

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, August 7, 1957.

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

QUESTIONS.

SNOWY RIVER WATERS AGREEMENT.

Mr. BYWATERS—Has the Premier noticed in this morning's *Advertiser* the article headed "Snowy Draft Approved," and if so, has he any comments to make upon it?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have examined the article, which, as far as I know, is the first public statement as to what the allocation of water and electricity under the proposed agreement will be. Up to the present these matters have been regarded as private. Mr. Cahill has undoubtedly made a public statement setting out certain facts which are now being examined by the Government. A statement will be made upon the matter after its full import has been closely examined.

TAPLEYS HILL ROAD.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked on July 24 concerning the lighting of Tapleys Hill Road?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—Yes. Through my colleague, the Minister of Roads, I have received the following report from the Highways Commissioner:—

The Alberton-Glenelg main road between Grange Road and North Glenelg provides two good traffic lanes, being in its narrowest section 22ft. wide. Compared with many other roads in the metropolitan area this one carries the normal traffic with little inconvenience and there is no proposal for reconstruction. The Commissioner of Highways has no power to expend funds on the lighting of roads with the exception of the Anzac Highway and the Port Road.

I mentioned the last fact when the matter was first raised.

ALLOCATION OF CROWN LANDS.

Mr. HEASLIP—Can the Minister of Lands say what is the Government's policy with regard to the allocation of any available Crown Lands?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—The Government has a definite policy in respect of allotting Crown lands. As a matter of fact it dates back to the time immediately prior to the A.M.P. becoming interested in developing Crown and other lands. The Lands Department then had a large plan for the development of Crown lands prepared. Since that time there

has been considerable soldier settlement, but that has eased considerably and the Crown lands at our disposal will be surveyed as soon as surveyors are available. Recently an area in the Hundred of Jeffries was allotted and within six or eight weeks a further area on Eyre Peninsula will be gazetted. As soon as other areas are surveyed and soil surveys made they will be gazetted as speedily as possible.

FINANCE FOR HOUSING.

Mr. QUIRKE—In this morning's *Advertiser* is a lengthy letter referring to the housing position, which contains a statement that an applicant to the Savings Bank for finance for a house to be built by a private contractor has to wait nine months whereas the applicant for finance for a Housing Trust home receives immediate attention. Can the Premier say whether there is any defined policy that differentiates between those who have homes constructed by private contractors and those who purchase trust homes?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Government is not aware of any policy. As members know, the Savings Bank is administered by a board of governors who are not public servants and they control the affairs of the bank in such manner as they see fit. I saw the article referred to and if there is a wait in respect of private building I know nothing about it. It may be that the Housing Trust has made arrangements with the bank for the financing of a certain number of houses. That may be the answer to the question.

If members examine the finance available to the Government in the Loan Estimates introduced yesterday they will see that a large sum has been deliberately allocated to the State Bank for the erection of houses for private ownership. The Government has, in point of fact, always given very great assistance for private housing and is providing money to building societies for that purpose.

FIRE RESISTANT PAINTS.

Mr. SHANNON—About two weeks ago the Fire Brigades Board tested the fire resistant qualities of various types of proprietary paints. I have been advised that the experiments prove conclusively that certain paints have strong fire resistant qualities. Will the Premier inquire into this matter and ascertain whether such paint could be used, not only by the Housing Trust but, as a means of protecting Government property, on timber frame structures the Government has had to erect?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will have the matter referred to the Architect-in-Chief and see if there is any information I can supply to the honourable member.

SEWER INSTALLATIONS.

Mr. DUNNAGE—I have been approached by builders in my area who have told me that it now takes up to three months before sewer connections are made whereas, a short time ago, they could be made within a fortnight or three weeks. Can the Minister of Works state the reason for this delay?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—Offhand, obviously I cannot, but I know that not very long ago applications for installations were almost kept pace with. I was surprised to hear that in some cases there might be some lag. When speaking in the Adelaide Town Hall two years ago, the chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works in Melbourne said there was a two years' lag with water installations and five years with sewers in that city. We are a long way away from that. There might be some reason for the delay, although I do not know offhand. Of course, it is necessary to have specialized machinery and gangs, and perhaps houses have been erected faster than the gangs could keep pace. If the honourable member tells me the area concerned, I will do what I can to expedite connections.

COUNCIL BY-LAWS: POULTRY KEEPING.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham)—I move—

That by-law No. 67 of the corporation of the city of Adelaide made on August 20, 1956, and laid on the table of this House on February 5, 1957, and by-law No. 57 of the corporation of the city of Woodville made on July 23, 1956, and laid on the table of this House on June 25, 1957, both in respect of the keeping of poultry, be disallowed.

Perhaps first I could indicate the grounds for the opinion of members of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation. These by-laws depend on administrative and not judicial decisions, and members will recall that that is one of the four matters that members of the Subordinate Legislation Committee are specifically directed to inquire into on each and every by-law that comes before them. I might also say that members of the committee are not unsympathetic to the object of the by-laws, which is to control the keeping of poultry within the city of Adelaide and the city of Woodville, but both by-laws contain a number

of features regarded as objectionable. The committee is in this difficulty—that a by-law must either be allowed or disallowed in full; there is no half way house. The difficulty in these by-laws is so objectionable that the committee feels in duty bound to move for the disallowance of both, much as they regret having to do so.

I will deal first of all with the by-law of the City of Adelaide as it was the first considered by the committee. For the benefit of those who have not seen it I will run through its five clauses. The first contains definitions, the second lays down conditions under which poultry can be kept, the third requires that any person keeping poultry shall make sure that conditions are clean and sanitary, the fourth refers to storing of food used by the poultry, and the final clause lays down certain offences. In the explanation which accompanied the by-law the Town Clerk, Mr. Veale, said that the object was to enable the city council to deal with the keeping of poultry on premises within the city and particularly in close proximity to buildings of a residential class or in which foodstuffs were stored or manufactured. The council has no control and complaints received from time to time could be dealt with only as provided by the Health Act. In other words, the council could not take action unless an insanitary condition existed on the premises.

Upon commencing its inquiry the committee immediately came to the conclusion that some of the conditions appeared to be very stringent indeed. For instance, it is laid down that no person shall keep poultry within the municipality of Adelaide unless it is at all times kept within a place or enclosure which is:—

(a) Surrounded by mesh wire netting not less than 6ft. high.

(b) Not less than 50ft. from any street or road bounding the front of the premises . . .

(c) Not less than 3ft. from any boundary fence, hedge or wall unless such enclosure is constructed of sheet metal or other rat-resisting material extending 18in. below ground and not less than 12in. above ground.

(d) Not less than 20ft. from any building.

(e) Of an area of not less than six square feet for each bird contained in such place or enclosure.

(f) Provided with a shelter constructed of suitable material with an area of not less than three square feet for each bird; the roof shall be rainproof and the floor shall be paved with impervious material.

I think members will agree that those conditions are very stringent. Evidence was taken from three witnesses—Mr. Lawn, the honourable member for Adelaide, Dr. Fry, the City Medical Officer, and Mr. Anderson, an officer of the Department of Agriculture, and I think it only fair that I should mention some of the points made in the evidence. Mr. Lawn said that he agreed with most of the by-law, but objected to a small part of it, as he felt that it would virtually prohibit the keeping of poultry in the area. He was asked by the member for Gawler, “I take it you are not opposed to the spirit of the by-law,” and he replied “I am not.” “But you think it is too harsh and will virtually prohibit the keeping of poultry in the area?—Yes.” The second witness, who was examined on two occasions, was what I suppose we could call the spokesman for the council, Dr. Fry. He explained that the corporation had for a long time been receiving complaints from various ratepayers about other persons who were keeping poultry in the city, and it was found with the powers possessed by the council, very difficult to remedy the matters complained of. He was then asked at some length about the provisions of the by-law and at first said they were quite lenient. He pointed to the matter which is the crux of our objection—that the council could waive all or any of the conditions by giving written consent. On page 4 of the evidence he is reported as having said:—

The provisions of the by-law are extremely lenient. They only lay down the conditions that shall apply without the written consent of the council, but the council can be milder than this by-law by giving that consent.

Later he admitted that at present no fowl houses within the City of Adelaide would comply with the conditions laid down, and when recalled subsequently, he said that the city inspectors who had made inspections as a result of the committee's inquiries had reported to him that probably three-quarters of the fowl houses within the City could be made to conform with these conditions. Apparently the other quarter could not under any circumstances be made to comply with them. The gist of the rest of his evidence was that the by-law would not be enforced strictly: written consent might be given, so the by-law could be used against refractory persons who would not reform their ways and keep fowls in a satisfactory condition. I think that is a fair summary of Dr. Fry's evidence.

The other witness was Mr. Anderson (Chief Poultry Adviser in the Department of Agriculture), who was not happy about the by-law.

The transcript of his evidence states:—

By the Chairman—This committee cannot suggest amendments. We must either recommend disallowance or acceptance. Would you suggest disallowance?—I do not think I would, although I would not like to support it in a special form.

By Mr. Clark—Will this discourage the keeping of fowls in the city?—I think that is the object.

