

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, August 28, 1957.

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

QUESTIONS.**MEDICAL BENEFITS.**

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Yesterday afternoon the Premier replied to my question concerning medical benefits and I appreciate the information he gave. He may have had some difficulty, however, in understanding what information I sought when I referred to tuberculosis and other diseases. The payment of medical benefits by the Commonwealth Government is subject to a means test and a person considered to be in satisfactory financial circumstances cannot qualify for the benefits outlined in the Premier's reply, and the same applies if he has a sick wife who needs medical attention and medicine. Can the Premier say whether in that case the husband would be able to receive any special benefits on behalf of his wife, particularly in relation to the doctor's and other medical expenses?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will see whether I can get the information for the honourable member.

SMOKING IN FOOD SHOPS.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—Has the Premier a reply to my recent question concerning the desirability of banning smoking in places where food is sold?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have sent for a report on that question, but, as the honourable member will realize, it has wide ramifications and in many places where food is sold it is customary to smoke. When the information is available, however, I will let the honourable member have it.

CONCESSION FARES FOR PENSIONERS.

Mr. LAWN—Yesterday in reply to a question concerning concession fares for pensioners, the Premier advised me that the Government had no money available for that purpose. Will he take the matter into consideration when framing his Budget?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—No. The Budget has already been framed and will be introduced next week, and the Government has had the greatest difficulty in providing for services that are already the Government's responsibility. Pensioners are the responsibility of the Commonwealth Government and if any special provision for them is necessary it

should be provided by that Government, and will no doubt receive consideration in its Budget, which also is forthcoming next week.

METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. DUNNAGE—During the week-end I passed a couple of the reservoirs supplying the metropolitan area and observed that they were only half full. As the dry weather seems to be continuing I should like to know whether the pumps on the Mannum-Adelaide main are working at full capacity 24 hours a day, or just what the position is?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Almost two months ago, I suppose, the Government, having received a report from the Engineer-in-Chief, decided to operate the pumps at full capacity for 24 hours a day, seven days a week. That is subject to one slight modification, namely, that in the event of an overload on the electricity grid pumping might have to be eased up for a short time. As far as I know there has not been an intermission even for that purpose, and the instruction is that the pumps are to work at their fullest possible capacity.

SUNDAY SPORT.

Mr. TAPPING—In this morning's *Advertiser* appears an article under the heading, "Sunday Sport Complaint" with reference to a football match on the Richmond Oval on Sunday, August 4, held for the benefit of the "Meals on Wheels" scheme. Although I do not subscribe to a Continental Sunday I ask the Treasurer if he will consider amending the regulations under the Places of Public Entertainment Act in order that *bona fide* organizations working for charitable purposes may be given some latitude in this matter.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Under the Act no Sunday fixtures may be held without the permission of the Chief Secretary. If we do not want a Continental Sunday I think that is a wise provision, as is shown by experience the world over. It is not proposed to ask Parliament to amend the law.

SUBSTITUTION OF BUSES FOR TRAMS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—On July 31 I asked the Premier a question about the desirability of the substitution of trolley buses rather than diesel buses for trams, and I understand he now has a reply.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The general manager of the Tramways Trust has submitted the following report:—

In reviewing the trust's rehabilitation scheme, the American transport consultants

advised against the use of trolley buses in Adelaide. However, when confronted with the question of the replacement of part of its trolley bus fleet, due for retirement within the next 12 months, the matter was again fully investigated. It was decided, on economic grounds, to replace these vehicles with under-floor diesel-engined buses. The balance of the trolley bus fleet, which is relatively new, will be retained until the conclusion of their economic life—in 1969-70. It has not been decided, nor would it be wise to do so, whether the trolley buses will finally be replaced by another form of vehicle; such a decision depends on technological developments and other conditions meantime.

GREAT WESTERN BRIDGE.

Mr. RICHES—Has the Minister of Education a reply from his colleague, the Minister of Roads, to a question I asked recently about the condition of the Great Western Bridge and the Highways Department's programme for resurfacing it?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—The Minister has supplied me with the following report from the Highways Commissioner:—

The necessity to complete works of a higher priority has caused some delay in the repairs to the Great Western Bridge. However, the necessary plant has now been assembled for an immediate start on closing up the decking and resurfacing the road.

