court and held that the direct object of the Act was to authorize the Minister to exercise the power of acquisition, which interfered with interstate trade by forcing the fruit off the Australian market. It therefore contravened section 92.

Then came the *McArthur v. Queensland* case (C.L.R. 530). This brought a new interpretation of section 92 and tested the validity of the Profiteering Prevention Act 1920 of Queensland, which declared it unlawful for any trader to sell any commodity at a price higher than the price declared in the *Gazette* under the Act. The court held that this was a transaction of interstate commerce and that the Queensland Act, as applied to it, was invalid. Then there was the *Willard v. Rawson* case (C.L.R. 416) regarding the Victorian Motor Car Act 1928-30, which required cars used on a public highway to be registered. The contestant was a carrier residing in New South Wales owning a motor truck registered in that State. He was using the truck to carry goods from New South Wales to Victoria, and was convicted under the Victorian Act for not having Victorian registration. On appeal to the High Court, the court held (Dixon J. dissenting) that the Act did not infringe section 92. The judgment stated that the Act was substantially traffic legislation for regulating the ordinary and inoffensive users of the King's Highway and provide funds for its maintenance, and its effect upon interstate commerce was indirect and inconsequential. At a later stage the case *Rex v. Vizzard ex-parte* (C.L.R. 16) came under notice. This was under State Transport Co-ordination Act, 1931. The subject matter here was definitely transport. The purpose of the Act was to co-ordinate road and rail transport and to attempt to regulate the ruinous competition of road transport with the State railways. Every public motor vehicle had to be licensed under the Act and a levy per passenger and per ton of goods was collected. There was no distinction between interstate travellers.

An interstate haulier was convicted for operating without a licence. He obtained an *order nisi* for prohibition which was taken into the High Court. The Commonwealth Government obtained leave to intervene. The counsel were invited by the court to argue the matter as if the court were not bound by authority. It was suggested to the court that the *McArthur* case should be reviewed and overruled. The court proved to be equally divided. Three judges, including the Chief Justice, were of the opinion that neither of the two propositions in the

McArthur case was justified in the language of section 92, but they thought it undesirable that the case should be over-ruled by the casting vote of the Chief Justice and equally divided court. Four judges held that the State Act was good. Two dissenting judges thought that the Act contravened section 92. Thus the first real attempt to get a proper interpretation of section 92 was left in a very unsatisfactory position, and the High Court admitted this to be so.

In view of the Privy Council's decision in *James v. Crown* and the *Hughes-Vale* cases, notwithstanding Commonwealth and State complementary legislation, the grower could declare that his wheat was acquired across the border for sale and invoke the aid of section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution—"trade, commerce and intercourse shall be absolutely free." On this uncertain basis rests the validity of all State legislation on such important matters as marketing, the control and co-ordination of transport, and State and Federal legislation on the marketing of produce.

On this uncertain basis, the court being equally divided, you cannot get a proper decision, and on this unsatisfactory basis rests our wheat and barley marketing legislation. Let us look at the transport legislation operating in the other States. I appeal to the Government to look at this question of section 92. In reply to a question by me yesterday, the Premier said that every member would want to maintain absolute freedom of trade between the States. He is not in favour of an alteration of section 92 in regard to wheat marketing. On February 26 last he gave an address on the history of the self-governing States at a meeting of the School of Political Instruction. He said he would do all in his power to oppose any proposal which might come from the Commonwealth to break down the effect of section 92 of the Federal Constitution protecting freedom of trade. I suggest to him that he have another look at the position. If we are to have the leader of the State advocating a no-vote on a referendum on the grounds that we should not give the Commonwealth any greater powers, then he is arguing that he should not have the powers himself. This is the year 1957, and Australia has reached adult nationhood, but if neither the Commonwealth nor the State Government has power to legislate to control interstate transport it is time we investigated the matter

thoroughly. Almost every year we pass legislation amending sections of the Road Traffic Act dealing with registration fees. We provide that people domiciled in South Australia must pay registration fees for the maintenance of our roads, but if they transact business across the border they need not pay anything. The Premier advocates freedom of trade and says we should not try to compel such people to pay registration fees, but it is time the Government had another look at this question.

Later this Parliament will be asked to amend wheat stabilization legislation, which has worked successfully, but in view of judgments on section 92 it is not free from legal attack. If we made a small amendment to the Commonwealth Constitution that legislation would be safeguarded in the interests of primary producers. If neither the Commonwealth nor the State Government can pass legislation controlling traffic across our borders we have reached a worse state than we reached in 1899. What does freedom of trade mean? It has never been clearly defined. I shall quote from one of the judgments of Dr. Evatt, who was at one time a Justice of the High Court of Australia. In his judgment in the Vizzards case he said:—

Added with this consideration that section 92 has effect wherever and whenever the State legislates against the freedom of interstate commerce and intercourse also shows that if, as the present applicant argues, the common carrier derives an inalienable right from section 92 to project every one of his motor lorries upon the States' roads and use them there so long as he does so for the purpose of carrying goods from one State to another, section 92 must also secure to all carriers, traders and travellers an immunity from obedience to the very many State laws which are analogous in scope and in object to the State Transport Co-ordination Act, 1931.