Then would it not be just as well to ban it altogether?—The regulation prescribes 50ft. from the road and 20ft. from any other building so it must be a pretty big block.

The implication of that reply is that it would be difficult to keep fowls under the conditions laid down.

Mr. LAWN—Especially in the city.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Yes. That completed the evidence given before the committee. Committee members believe that the by-law means that the keeping of poultry would be entirely at the discretion of the council for although stringent conditions have been laid down, they could be waived by written permission from the council.

Mr. LAWN—That proves they are not necessary.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Possibly, but the ground of the committee's objection is that it would be entirely in the discretion of the council whether fowls might be kept. The conditions could have been harsher or less harsh, but they are nullified by the words “without written consent of the council” in paragraph 2. In other words, members of the committee feel that the working of this by-law would depend on an administrative decision by the Corporation of the City of Adelaide and not upon the conditions laid down in the by-law.

Mr. Heaslip—Even if a householder complied with these conditions the Corporation of the City of Adelaide could refuse a permit?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—No; if he complied with the conditions he would be all right, but no fowl house at present complies with those conditions, according to the City Health Officer.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—The corporation could allow one person to keep fowls under certain conditions, yet prevent another person from keeping them under identical conditions?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—That is so, and my committee feels it has a duty to the House to point that out. The City of Woodville by-law follows very much the same form as that of the City of Adelaide, but some of its conditions are even more stringent. For instance, whereas a fowl house in Adelaide

would have to be at least 20ft. from any building, in Woodville it would have to be at least 40ft. from any building, which is double the distance. Paragraph 3 of the by-law provides—

No accommodation for poultry shall be:—

- (a) Within 10ft. of any street alignment.
- (b) Within 3ft. of any boundary of a property on which it is erected.
- (c) Within 40ft. of any dwelling, shop, factory, public building or of any building or structure which is ordinarily used for human beings to live or work in or to which the public ordinarily has access.

Paragraph 6 provides:—

- (a) The council may in special circumstances (which shall be in the sole and absolute discretion of the council) dispense with the compliance by any person with any provision of this by-law on such terms and for such period as the council may think proper.
- (b) Such dispensation shall be in writing under the hand of the Town Clerk but shall not otherwise be valid.
- (c) Such dispensation may be revoked at any time without any reason being given.

The committee believes that the by-law gives an unlimited administrative discretion which should not be allowed and considers it therefore to be an undesirable provision, and for that reason I ask members to agree to the motion.

Mr. HUTCHENS secured the adjournment of the debate.

Year.	Metropolitan.	Country.	Total.
1938	321,000 (54%)	274,000 (46%)	595,000
1956	522,000 (60%)	340,000 (40%)	862,000
Increase	201,000	66,000	267,000
Increase %	66%	24%	45%

I shall now give another set of figures, which reflect substantially what is conveyed by the population figures I have just given. The

	1938.	1956.	Increase.	Per Cent Increase.
Total enrolment	364,884	468,303	103,419	28
Metropolitan enrolment	211,963	293,315	81,352	38
Country enrolment	152,921	174,988	22,067	14
Average metropolitan enrolment	16,300	22,600	6,200	38
Average country enrolment	5,900	6,700	800	14

Members will see that the percentage increases for both the metropolitan enrolment and the average metropolitan enrolment were the same, namely, 38 per cent. Furthermore, the percentage increases in both the country enrolment and the average country enrolment were

DECENTRALIZATION.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—I move—

That in view of the alarming concentration of population in the metropolitan area of South Australia, an address be presented to the Governor praying His Excellency to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into and report upon—

- (a) Whether industries ancillary to primary production, such as meat works, establishments for treating hides, skins, etc., and other works for the processing of primary products should be established in country districts; and
- (b) What other secondary industries could appropriately be transferred from the metropolitan area to the country; and
- (c) What new industries could be established in country districts; and
- (d) Whether more railway construction and maintenance work could be done at country railway depots; and
- (e) What housing provision should be made to assist a programme of decentralization; and
- (f) What amenities, particularly sewerage schemes, are necessary to make country towns more attractive.

In the preamble I say there is an alarming concentration of population in the metropolitan area, and I propose to quote briefly from our statistical and other records to prove that contention. For comparative purposes I have taken the years 1938 and 1956. The following table shows the distribution of population in the metropolitan and country areas for those two years:—

following table gives the enrolment figures for the House of Assembly:

	1938.	1956.	Increase.	Per Cent Increase.
Total enrolment	364,884	468,303	103,419	28
Metropolitan enrolment	211,963	293,315	81,352	38
Country enrolment	152,921	174,988	22,067	14
Average metropolitan enrolment	16,300	22,600	6,200	38
Average country enrolment	5,900	6,700	800	14

the same, namely, 14 per cent. I believe that there is some relationship between the electoral system, which is portrayed so aptly by these figures, and the centralization of population and industry in the metropolitan area, and I shall have more to say on that point

later. The disproportionate growth of the metropolitan population compared with that of the country has been due to:—

- (1) lack of employment for those not actually engaged in primary production;
- (2) positive discouragement of settlement of population in the country through failure of the Government to provide employment there;
- (3) policy followed by the Government in serving the interests of land-owners who, because they own the land and can provide amenities for themselves, etc., remain in the country while other people have to come to the metropolitan area;
- (4) retention, encouraged by the Government, of the good land in the hands of a relatively few people;
- (5) special precautions taken by the Government to ensure that closer settlement and industrial concentrations shall not take place in districts represented by members of the Liberal and Country League.

Employment in both primary and secondary industries must be provided in the country regardless of party political interests, which must be disregarded if we are to give effect to a sound policy for the future and the permanent welfare of South Australia. The obvious type of employment would be that afforded by industries allied to the appropriate primary industries already established in the country. Other industries, not so allied, must also be encouraged to establish themselves by the provision of such services as would give them a reasonable chance of becoming self-supporting. There is considerable scope for closer settlement enabling many more people to derive their living directly from the land in the better areas. In this respect, I quote these figures which I mentioned earlier in the Address in Reply debate. In 1938-39 the number of individual holdings amounted to 31,123, and in 1954-55, which are the latest figures available, the number had fallen to 28,092, a reduction of about 3,000.

I point out that this has been a period when we have been favoured by many discoveries which have increased the productive capacity of land, particularly in the higher rainfall areas. The decrease in holdings has occurred in a period when the population of the State has increased, as I pointed out earlier, by 45 per cent. To maintain the *status quo* in regard to land settlement at the figure which existed in 1938-39, instead of there being a reduction of 3,000 in the number individually settled on the land there should have been a very substantial increase in that period, par-

ticularly when we realize that during the latter portion of the period we have embarked, in partnership with the Commonwealth Government, on a land settlement scheme for ex-servicemen which has been responsible for placing over 900 settlers on the land in various parts of the State. The undoubted possibilities for closer settlement and placing more people on the land have been completely and pathetically neglected by this Government.

All sound political thought is against the continued increase in metropolitan population and the concentration of industries in the metropolitan area. In order to prove that point I have a table which shows a large number of country towns that have lost population as indicated by the census figures of 1933 and 1954. I ask permission of the House for the table to be inserted in *Hansard* without being read.

Leave granted.

Town.	Popu- lation, 1933.	Popu- lation, 1954.	Decrease.
Blyth	659	503	156
Booborowie . . .	675	446	229
Boooleroo	852	617	235
Burra	1,951	1,599	352
Bute	849	693	156
Caltowie	651	366	285
Edithburgh . . .	800	610	190
Hamley Bridge . .	870	725	145
Hawker	688	495	193
Jamestown	2,134	1,877	257
Kapunda	2,027	1,614	413
Kimba	950	815	135
Melrose	606	463	143
Minnipa	516	376	140
Morgan	777	575	202
Orroroo	1,047	846	201
Pinnaroo	1,528	1,153	375
Port Broughton . .	819	598	221
Quorn	1,946	1,813	133
Saddleworth . . .	622	565	57
Snowtown	950	854	96
Warooka	575	419	156
Wasleys	534	386	148
Wirrabara	981	670	311
Yongala	626	243	383

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I draw attention to the fact that included in this list are towns such as Burra, where the population has decreased by 352 in the period. Burra is an historical and well-established town which up to about 20 years ago had substantially maintained the prosperity of the area as a result of mining activities, particularly during last century. The continued prosperity of Burra was mainly because in the early days of this century, as a result of a vigorous closer settlement policy promulgated by the Labor Party and given effect to firstly by the Kingston Government

and subsequently by the Price-Peake Government, many large estates were subdivided for closer settlement. The result was that the business community in Burra benefited from production from the land which substantially took the place of the business increment due in days gone by to production from the mines. Subsequently a re-aggregation set in, and today there are very few of these original closer settlement holdings still extant in the Burra district. It is true that large aggregations were subdivided in the years between 1902 and 1914, but in their place we have what is a much greater menace than were the large estates. The latter called for some action because they were so obvious that people passing through the area were staggered at the sparsity of population, with the result that subdivision became the almost constant and imperative cry. The accumulated effect today is even worse than was the effect of the large estates.