SOUTH-EAST ELECTRICITY SUPPLY.

Mr. HARDING—Can townships adjacent to Victoria, such as Frances, Binnun, Kybybolite and Hynam, be supplied with electricity from the State Electricity Commission of Victoria?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I know of no legal difficulty. There might be technical difficulties in bringing electricity such long distances. I will get a report from the trust for the honourable member and advise him in due course.

LOADING OF ORE AT PORT PIRIE.

Mr. DAVIS—Has the Minister representing the Minister of Marine a reply to my recent question about the loading of ore at Port Pirie?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—The board visited Port Pirie on the 9th instant and discussed conditions at the ore stacking sites with the honourable member and the Port Pirie Branch Secretary of the Waterside Workers' Federation, Mr. G. L. O'Brien. All agreed that the handling of the commodity along with wintry conditions and watering to allay ore dust could do no other than produce slush. It was evident, however, that the condition could be minimized by more frequent cleaning up of the roadways between the wharf and the

stacks by the agents responsible for the handling of the ore. The Harbormaster was instructed to give special attention to this aspect, although it must be pointed out in fairness to the agents concerned that the intensity of operations at the ore berths (Railway and Federal Wharves) makes adequate cleaning up operations difficult at times. The principal places subject of complaint are those avenues giving access to the public amenities buildings at the respective wharves. In this regard, the board undertook to carry out some improvements in the way of levelling and raising of the areas to minimize the adverse conditions.

RESIDENTIAL HIGH SCHOOL, EYRE PENINSULA.

Mr. BOCKELBERG—In view of the isolation of Eyre Peninsula and the difficulty in many places of obtaining higher education, will the Minister consider the establishment of a residential high school on Eyre Peninsula?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I shall be pleased to consider it and discuss the matter with the honourable member.

WEST BEACH RESERVE.

Mr. FRED WALSH—On several occasions I have raised the question of the proposal to build a drive-in theatre at the West Beach Reserve. Representatives of at least two established organizations representing the people in the district have put forward objections to the proposed theatre. However, it seems that the question of the establishment of the theatre is a *fait accompli*, and perhaps no further good purpose could be served by endeavouring to get any arrangements cancelled, but I ask the Premier, with a view to removing the main ground of objection by nearby residents, to use his good offices with the members of the West Beach Reserve Trust for the purpose of negotiations being opened up with the picture theatre interests to move the site a little farther along Tapley's Hill Road.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—As far as I know an application has been received by the Inspector of Places of Public Entertainment for the licensing of the proposed site, and plans have been submitted to the Minister for the establishment of an open air theatre. The Inspector raised the question whether the site was in the best interests of the community because of its closeness to one of the main runways of the West Beach Aerodrome and the fact that it was completely in

line with the aerodrome. Under those circumstances I have asked the officer controlling civil aviation in this State for a report to see whether the theatre constitutes a danger to the public, or whether it is undesirable from the point of view of aircraft approaching and leaving the aerodrome. When the other matter has been cleared up I will have the honourable member's suggestion examined to see whether it can be given effect to.

DETAINING DEFENDANTS IN GAOL.

Mr. RICHES—Last week the Minister of Education was good enough to take up with the Attorney-General a question I had raised concerning the practice of judges requiring defendants to remain in gaol rather than be released on bail whilst their trial was progressing. Part of the reply I received was:—

The important aspect is that the granting or refusal of bail during the trial is entirely in the discretion of the presiding judge. It is felt that it is better to leave a judicial discretion of this sort undisturbed so that the judges may exercise their functions in the way they regard as best calculated to do justice.

In the case I mentioned I am informed that the presiding judge in deciding not to grant bail said that this was a matter for Parliament to act. In view of that statement, could the Attorney-General ask for a report from His Honour on the case under review and for the text of what he did say publicly in the court concerning the application?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I will be pleased to ask my colleague to obtain a report on the matter. Personally, I see nothing contradictory in the two statements—one by the Attorney-General stating what is the existing law and practice and that the question of bail is entirely in the hands of the presiding judge in each case, and the statement by His Honour to which the honourable member has referred that if the law or practice should be altered, it is a matter for Parliament. I see nothing contradictory in the two statements but I shall again refer the matter to the Attorney-General.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL.