Unless section 92 is altered we cannot be sure that our wheat and barley legislation will be secure, for that section says that trade between the States must be absolutely free. What a ridiculous state of affairs! If the Premier advocates a "No" vote by the people on a referendum to amend section 92 he is denying himself the right to collect registration fees to control interstate hauliers. I want this Parliament and the people to realize that we have an opportunity to convince an all-Party committee of the Commonwealth Parliament of the need for a review of the Commonwealth Constitution. I know that many people say that section 92 safeguards their interests, but I shall quote the opinions of one of our most eminent judges, Sir John Latham.

He was Chief Justice of the High Court, and a great advocate of altering section 92. The following is a report of what he said:—

Canberra, May 13, 1955. Australia could not afford to allow obstacles to her unity and progress to remain in the Constitution, Sir John Latham said today. Sir John Latham, a former Chief Justice of the High Court, was speaking at a conferring of degrees ceremony at the Australian National University. The Constitution had worked pretty well on the whole, but today it was producing too much friction. Sir John Latham said that section 92, which stated that trade, commerce and intercourse between the States should be absolutely free, was only a political slogan. I am ashamed to think how much money I have made out of that section, he said. A large number of people say that the section is the protection of private enterprise. But the section should say what we want interstate trade and commerce to be free from.

When addressing the Commonwealth Club in the Adelaide Town Hall on March 19, 1956, Sir John Latham said:—

Australia was handicapping herself with the outmoded provisions of the Commonwealth Constitution. Sir John Latham, who was speaking at a Commonwealth Club luncheon in the Adelaide Town Hall, is attending the Federal Conference of the Australian-American Association in Adelaide. He is president of the Victorian branch of the association. He said that the Commonwealth Constitution had worked well for 50 years, and proved itself able to absorb changed conditions, such as broadcasting and the R.A.A.F. We should ask ourselves, however, if it is not time to examine the Constitution, he added. Elections for the Senate and the House of Representatives were outmoded. This caused too many elections, which prevented continuity of policy. The States derived most of their income from the Commonwealth, and there was a yearly wrangle in Canberra over how much each was to receive. In certain States it has become the practice of some Ministers to make promises and then blame the Commonwealth for their non-fulfilment. This leads to irresponsibility. The States should know in advance what money they could expect from the Commonwealth and the distribution should be on a *per capita* basis so that the States could form responsible budgets. Section 92 of the Constitution, which was generally thought to guarantee freedom of interstate trade, created a great area of uncertainty because no-one could be sure what it meant in a particular case.

Sir John Latham went on to suggest that Australians should define exactly what they wanted section 92 to fulfil, but this would require thinking out many details. There was one Commonwealth Department of Navigation and six State Harbors and marine departments. There appeared no sense in having seven departments. Criticizing the arbitration system, Sir John Latham said that the waste which occurred in settlement of industrial

disputes as a result of provisions in the Constitution was tremendous. The Arbitration Court could give a decision only after a dispute had started and this meant, in some cases, that to get something done it was necessary to create a dispute. This was psychologically wrong. Parties to a dispute had to extend it to other States to gain a Federal decision. The present law created bigger and more disputes.

These remarks are interesting to anyone who takes an interest in this matter, and I have been compelled by circumstances to make a study of this problem and how it affects the barley marketing legislation. I am naturally vitally interested in the question of controlling interstate hauliers who travel across the border and damage our roads. In 1954 Sir John Latham suggested four possible courses for amendment of the Constitution to clear up the matters in doubt. The possibilities were as follows:—

- (a) Repeal section 92 and allow Federal and State Parliaments to have full power to legislate on interstate trade and commerce with the Federal law over-riding such laws where they conflict.
- (b) Provide for an interstate commission to supervise and enforce laws of Parliament and the provisions of the Constitution with respect to trade and commerce.
- (c) Make up our minds what we want section 92 to do, then say it in the Constitution.
- (d) Do nothing.

There are Sir John Latham's remarks. I ask members of this House to look at this question again. It is easy to be airy fairy about this question and say that we want section 92 to remain, but if we want that

section to remain it is no use expecting to bring down legislation to control interstate hauliers, and it is no use expecting to pass legislation for the continuation of the security of the wheat and barley industries. At some later stage we would find that some litigious individual could attack the legislation and there would be absolute chaos. Now is the time to strike, because we have the opportunity to convince an all-party committee in Canberra of the necessity of altering section 92. I will not have a bar of this attitude that we would only be giving greater power to the Commonwealth. Let us give the Commonwealth the power to control interstate hauliers, and let us make an arrangement with the Commonwealth that the contribution it receives will go back to the State revenue.

Mr. Shannon—The place to give evidence is before this committee you mentioned.

Mr. STOTT—The honourable member reminded me of a point I should have made, and that is that I intend to give evidence before this committee on the points I have mentioned. As the honourable member said, that is the place to do it. I gave this information to the House tonight for the purpose of pointing out that we cannot get out of this thing by saying that we will have it as it always was. If we allowed it to remain as it was we would be denying ourselves any power to fix fees and control interstate hauliers.

Mr. RICHES secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.47 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 1, at 2 p.m.