The town of Hamley Bridge during that period lost 145 and Jamestown 257 of its population. Very similar conditions to what I have mentioned at Burra have been responsible for the loss of population in the Jamestown area. Kapunda lost 413 of its population in that period. Here again, the conversion of small holdings into large holdings has been responsible to a very marked degree for the business stagnation in the town which resulted, as any honourable member can see passing through this town, in closed shops and in a run-down appearance in the area. There are very few country towns with populations exceeding 500 and this supports my contention that the aggregation of population in the metropolitan area is much worse in South Australia than in other States. I have a list, based on the 1954 census, comprising approximately 660 country towns, townships and localities. Of

this number, about 540 have populations of less than 500—the great majority very much less. Of the 120 towns with populations exceeding 500, 67 are in the 501-1,000 group; 28 in the 1,001-2,000 group; 16 in the 2,001-5,000 group; seven in the 5,001-10,000 group and two only—Mount Gambier and Port Pirie—have more than 10,000 inhabitants. This proves conclusively that there is a greater aggregation of population in our metropolitan area than in other States.

It is obvious that there must be a stipulated minimum size for a community before an adequate and economic provision of amenities is possible. Members ought to be able to see, notwithstanding any political myopia they may be afflicted with, that in the interests of the State's progress and stability we must **disperse** our population and that can only be done by making amenities available in country areas. Members will say that this would cost money, but the cost would pale into insignificance compared with what has been spent in the metropolitan area in providing amenities for its increasing population. Let us consider the Adelaide water district as an example. In 1946-47—about the time the increased concentration of population in the metropolitan area began—the capital cost of this water district was £5,900,000 and the number of services 102,000. By 1955-56 the capital cost had increased by 244 per cent to £20,400,000 and the number of services by 55 per cent to 157,000. Those are startling figures and they will increase still further if the Premier's vision of a population of 1,000,000 people between Adelaide and Gawler within 25 years becomes a fact. The following is a table of revenue and expenditure relating to the Adelaide water district:—

Year.	Revenue. £	Expenditure. £	Result. £
1948-49	608,000	458,000	150,000 Surplus
1949-50	631,000	529,000	102,000 Surplus
1950-51	680,000	631,000	49,000 Surplus
1951-52	860,000	768,000	92,000 Surplus
1952-53	908,000	847,000	61,000 Surplus
1953-54	969,000	992,000	23,000 Deficiency
1954-55	1,079,000	1,450,000	372,000 Deficiency
1955-56	1,359,000	1,577,000	218,000 Deficiency

I think probably the explanation of the increase in revenue from £1,079,000 to £1,359,000 was the increase in assessments that occurred about that time, but despite that, the deficiency was £218,000.

Let us now look at what happened in country districts in the same period. In 1946-47 the capital cost of country water schemes was

£13,600,000, and 40,000 services were connected; in 1955-56 the capital cost was £21,100,000 and 59,000 services were connected. Capital cost increased by 55 per cent and the number of services by 48 per cent. In the same period in the metropolitan water district the increase in capital cost was 244 per cent, yet the increase in the number of services was only 55 per cent—

a striking comparison. The following table shows the revenue and expenditure in country water districts for the period shown:—

Year.	Revenue. £	Expenditure. £	Deficit. £
1948-49 . . .	371,000	908,000	537,000
1949-50 . . .	385,000	994,000	609,000
1950-51 . . .	418,000	1,157,000	739,000
1951-52 . . .	441,000	1,259,000	818,000
1952-53 . . .	507,000	1,319,000	812,000
1953-54 . . .	537,000	1,316,000	778,000
1954-55 . . .	664,000	1,514,000	850,000
1955-56 . . .	724,000	1,672,000	948,000

I suggest that these figures tell two different stories. In the first instance, for many years prior to the last three the surplus in the metropolitan water district was substantially able to meet the deficiency in the country, and this was felt to be a proper apportionment of the burden because country water schemes were developmental. In fact, in some instances they were imperative for development. Of course, in the final analysis the wealth produced in the country has a very astounding impact on the business and community life of the metropolitan area, but as a result of country towns being denuded of their populations, the revenue from the water services in country areas has not kept pace with the capital expenditure. My point is that if we had developed industries and population in country towns to the same extent as in the metropolitan area in this same period we would have a much better result from country water schemes to help counter-balance the drastic result in the metropolitan water district.

Members, of course, are familiar with the figures given in the Loan Estimates yesterday showing the tremendous increase in the cost of school buildings, hospitals and other amenities rendered necessary in the metropolitan area as a result of the growth of its population, and so it becomes difficult to provide necessary services in the country because of the haphazard and costly metropolitan development. Another point to which I wish to refer briefly is the position of the population in the event of war. I certainly hope we will never have to face another war, but if we do it will be an atomic war, and it will be impossible to defend the huge population in the metropolitan area.

I shall not try to lay down what industries should be transferred from the metropolitan area to the country or what new industries should be established in country districts: I suggest that that is a matter for an expert committee, and I am giving the Government the opportunity in this motion to appoint such a committee in order to have the matter

properly and completely investigated so that we will know what the blue print for the future will be, and we may prescribe for the carrying of that blue print to its successful completion. I draw attention to the fact that this Government in 1946 made a pretence of doing something about decentralization, but of course it makes a pretence of doing anything. The Premier particularly makes grandiloquent statements about a new industry here, a new port there, and something else somewhere else, all of which, as the member for Hindmarsh said during the Address in Reply debate, are ultimately lost in the limbo of forgotten things. The body appointed by the Government had a very good personnel. The chairman was Mr. M. A. F. Pearce, C.B.E., A.F.I.A., Secretary to the Premier. Its members were Messrs. C. M. Hambridge, L.S. (Surveyor-General), D. V. Fleming, O.B.E., A.S.M.B., M.I.E.(Aust.) (Commissioner of Highways and Director of Local Government), J. R. Dridan, B.E., Dip. Mech. Eng., F.S.A.S.M., A.M.I.U.(Aust.) (Deputy Engineer-in-Chief), and the secretary, Mr. R. G. Hitchcox of the Chief Secretary's Department. This committee was appointed for the purpose of developing something in the nature of a regional plan and in 1946 it made a report on regional boundaries. It went into all manner of things dealing with the physical characteristics of the various districts, such as, rainfall, minerals, soil types and so forth; quite a valuable report if anything had been done about it except placing it in a pigeonhole and forgetting all about it, which is precisely what this Government did. I am suggesting that we take up the investigation where that body left off with another investigation as to what can be done to develop industries in the country areas. One point that is germane to the argument as regards a number of country areas is the question of railway maintenance and the production of railway equipment. We have at Peterborough, Tailem Bend and other places railway depots where a considerable volume of maintenance is carried out, and my submission is that more work could be done in these depots. I have had discussions with railway men on the subject and they assure me that it is only a matter of having skilled personnel in these places and, with existing equipment, they could do much work which is now sent to the metropolitan area for fabrication. Here is an opportunity to make a start in the decentralization of population and industry.

To show that there is nothing new in my proposal I wish briefly to quote from something

that occurred quite a while ago. It will be remembered that in 1942 the Commonwealth Government appointed a committee to investigate the possibilities of decentralization of population and industry after the war on a nation-wide basis. Invitations were issued to prominent figures in the various States and I wish to quote from the evidence given by the then Leader of the Opposition in South Australia, the Hon. R. S. Richards. He said said:—

Decentralization of secondary industries should form part of the reconstruction scheme. The promotion of secondary industries in country areas should aim at providing employment for those members of rural families who are unable to be permanently employed on the land. It must be apparent that it is not possible to continually subdivide land to accommodate all members of rural families. Those who wish to enter industry should have ample opportunity to do so without swelling the population of capital cities. If provision were made for local industries reasonable amenities would be available to rural populations, thus tending to prevent the concentration of population in congested areas which has been found so undesirable and dangerous in time of war. This close association of industrial and rural interests would ultimately break down the existing prejudices between city and country and promote a wider knowledge of the total dependence of a nation upon the productive capacity of the land.

These remarks were pertinent and correct when made in 1942 and are just as pertinent and correct today, but unfortunately this Government—this allegedly Liberal and Country League Government which is supposed to have the interests of the country at heart—has taken no steps to give effect to a policy which would make Mr. Richards' vision come true.

I notice that the Premier, speaking in another debate last week, did me the honour of anticipating some of the things that I would say in this debate. He said:—

I realize it is one of the most important topics dealt with by members and one of the greatest problems confronting either this Parliament or the Parliament of any other State or country.

He was, of course, referring to decentralization, so why have not he and his Government done something about it? He went on to refer to the fact that there has been decentralization of population and industry and mentioned such places as Mount Gambier, Whyalla, Radium Hill and Leigh Creek, but I suggest that the increase in population in those areas is due to two things. In the first instance it is due to natural advantages. But

for the hill of iron ore at Iron Knob do members think there would have been any Whyalla?

Mr. Jennings—The Premier put it there.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I suggest that neither he nor his grandfather put it there, but that it was put there by the Almighty for the use and benefit of mankind; but under the control of this Government the mankind of South Australia is not getting its quota of benefits from its development.

Mr. Hutchens—How do you account for so many being misled?

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I am convinced that there is always a majority of the people of South Australia who believe in the policy I am enunciating and would like the Government to conform to it, but unfortunately, because of the electoral system, they are denied the right to reject the Government they do not want and elect a Government that they desire. The Premier went on to say:—

The problem is simply that of the bright city lights *versus* the necessity to distribute population as widely as possible in the interests of the economy.

I have said already that one of the drawbacks to the dispersal of the population is the fact that the land in country areas is held in too large holdings and that smaller holdings would provide incentives which would ultimately lead to the building up of country industries. The Premier went on:—

Admittedly, the population of Adelaide has increased more rapidly than the country population, but that is only to be expected at a time when large numbers of people are being brought from the heavily populated countries of Europe.

This is one of the weakest arguments ever adduced to justify the disproportionate increase in the metropolitan population. However, in the outlying parts to which he referred, such as Radium Hill, Leigh Creek, and the settlements along the north-south railway line, about 50 per cent of the labour force are migrants from these densely populated areas in Europe. The Australians have been forced out of country towns by the deliberate policy of the Playford Government; they have lost their livelihood there merely because this Government does not want workers in country towns lest the vote go against its political henchmen. In the Address in Reply debate the Premier said:—

The true position is that the country population is advancing fairly rapidly, although on the average not the same as the phenomenal growth in the metropolitan area.

Yet even the figures he produced showed that the metropolitan population had increased by 100,000 over the period referred to, whereas the country population had increased by only 50,000. If that state of affairs continues—and apparently it will while this Government has its way, unless by passing this motion Parliament can persuade it to take some positive action—what will the future of this State be? Not only will we have 60 per cent of the population in the metropolitan area, but the percentage will continue to grow, because for every two persons who come to live in the metropolitan area only one will go to the country.

In May each year the Catholic Church in Australia sets aside one Sunday as Social Service Sunday, and prior to that day the hierarchy of the Church in Australia publishes a pamphlet dealing with some aspect of social service or some moral aspect upon which they feel the community should be informed. I wish to make it clear that the Church does not intend to intrude into politics: the bishops merely set out their views clearly on the moral and social issues to which they desire to draw attention. In the 1955 statement on social justice they referred particularly to big cities, saying:—

Is it not the duty of governments to give the lead in a programme which ensures that no further growth of factories or industries be permitted in the State capitals and all cities above a defined size; and which, by consequence, deflects industrial development and all increase in population to smaller centres?

About the time that pamphlet was printed I suggested that we should call a halt to the growth of the metropolitan area by refusing to provide amenities outside a defined distance from the city, but I was severely criticized by the Premier and his supporters, who said that it was a frightful proposal and something quite beyond the ken of civilized man. Yet we find that that is what is advocated by the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church in Australia when it says that we should arrest the growth of big concentrations of population and use the resultant saving of capital expenditure to provide amenities and encourage the growth of population in other areas. At page 8 the bishops drew attention to this aspect by saying:—

So much capital spent on building up the metropolitan cities is so much capital taken away from the development of country towns and rural areas. It involves us also in a vicious circle. The fact that these facilities are added annually to capital cities is a constant inducement to secondary industries to establish themselves in the capitals, setting up a

further demand for housing and services. There is a limit to the capital annually available for investment in the development of Australia. If so much is spent on the expansion of the cities, it is inevitable that the development of the inland will be retarded. That is economically and socially bad.

At page 10 the authors referred to the responsibility of Governments by saying:—

The damaging effects of centralization on the life of the nation are in themselves sufficient to warrant the strongest action by governments to put a limit on the size of the major industrial cities and to take all the necessary measures to make that limit effective. The first essential of any programme of decentralization is to impart the conviction that decentralization is a practical programme which can be carried through. One of the major factors which operate against decentralization is the popular superstition that the continuous growth of cities is in some way inevitable and that it cannot be prevented without flying in the face of "progress."

If it is progress to continue to herd a disproportionate number of our people in a few big wens in this country, then we should be preserved by our Governments from such progress in the future. The statement continues:—

In fact, the opposite is the case. Practically the only factor making naturally for centralization in most of the Australian States is the scarcity of good harbours. Almost every other factor which has led to centralization is man-made—the direction of rail and road systems, freight rates, the expenditure of a great part of the public revenues on public works and amenities attached to the cities and so on. These man-made factors are by no means inevitable, and it is possible to substitute for them measures of a quite different kind.

Is that not precisely what I have been saying this afternoon? Indeed, I said it in 1952, yet my words then fell on deaf ears, but I trust my words today will fall on more enlightened ears. Dealing with the restriction by government action of the growth of certain areas, the statement continues:—

The recommendations of the Utthwatt and Barlow Royal Commissions (Great Britain) should be applied in the various States. This would involve a direct ban on building any new factories within a specified radius of cities over a certain size. This ban would be reinforced if it were accompanied by taxation incentives to industries establishing themselves along the road and rail links to the new ports . . . The development of agricultural settlement for Australians, both returned soldiers and civilians, and migrants in regions thus created around these focal points, should be proceeded with to provide the agricultural base for an expanding Australian economy. The many millions of pounds which are being devoted to solving traffic and similar problems in capital cities might be invested with greater profit in settlement of the land.

The expansion of agriculture and of country industries should be accompanied by the extension to these areas of the social and cultural amenities and the facilities for recreation with which the cities are so lavishly endowed . . . All increases in secondary and tertiary industries would be centred in thriving country towns, whose ultimate size would also be controlled by the indirect means of limiting industries within them. These towns in their turn would exist in a thriving agricultural hinterland, for agriculture would have been expanded to serve as the base of a thriving and populous nation.

I shall quote the conclusion of their lordships at the end of this pamphlet, because it sets out more effectively in their language than in language I am able to use what this policy is intended to lead to, what it should lead to and why it should be implemented. Their conclusion is:—

Without assuming competence to speak authoritatively in technical matters, it seems to us that these proposals are worthy of mature consideration since they are one of the few systematic contributions presented to solve the problem of centralization. Finally, it should not be forgotten that the successful achievement of a thorough-going programme of decentralization would furnish outstanding proof of the vitality of our people and of their capacity to respond to the challenge of their history.

Only those men and women who are true patriots, who are truly confident of their nation's capacity to become great, will be capable of the moral effort needed to develop Australia's resources to the full. Without a genuine programme of decentralization these resources will be untapped and unharnessed in many regions and many of the opportunities to enrich mankind with which Almighty God has endowed this Continent will be wasted.

It is our hope that once these obligations have been explained and once the pattern of policy necessary to fulfil them has been outlined to our people, they, in their turn, will respond to the challenge, turn back the tide of history, and remake Australia.

That is what I am suggesting we should begin to do in South Australia, the worst State in our Continent as regards decentralization, through a petition to His Excellency to appoint a Royal Commission to consider the steps necessary to be taken to bring about decentralization of industry and population.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—A motion on almost precisely the same terms was before the House in 1952, and consequently I anticipated that the Leader of the Opposition's remarks would also be similar. In looking through *Hansard* and listening to the honourable member this afternoon, I find that my forecast was singularly accurate, because we have had placed

before us almost precisely the same material, the only difference being that the honourable member has taken a leaf out of the book of the member for Adelaide and had a few comments to make regarding electoral reform. That is something new.

Mr. O'Halloran—Nevertheless, it is true.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Secondly, Mr. O'Halloran has brought his statistics up to date, but not his general knowledge. Only last week I heard in the Address in Reply debate a number of members say that they could not remember one industry that the State had established in the country, or one thing which the State had ever done to help the establishment of industry in the country. If members opposite believe that they must have been asleep for a very long time or could not have taken an intelligent interest in what occurs in the House from day to day, and what has been the significantly successful policy of this Chamber for a number of years. I know many arguments can be submitted dealing with the undesirability of a large proportion of the population being centred in Adelaide, and I quite agree that it is undesirable for that position to apply to any capital city in any country. It is true that a large majority of the population of South Australia lives within the metropolitan area and that that population is continuing to grow, but it is not true that there has been a concentration of population in Adelaide, as the Leader of the Opposition has stated. It is true that country population has been growing, perhaps not quite so rapidly as in the city, although in some towns it has been growing very much more rapidly than in the city. We have had a net gain from natural increase, and as we are still a free community people can decide for themselves where they shall live, notwithstanding Her Majesty's Opposition.

Mr. O'Halloran—The availability of jobs decides that.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Honourable members know that since the war there have been vacancies for jobs in every part of the State. For instance the labour force at the shipbuilding yard at Whyalla has never been at more than half strength since the war. Many members seem to forget that in a free country a man can select his own work and where he will live. The Leader of the Opposition talks glibly of transferring industries to the country.

Mr. O'Halloran—No.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—One part of his motion states:—

What other secondary industries could appropriately be transferred from the metropolitan area to the country.

Are we to assume that by Act of Parliament we may tell a firm, say Simpsons Ltd., that it shall go to a certain country town? If we do that we shall meet exactly the same fate as did a Labor Government in New South Wales when it told one industry that it must not establish itself within a certain distance of Sydney. That industry said, "Thank you, we will go to South Australia," and it is now in this State and employing 1,200 people. When the Leader talks so glibly of transferring industries to the country he is coming up against the basic rights of the people of Australia.

Mr. Shannon—Both employers and employees.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes. During a war there may be good grounds for telling people what they shall do, but they do not like being told what they shall do. If that is the policy of the Leader of the Opposition it has no support from me.

Mr. O'Halloran—I did not say that is my policy.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I am looking at the word "transfer," and I remind the honourable member that if people want to go to the country there is no need to transfer them. "Transferring" obviously implies taking some action to shift people, but I hope that such will never be a policy of this Parliament. If it becomes the policy of this Parliament we shall destroy with one fell sweep all the goodwill that we have built up over many years. Today this State is recognized, both in Australia and overseas, as being one place where it is desirable to establish secondary industries, where the atmosphere for secondary industries is favourable, and where there is a liberty and general understanding of the problems of secondary industries. When an industry indicates that it may start in South Australia I tell it that the best services of the Government will be at its disposal and that if it is set up in a country town the Government will be prepared to extend additional facilities.

Mr. O'Halloran—What country towns?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Many. For instance, I told one industry that the Government would erect 4,000 houses in Mount Gambier if it would establish there. It ultimately went to New South Wales

because we could not provide it with all its basic requirements. Again, we promised almost unlimited assistance to another industry if it would commence in the Victor Harbor district.

Mr. O'Halloran—I am pleased it did not go there.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The honourable member changes his ground immediately, but the fact is that the Government has given much more liberal support to any industry going to the country. Legislation passed by this House provides for much more liberal financial assistance for industries in the country. Practically every country town has some industry which in some way owes its being to action taken by the Government. Indeed, in the Leader's own district the Government undertook technical investigations that led to the establishment of an industry. The Government then provided finance and went to considerable expense in providing it with electricity.

Mr. O'Halloran—You did not put the deposit of ore there.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Neither did the honourable member. The ore had been there for years, but no firm worked it until the Government provided great assistance. When the Leader of the Opposition was making his sweeping assertions he forgot about that industry. I have compiled some information to show what technical and other assistance has been given to industries. I do not want to bore members by reading all of it, but I shall read some of it and ask for the remainder to be printed in *Hansard* without reading it, and then members will have all the information. What I shall read will give some idea of the investigations that have been carried out by the Government for the benefit of secondary industries. Geological and metallurgical investigations have been carried out on a deposit of asbestos at Williamstown, and they are incomplete. Geological and mining investigations of barytes at Orparinna have been carried out for South Australian Barytes Limited. At Quorn metallurgical investigations were carried out for the same firm, and at Willunga mining and drilling was done for L. G. Abbott & Company.

We have investigated brick clays at Lobethal, Nuriootpa, Port Elliott, South Hummocks, Cherryville, Bordertown, and Woodside, and industries have been established at some of those places. Further, a general survey of brick clays has been carried out

over many parts of the State. Investigations into building stone deposits have been carried out at Auburn, Mount Gambier, Angaston, Cowell, Ashton, Morgan and Ashbourne. Again, in some instances, industries followed those investigations. We have investigated white clay deposits at Woocalla and other places and made a general survey of the resources throughout the State. Deposits of felspar were investigated in the Gumeracha district, and graphite in the Port Lincoln and Tumby Bay areas. Gypsum was investigated at Lake MacDonnell, Marion Lake, Snow Lake, Coores Plains, Tickera, Lake Fowler, Craigies Plain, Balaklava and Kangaroo Island, and a general survey was made of the whole State. Again, in some instances, industries followed these investigations. The firm of F. Ingham & Company is now established on Kangaroo Island as a direct result of what has been done by the State Government.

Mr. O'Halloran—They shifted the plaster works from Port Pirie to Adelaide.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—They may have, but does the honourable member propose by legislation to stop them doing that? When you try to control the movements of the people you will have a much worse position than if you give them encouragement, technical advice and financial assistance if necessary. When you try to push them around, which too often is the policy of bureaucrats in this country, you do not get any benefit, because an Australian can be led but not pushed. The sooner the Leader of the Opposition understands that the better we will get along. We have undertaken hematite investigations at Williamstown and a very extensive one, costing hundreds of thousands of pounds, into iron ore deposits in the Middle-back Ranges; that investigation is continuing. We have conducted investigations into limestone and marble at Angaston, and as a result one of the largest industries in South Australia has been established. Limestone and marble investigations have also been carried out at Wardang Island on behalf of the B.H.A.S., at Paris Creek and Murray Bridge on behalf of Hydrated Lime Ltd., around Gulf St. Vincent on behalf of Shellgrit Resources, at Point Turton on behalf of the B.H.P. Company, at Mount Gambier on behalf of Hydrated Lime Ltd., at Hallett Cove on behalf of S.A. Portland Cement Company, at Klein Point on behalf of Adelaide Cement Company, at Mount Torrens on behalf of Hydrated Lime Ltd., at Rapid Bay and Ardrossan for the B.H.P. Company, at Wool Bay and Yorketown

on behalf of Wool Bay Lime Ltd., and at Kapunda, and a general reconnaissance has been made of the whole of South Australia.

Honourable members know the work that was done right from the pioneering stage to the completion of the project at Leigh Creek. Not only was investigational work undertaken, but the whole project was financed by the State and carried on to the point of successful production before it was handed over to the Electricity Trust. We have undertaken investigations into lignite supplies at Moorlands, Clinton, Inkerman and Balaklava. Some of these investigations are still under consideration for further action. Investigations have been carried out into supplies of magnesite at Port Germein, Port Augusta and Copley. In the first two instances the investigations were made on behalf of the B.H.P. Company and the firm of G. Cardassis, and at Copley on behalf of F. H. Faulding and Company.

Mr. Riches—You have examined samples submitted, but what else has been done?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—We have given technical advice and have gone as far as we possibly can to assist companies. If any company submits a worthwhile proposition for financial or any other type of assistance and can show that it is a deserving firm we will give it every possible support.

Mr. Riches—Does that apply only to magnesite?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—It applies to any type of industry.

Mr. Riches—Could it apply to salt?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes. The honourable member made some references to salt, and said that all these people wanted was a road to enable them to get their salt out.

Mr. Riches—No, I did not; I said, "transport."

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—This company had and still has the good will of the South Australian Government in every way. The only difficulty about the support of this company is that it has not been able to establish itself in any way as being a project that has been well-developed, even though a very large amount of money has been spent. The firm has now been reorganized. Their representatives came to see me recently and stated that they desired assistance, firstly a roadway, secondly a harbour, and thirdly, finance. Although a lot of money has been spent the most recent report that I could procure was that the total amount of salt produced was 50 tons. That report was obtained for me as recently as the day before yesterday.

The honourable member accuses the Government of not taking a sympathetic view of this firm. The Government takes a most sympathetic view, and hopes it can assist the firm to go forward, but with a production of 50 tons of salt can we establish a harbour and a roadway system, and show any grounds for large expenditure of public money?

Mr. O'Halloran—What is the use their producing when they cannot dispose of the product?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The firm states that it can dispose of it.

Mr. O'Halloran—With the facilities asked for.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—No, it states that it can dispose of the salt and that it has an overseas market for it. I believe that it can probably get a satisfactory contract overseas, but I point out that this is not a Government industry.

Mr. Riches—They are producing 150 tons a day now; I have been there and seen them harvesting.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The report I received this week stated that 50 tons was the total amount of salt at present on hand. An inspection was made only this week as a result of statements made last week by the honourable member. If the industry was falling back because the Government had not given it assistance, I assure him that the Government would be most anxious to assist it.

I am quite sure that when honourable members read this list relating to the various types of assistance given to industry they will be surprised at the far-reaching nature of the investigations that have been made not only to assist industry but to point the way to opportunities for advancement. We have spent well over £250,000 in establishing scientific laboratories which help not only South Australian industries on all metallurgical problems, but almost every major mining concern in Australia. All the work for the treatment of the Mary Kathleen mines in Queensland was undertaken in those laboratories. The elaboration of the processes for the separation of uranium ore was undertaken there. Furthermore, they designed the entire plant for the Mary Kathleen mines. They are the most up-to-date metallurgical laboratories in Australia and, although established for the sole purpose of assisting the development of this State, have been so successful that the Commonwealth Government is negotiating with this Government to make them national laboratories. That, surely, answers the question whether this

Government is giving technical or other assistance to secondary industries. As the hour is 4 o'clock I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

METROPOLITAN AND EXPORT ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. O'HALLORAN, having obtained leave, introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Act, 1936-56.

Read a first time.

HINDMARSH CORPORATION BY-LAW—STREET ALIGNMENTS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham)—I move—

That By-law No. 41 of the Corporation of the Town of Hindmarsh for the fixing of the building line in relation to the street alignment of certain streets, made on November 14, 1955, and laid on the table of this House on February 5, 1957, be disallowed.

This by-law came before the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation in the usual manner. Subsequently the member for Hindmarsh (Mr. Hutchens), on representations made to him, mentioned this matter to the chairman of the committee and as a result the area in question was inspected by members of the committee, by members of the Hindmarsh Council, by Mr. Hutchens, by Mr. Hart the Town Planner, and by representatives of local landowners. The Town Planner subsequently recommended in effect that replanning of this area should be incorporated in the wider plan for the metropolitan area. Later the chairman of the Subordinate Legislation Committee received the following letter from the town clerk of the Corporation of Hindmarsh:—

I confirm our conversation of the 11th June, 1957, wherein I advised that my council decided to withdraw the proposed by-law for the widening of certain streets in the Bowden and Brompton area, from consideration until further notice. I desire to thank you for your interest and assistance in the consideration of this very important matter, since it has been under consideration by your committee.

In other words, the corporation desires this by-law to be withdrawn. There is no way of withdrawing it other than by its disallowance by one House of Parliament or the other. The committee believes this is sufficient reason for disallowance.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh)—I support the motion, and express my appreciation and that of the Hindmarsh Council to the Subordinate Legislation Committee for its interest in the matter. As the member for Mitcham said, after this by-law was made some landowners

drew attention to the effects it might have in the Bowden and Brompton areas. After drawing the attention of the Subordinate Legislation Committee to this, I waited on the Hindmarsh Council and explained the attitude of the committee and of the Town Planner (Mr. Hart). After careful consideration, the council felt it would be wise to ask for withdrawal of the by-law. As Mr. Millhouse said, the only way that this can be done is by disallowance.

I want to make it clear that the council was influenced to take the action it took largely by the Government's attitude towards town planning and it was heartened by later advice that an over-all plan would come into effect in about three years. I hope that the difficulties of councils will be completely overcome by the work of the Town Planner and the Town Planning Committee: in old-established and highly industrialized areas the new mobile transport and development of heavy industries have made it necessary to have wider streets and a greater degree of planning. All councils feel that hotch-potch planning by each individual council, without permanent agreement with other councils, is not satisfactory. As a result, the Hindmarsh council approved of delaying action because it is confident that a beneficial over-all plan will come into being.

Motion carried.

HOLIDAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. Dunstan, having obtained leave, introduced a Bill to amend the Holidays Act, 1910-47. Read a first time.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This is a particularly short Bill, with only two operative clauses. Clause 3 provides that there shall be a schedule under the Holidays Act providing for bank holidays that are separate from public holidays. The Holidays Act provides for public holidays and bank holidays, for which there is a schedule to the Act, but all bank holidays fall on public holidays except where they are separately proclaimed by the Governor, and no such proclamations are in operation at the moment. My proposal is for a separate schedule providing for bank holidays which would not be specifically public holidays. The particular bank holidays that I propose would occur every Saturday. The purpose of this Bill is to provide, in effect, a five-day basic working week for bank officers.

Members might well ask why legislation for this purpose should come before Parliament, or

why the matter cannot be dealt with by industrial arbitration or conciliation, but this is the only place that can determine the issue; it cannot be determined by courts of conciliation and arbitration, as I will explain. Certain payments and protests are required under the Federal Bills of Exchange Act to take place on certain dates, and unless a particular day which is a normal bank trading day is a proclaimed bank holiday, the bank must be open for some time on that day to enable the payment or the protest to take place. Otherwise the banks would be liable, in the opinion of most counsel, if the proper payment or protest were not made, or on occasions, if not the banks, at any rate the persons required to do the particular act. What are bank holidays is governed, not by the Bills of Exchange Act, but by State legislation; and therefore bank officials are caught between Federal and State legislation; this is another of the anomalies which face us under a Federal Constitution. They cannot go to an Arbitration tribunal and ask for what most other workers have already, namely, a five-day basic working week for their 40-hours because the court cannot require that a bank shall close upon a Saturday, in view of the Bills of Exchange Act, unless the Saturday is a bank holiday. The various bank officials' associations have gone to the courts in some jurisdictions upon this matter; they did not come to the Legislature without having tried every possible avenue to get what they claim is their right. There are at the moment in South Australia three sets of provisions governing the bank officials, namely, the Federal Award for South Australian Savings Bank employees, a State Industrial Agreement governing the employees of the private banks, and a provision by the Commonwealth Bank for its officers which is not a provision of the court, the exact terms of which are not available to me. The bank officials brought a claim for a basic five-day working week before Mr. Conciliation Commissioner Portus, who, after he had examined the matter, stated categorically that the question of a five-day basic working week for bank officials was a matter which could be determined only by the Legislature, and as legislation is at present it was impossible for the court to prescribe a five-day basic working week. Similar statements were made by the Western Australia Industrial Court, where the president said quite clearly that this was a matter which could be determined only by the Legislature because the court could not, the Bills of Exchange Act being

what it was, prescribe a basic five-day working week of 40 hours.

Therefore, in effect, we are the people who must become upon this occasion, owing to the disabilities of the bank officials in the face of Commonwealth legislation, a court of conciliation and arbitration, to determine the rights and wrongs of this matter. In effect, most employees now have a five-day working week. That is, their basic 40 hours are worked in five days, and if they are required to work on other days they are paid penalty rates for those days. The vast majority of the employees of South Australia are already enjoying this privilege and having two days leisure each week. There are a few exceptions to this rule and it is claimed by the opponents of this proposal that banking should be considered to be an exception as being a service necessary to the public. What is the banking that is necessary to the public?

Banking business, of course, does not only include the counter transactions of cashing cheques or the placing of deposits. It includes general banking matters, particularly the negotiating of loans and things of that kind: few of the major transactions of banking are carried out on Saturday mornings. The only real purpose for which banks are open on Saturday mornings is for the changing of cheques or the withdrawal of deposits from Savings Bank or the placing of deposits within banks. Is this service vital to the public? Quite frankly, I do not think it is any more vital than are the services of many public offices which are closed on Saturday morning. Is it any more essential that I should be able to cash a cheque on Saturday morning than that I should be able to go to the Motor Vehicles Department to register my motor car or to Lands Titles Office to register a land transaction or to other Government departments to pay accounts? It is no more essential that a man should be able to change a cheque on a Saturday morning than that he should be able to buy his meat or have his bread delivered on Saturday mornings.

Mr. Fletcher—He should have all deliveries on Saturdays.

Mr. DUNSTAN—The honourable member apparently proposes to go back to a six-day working week.

Mr. Fletcher—That would not hurt us, either.

Mr. DUNSTAN—I hope the honourable member is not addressing me because I normally work an 80-hour week anyway. If we

accept the principle of a five-day week—and I gather that members opposite do so because I have not heard anyone in this House propose that we should go back to full retail trading or the re-opening of butcher shops on Saturdays—there is no reason why cash transactions in banking are more essential to the public than the other services I have mentioned that are not available to the public on Saturday mornings. Tasmania has included this feature in its legislation.

Mr. Jennings—Are they any worse off because of that?

Mr. DUNSTAN—Of course not. They have had this measure since 1953 and do not want to change. Indeed, it was introduced not in the Lower House, but in the Legislative Council, which is not dominated by Labor members.

Mr. Corcoran—They have it in New Zealand.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Yes, and in parts of the United States of America and Canada. In none of those countries has the public been placed at a disadvantage because of it. For a period before the measure was introduced, Saturday morning closing of banks was tried, and a permissive system operated in certain areas where for a period the retail shops opened and the banks closed on Saturday morning, and then the banks opened and the retail shops closed. Then both were closed, and it was found that no disservice was rendered to the Tasmanian public. In fact the public is now able to transact its banking business in five days the same as it transacts its official business with Government departments in five days in South Australia.

In Western Australia a Bill to grant this proposal has passed the Assembly twice, but has been defeated each time in the Legislative Council. Prior to the last measure passing the Assembly, a Select Committee was appointed to investigate the whole matter and take evidence from all parties concerned, not only in the metropolitan area, but also in country centres, to see whether it was essential for people in any area to be able to bank on Saturday morning. From the evidence the majority of members on that committee considered it was clearly established that such facilities were not necessary on Saturday mornings, but a minority report was also furnished, and it would be interesting for members to examine the decisions of the committee.

What were the objections put before that committee? The first allegation was that Saturday morning closing of banks would strike at the worker because, it was said, he would not

be able to deposit money in, or withdraw money from, his savings bank account on Saturday morning; but today savings banks have a myriad agencies and do not ordinarily rely only on their bank offices. For instance, the Savings Bank of South Australia has an agency in practically every grocer's and chemist's shop, and a customer may transact his business in such places at any time the shop is open. A depositor of the Commonwealth Savings Bank can do business at post offices during money order hours. A depositor of the State Savings Bank going to shop in Rundle Street on Saturday morning could go to the nearest agency; there is one in Myer's, for instance. If this Bill becomes law that facility will still be available to him. It may be contended that the wording of the Holidays Act is such that agencies would have to close if this Bill became law, but I do not agree, nor do counsel whose opinion has been taken on this matter: only the banks would have to observe the bank holiday.

Secondly, it has been argued that retail traders need banking facilities on Saturday mornings, firstly to obtain change, and secondly, to deposit takings so that they need not hold them over the week-end. A survey of banking practice, however, has shown that little change is taken from banks on Saturday mornings, and if he goes to the bank at all on Saturday morning, the average retailer goes early. There is not the slightest reason why he cannot get change on Friday afternoon. Should he wish to deposit money on Saturday mornings, most banks today provide safe deposit facilities, and he could simply put his takings in the safe deposit; he need not hold them over the week-end.

That disposes of those two objections. What other objections are there? I know of none. It has been contended that in some country areas the farmer comes to town only on Saturday morning, therefore he must do his business then, but I have gone to pains to inquire in some country centres and find that in most the farmer comes to town on some other day, which is usually Wednesday, but occasionally Friday. Only rarely does a market day occur on a Saturday, and it is usually on a week day that the farming community comes to town to do business.

Mr. Corcoran—Similar reforms have not been received with open arms.

Mr. DUNSTAN—True. When it was suggested that shops in country towns close on Saturday afternoons, it was said that the farmers would be hit, but that has not proved to be the case. If country members will

consult their local bank managers I am sure they will be enlightened on the degree of need for banks to stay open on Saturdays in their district. Bank managers can be quite vociferous on this matter. Saturday in many places tends to be a dead day for other than purely cash transactions, which after all can be managed on other days without the slightest difficulty.

Mr. Millhouse—Do you believe in the nationalization of banks?

Mr. DUNSTAN—I have subscribed to that policy and if the honourable member gives me an opportunity some other time to deal with that matter I will instruct him in it; but that has nothing to do with the case for a fair working provision for bank employees. I do not see why bank officials, even though many of them do not agree with bank nationalization or my politics generally, should be worse off than other workers as regards approaching the industrial tribunals. I want to see them on an equal footing and I cannot see why they should be at a disadvantage for they have a right to a fair go the same as everybody else. That is why I have brought this matter before the House. I do not know whether the honourable member will suggest that I am advocating a five-day week because this will break the banks and will be a step toward nationalization. If that is his contention, it is patently absurd. The evidence of the associated banks before the select committee in Western Australia was that it would not in any way affect the profit and loss position of the banks if they were closed on Saturday mornings. It was not the slightest worry to the banks in this regard. According to their evidence, it could not hurt the banks if they were closed on Saturday mornings. On the contrary they said they did not mind closing on Saturday mornings from their point of view, but they thought it was a service they could give to the public. It was entirely upon this question of service that the issue has been fought everywhere it has been discussed.

I cannot see why this service is so necessary when other services are proved not to be necessary. I cannot see what differentiates this particular service from the others I have enumerated, and which are not provided on public holidays and Saturday mornings with the consent and under the direction of the Government. Why is it necessary for people to transact business in banks on Saturday mornings and for them not to register their motor vehicles or transact business with other Government departments on Saturday mornings? I can see no difference in principle. The Arbitration

Court has accepted in principle that what basically should be aimed at in Australia is a 40-hour week worked over five days. Most employees have been granted that already by the courts.

Mr. Millhouse—Why didn't you include shop assistants and others in this proposal?

Mr. DUNSTAN—Because shop assistants are not at a disadvantage in this matter. They can go to the court and get this provision, and that is why I did not include them. There is nothing to stop them from going to the court and getting a five-day week if the court thinks that is proper, but the bank officials cannot do it and that is why I am taking this action. I believe that shop assistants want a five-day week and have little doubt that eventually they will get it. The whole issue is really very simple. It comes back to this—are we to deprive these people permanently of a right which has been established by other workers? I do not think we should, but should put them upon the same basis as other workers in Australia have been placed. That is something which would be not only pleasing to them, but it is a right. It is not true that even if this is provided, bank officers will not have to work on Saturday mornings. They could still be asked by the banks to do so, but they could not be put in the position that the opening of the banks on Saturday mornings would be part of their normal 40-hour week. They could go to the court and ask that the 40-hour week should be worked over a period of five days. There would be nothing to stop the court from including a provision which exists in most awards and agreements that if they were asked to work on week-ends or during public holidays they should be paid a penalty rate. Seventy-five percent or more of Australian workers already have this, so why should bank officials be at a disadvantage? It is not necessary for the Conciliation and Arbitration Court to provide a particularly high penalty rate. That is a question for the court and we are not determining it here.

It is true that as the award stands if Saturday is proclaimed a bank holiday it would import a penalty rate. In drafting this proposal I did consider including the same provision as is provided in the Bank Holidays Act of Tasmania, which provides that Saturday shall be a bank holiday—

Provided that reference to a public or bank holiday in any wages board determination or any industrial agreement or any agreement relating to work whether made before or after the commencement of this paragraph, shall not be deemed to be a reference to a day on which

banks are required to be closed under this paragraph and not otherwise.

I think it would be better if this matter were enacted in South Australia and that the courts should immediately consider the question of penalty rates again so as to determine what the position would be, and it would be fairer than that the Legislature should intervene. It would be proper for the court to investigate it again in view of the fact that Saturday would not now be a day essential for the bank to stay open. I think members would agree to that in principle. The matter before the House is not a complicated one, but perfectly simple, and the whole issue can be summed up by my saying that bank officials are permanently at a disadvantage compared with other employees in their claims as to wages, hours and conditions. Since they are, then it is for this Parliament to determine the position in South Australia. Upon any examination of the situation, there is nothing to differentiate in principle between bank services or other services which are not now provided on Saturday mornings. There is no need for people to transact bank business on Saturday mornings when they could quite conveniently do their business on other days. There is no let or hindrance which should prevent bank officials from having the same provisions as already apply to the working hours and conditions of the vast majority of employees in this State.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2).

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) moved—

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of Supply.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh)—I make a plea to the Minister of Education, his department and the Public Works Standing Committee on a matter concerning my district which was on the Loan Estimates as far back as 1948. I refer to the Croydon Boys Technical School. The Public Works Committee, following an inquiry, recommended the building of the school and shortly afterwards it was agreed that workshops should be erected. It seemed that the authorities considered that the workshops were part of the whole plan, and could not be built separately. It was later determined that the workshops could be built in part, and after a deputation from the school council, which I introduced, waited on the Minister, the Director of Education

and the Superintendent of Technical Schools said—I am sure in all good faith—that they would see that the necessary shops were built. I think they were to have been built last year, but it was once again discovered that they could not be built in part. A further reference was made to the Public Works Committee because the estimated cost of the school had risen far above what it was expected to cost in 1949. The Croydon school council hoped, on the work being recommended by the committee, that the workshops would be built.

I stress that for a school of this kind to function properly it is necessary to have these workshops to provide the necessary tuition for boys who wish to enter industry. I believe the project was referred to the Public Works Committee on or about April 18 this year. According to a press statement the Superintendent of Technical Schools (Mr. Walker) said that the Croydon Boys Technical School consisted of a number of motley buildings quite unsuitable for the type of tuition intended to be provided. The members of the school council agreed with the Superintendent of Technical Schools and appreciated that many school projects have to be carried out throughout the State, but they are disappointed that the Public Works Committee took so long to consider this project and has referred the plans back to the Architect-in-Chief's Department so that a standard school design may be prepared. That may be sound in economics, but I ask the Minister of Education to give early consideration to the building of the workshops. I point out that the Woodville High School, which caters mainly for scholars taking academic courses, has facilities for manual work far in excess of a school that has for its specific purpose the training of boys for industry. I trust that prompt action will be taken to meet this great need at the Croydon Boys Technical School.

Motion carried.

In Committee of Supply.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) moved—

That towards defraying the expenses of the establishments and public services of the State for the year ending June 30, 1958, a sum of £7,000,000 be granted; provided that no payment for any establishment or service shall be made out of the said sum in excess of the rates voted for similar establishments or services on the Estimates for the financial year ended June 30, 1957, except increases of salaries or wages fixed or prescribed by any

return made under any Act relating to the Public Service, or by any regulation, or by any award, order, or determination of any court or other body empowered to fix or prescribe wages or salaries.

Motion carried. Resolution agreed to in Committee of Ways and Means, and adopted by the House.

Bill introduced by the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford and read a first time.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill provides further supply amounting to £7,000,000 which will enable the public services of the State to be carried on until about the middle of October next. I expect that honourable members will have the Estimates for consideration within the next four weeks; they are fairly well advanced in the preparation, and may be available even earlier. Clause 2 provides for the issue and application of £7,000,000. Clause 3 limits payments to amounts on last year's Estimates except in cases of increases in salaries and wages authorized by wage fixing tribunals. Members will see that there is nothing in the Bill except the appropriation for carrying on the normal services of the State pending the Budget being introduced.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

SCAFFOLDING INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT ACT.

Bill introduced and read a first time.

PRINTING COMMITTEE.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD moved—

That Mr. L. C. Harding be appointed on the Printing Committee in place of Mr. L. R. Heath, deceased.

Motion carried.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONSOLIDATION BILLS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD moved—

That the House of Assembly request the concurrence of the Legislative Council in the appointment for the present session of a joint committee to which all Consolidation Bills shall stand referred, in accordance with Joint Standing Order No. 18, and to which any further question, relative thereto, may at any time be sent by either House for report.

That, in the event of the Joint Committee being appointed, the House of Assembly be represented thereon by three members, two of whom shall form the quorum of the Assembly

Members necessary to be present at all sittings of the Committee.

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolutions.

That Messrs. King, Millhouse, and O'Halloran be representatives of the Assembly on the said Committee.

Motion carried.

WATER RATES REMISSION BILL.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS (Minister of Irrigation) moved—

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution:—That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to provide for the remission of water rates payable under the Irrigation Act, 1930-1946, in respect of the financial year 1956-1957.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to enable the Government to remit, either wholly or in part, the water rates payable under Division II of Part V of the Irrigation Act, 1930-1946. The decision as to whether any rates should be remitted will be in the hands of the Minister. It is intended that remissions will be granted in cases where, owing to the floods, settlers did not receive the benefit of the irrigation services provided by the Government. The remissions will be limited to the financial year 1956-57. In cases where the settler, after paying his water rates account for 1956-57, is granted a remission under this Act, the Minister is given the power to apply the amount remitted, in payment of some other debt owing by the settler to the Government, or to make a refund.

Mr. O'HALLORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

AUDIT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. C. S. Hincks for the Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill makes a number of amendments to the Audit Act which have been asked for by the Auditor-General. Most of the provisions of the present Act, although they were enacted in 1921 followed the principles of the Act of 1882. Since then the scope of the activities

of the Government has been greatly enlarged and audit practice has altered. The language of the Act, in important respects, does not now adequately cover the present functions and practices of the Auditor-General. The main amendments in the Bill are directed towards the following purposes:—

(a) The clarification of the scope of the Auditor-General's functions, particularly in relation to public moneys.

(b) Conferring on the Auditor-General a discretionary power (similar to that existing in Great Britain, Canada, the Commonwealth and New South Wales) as to the extent of the checks which he will apply in the conduct of an audit, provided that the appropriation audit will be fully maintained.

(c) The enactment of requirements as to the form of the Treasurer's accounts and the duty of Government authorities to furnish financial statements and accounts to the Treasurer.

(d) The abolition of the duty of the Auditor-General to publish details of every excess warrant under section 32a of the Public Finance Act.

(e) Power to charge statutory authorities for audit services.

In addition to these, several less important amendments and some consequential amendments are proposed.

The first matter dealt with in the Bill is in clause 3, which contains a definition of public moneys. The scope of the Auditor-General's duties depends largely on the meaning of this term. It is used in several places in the Act of 1921, but is not defined. There are some sections which indicate that the scope of the Auditor-General's duties is limited to revenue and trust moneys: Another section refers only to revenue. Possibly it was thought in 1882 that loan moneys raised by the Government fell within the category of revenue—as no doubt they do if the word "revenue" is given its widest meaning. But loan moneys are not revenue in the technical sense in which that term is used today. It is desirable that this matter should be clarified while the Act is under review, and for this purpose a definition of public moneys is inserted stating that "public moneys" includes revenue, loan and trust or other moneys received or held for or on account of the Crown by Ministers and departmental officers. The Auditor-General audits accounts of other moneys besides public moneys as defined in this definition but these audits are carried out pursuant to other Acts of Parliament and for purposes of the Audit Act it is agreed that the correct definition of public moneys is, to put it shortly, revenue, loan and trust moneys held in Government Departments.

Clause 4 deals with the Auditor-General's right to leave of absence. The present provision (contained in section 7 (2) (d) of the principal Act) is that the Auditor-General can not take more than a fortnight's annual leave without special approval granted by Executive Council. This provision dates from the time when the annual leave of public servants was only two weeks. It is proposed to alter this to enable the Auditor-General to take the same annual leave as other public servants, without applying for special approval from the Executive Council.

Clause 5 deals with the power of the Auditor-General to appoint persons to conduct audits and to report to him. At present this power is limited to audits which the Audit Act requires him to conduct. It is proposed to extend the power so that it will apply to every audit which the Auditor-General is obliged to conduct, whether by the Audit Act or any other Act.

Clause 6 deals with the duty of the Auditor-General to make reports to the Treasurer. In section 12 of the Audit Act at present there is a rather unusual provision saying that the Auditor-General must communicate with the Treasurer upon all matters arising under the Act relating to the collection, receipt, issue and expenditure of public moneys. Very many such matters arise in the course of audit and it is impossible, as well as unnecessary, for the Auditor-General to communicate with the Treasurer upon all of them. It is proposed to restrict the Auditor-General's duty of communicating with the Treasurer, to matters which may require action by the Government or should be reported to the Government in the public interest. Clause 7 is an amendment consequential on the definition contained in Clause 3.

Clause 8 is one of several amendments which are designed to relieve the Auditor-General from the duty of conducting a detailed audit to ascertain whether every disbursement of Government moneys has been made under competent administrative authority. This particular aspect of auditing is not directed at the question whether the money spent has been voted by Parliament. This is commonly called the appropriation audit and will not be affected by this Bill. But the question whether money has been spent under competent authority raises the issues whether the proper Minister or officer has authorized the expenditure in accordance with regulations and practice and whether proper procedures have been observed.

Owing to the millions of payments, large and small, made every year by the Government this is a very onerous task; and in recent years it has been the practice of the Auditor-General and his officers to rely—to a considerable extent—upon the certificates of certifying officers in the departments who are responsible for the examination of the vouchers covering expenditure. In view of this practice the Auditor-General does not find it necessary to audit all disbursements in detail. It is proposed by the amendments in clause 8 to bring the principal Act into line with this practice. Clause 9 contains a consequential amendment.

Clause 10 contains an amendment for the same purpose as clause 8, namely, to give the Auditor-General further authority to dispense with the detailed audit of accounts of receipts and expenditure. Under section 32 of the principal Act as it reads at present the Governor is empowered to exempt from detailed audit the accounts of a department whose peculiar duties, constitution or circumstances render the exemption expedient but there is no power to grant an exemption from the appropriation audit. It is proposed in clause 10 to give the Auditor-General a general discretion to dispense wholly or partly with the audit (other than the appropriation audit) of the details of any accounts and their supporting statements and vouchers.

Clause 11 deals with the annual statements which the Treasurer is required to prepare and forward to the Auditor-General. Section 36 of the principal Act, which deals with this matter, has for some time been out of line with the practice. Under the section the Treasurer's statement need only be a statement of the expenditure of the public revenue for the year and of the receipt of the revenue, whatever that may mean. It is proposed in the Bill to re-enact section 36 so that it will cover all the classes of financial statements which the Treasury has for some years past prepared annually and submitted to the Auditor-General for inclusion in his report. Clause 12 contains consequential amendments.

Clause 13 deals with the duty of the Auditor-General to include in his annual report particulars of all excess warrants on account of consolidated revenue. These particulars take up several printed pages and often cause delay in presenting the report. The warrants of which particulars are given are those issued pursuant to section 32a of the Public Finance Act. This is a well-known statutory provision authorizing the expenditure of money under warrant on certain defined classes of purposes.

Particulars of this expenditure are shown in the Treasurer's accounts and there is no good reason why they should also be set out in detail in the Auditor-General's report. It is proposed by the amendments in clause 13 to abolish the duty of publishing the particulars. In place of this requirement, the Auditor-General will be required to include in his report a certificate stating whether any money has been spent otherwise than pursuant to an appropriation by Parliament or a warrant under section 32a of the Public Finance Act; and if any money has been so spent particulars of the expenditure must be given.

Clause 15 provides that heads of Government departments must at the end of each financial year prepare annual statements and accounts as directed by the Treasurer and that all financial statements and accounts prepared by the head of a Government department or by an authority whose accounts the Auditor-General is required by law to audit must be forwarded to the Auditor-General. The clause also empowers the Auditor-General to include these statements and accounts in his annual report. The clause gives a general authority for practices which have grown up piecemeal as a result of individual conferences and arrangements. Clause 16 is a consequential amendment.

Clause 17 gives the Auditor-General authority to charge reasonable audit fees for auditing the accounts of any corporation or body whose accounts are audited by him pursuant to a special Act. The fees will be of an amount approved by the Treasurer. The main purpose of the clause is to ensure some

uniformity on this question of audit fees. At present some authorities pay and others do not.

Clause 18 repeals sections 42 and 43 of the Audit Act. These sections deal with the misappropriation of public moneys and forgery. They are based on old provisions in the audit laws and have become obsolete because prosecutions are invariably instituted under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act and other general laws which are much better understood and more effective. In view of other amendments to the Act these sections had either to be amended or repealed, and upon consideration it was clear that repeal was the most satisfactory course.

Clause 19 makes it an offence for a person to make a false statement in a certificate or declaration relating to public moneys. Any such offence will be punishable summarily by a fine not exceeding £100. Many of these declarations and certificates are made every day in the course of preparing Government accounts, but they do not appear to be subject to any general law penalizing false statements. The difficulty could be got over by requiring officers to make statutory declarations under the Oaths Act in every case; but this would entail a lot of avoidable work. Clause 19 is therefore proposed as a better solution of the difficulty.

Mr. O'HALLORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.23 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 8, 1957, at 2 p.m.