Mr. FLETCHER—Has the Premier received any further information from the Hospitals Department following on the letter I wrote to him on July 5 regarding conditions prevailing at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the treatment meted out to old age pensioners?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have a full report for the honourable member on this case.

EARLY CLOSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. FRANK WALSH, on behalf of Mr. O'Halloran, having obtained leave, introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Early Closing Act, 1926-1954. Read a first time.

DECENTRALIZATION.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. O'Halloran—

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.

(Continued from August 21. Page 409.)

Mr. TAPPING (Semaphore)—I support the motion, which in effect provides for a Royal Commission to consider the need for decentralization in this State. This matter is of vital importance. It has been said that the Labor Party has introduced similar measures over a period of years, but we have done that because we feel that decentralization is important for South Australia and for South Australians. I understand that at least one member of the Government feels that, because a Royal Commission has been mentioned, it might savour of something ulterior, but I hasten to assure the House that if the Government or members opposite feel that it should not be a Royal Commission, we are prepared to have the matter considered by a Select Committee.

I am prepared to admit that decentralization is not confined only to this State, but will

always be a national matter, so I think we must deal with the matter in two parts; firstly, the obligation of the Federal Government, and secondly, the onus cast on the State Government to do something about the position, which has been deteriorating for a number of years. Although we often read that the Federal Government is concerned at the lack of decentralization, it will not do much about it. I believe the only way it could do something tangible is to give some concessions to industries that might be prepared to go to the country but by doing so have to overcome a severe handicap. The Royal Commission suggested in this motion should seriously consider asking the Federal Government to grant taxation concessions to these industries for at least two years. With regard to the State's obligation, we on this side of the House believe that the appointment of a Commission could do much good, but no harm. We realize that the severe drift to the city is becoming top-heavy.

In his reply last week, the Premier said that the Leader, "who spoke so glibly about the transfer of people to the country, would be coming up against the rights of people." I take it that the Premier is against compulsion, and I subscribe to that because it would be wrong to force industries or persons to go to the country if they did not wish to do so. If the Premier construed it that way, it was not the intention of the motion; the motion seeks to induce people to go to the country, not to force them. A Royal Commission could consider the best methods to adopt. When I visited Victoria some months ago I paid special attention to the question of decentralization because that State has a similar problem. There are country towns many miles from Melbourne that have not only maintained their population but increased it. In South Australia many country towns have lost population: the Leader of the Opposition enumerated a number of them. I am prepared to admit that towns such as Gawler, Whyalla, Port Pirie and Port Augusta have grown, but they are exceptions. The metropolitan area has increased at an alarming rate and today 62 per cent of the State's population reside there.

We must face up to the situation and give this motion our mature consideration and not reject it. It does not savour of party politics, but is designed for the welfare of the State. A Royal Commission would be divorced from politics. It is interesting to note the position in some Victorian country towns. In 1954, Geelong—45 miles from Melbourne—had a

population of 72,500. Its population by the end of 1955 was 78,500. Ballarat—73 miles from Melbourne—with a population of 48,000 in 1954, increased it to 49,500 in 1955. Bendigo—103 miles from Melbourne—with a population of 37,000 in 1954, had 38,130 in 1955.

Mr. Jenkins—They are cities.

Mr. TAPPING—That is so. Whilst Melbourne is being decentralized big populations are being established in country towns, but by a similar process people are moving from those bigger towns to smaller towns. Even in the bigger towns there is still room for more people. In 1941 the Victorian Government appointed a State Development Committee comprising six members of Parliament of both parties. As the work of that committee developed it became apparent that it required financial assistance, and in September, 1944, the Government voted £100,000 for a decentralization fund. The committee was to investigate projects which might aid decentralization and if any project seemed economically sound the committee could provide it with financial assistance. The function of the Victorian committee was to find suitable land for factories and, if necessary, to purchase it. Secondly, it recommended that if a factory were built in the country a 50 per cent concession on railway freight rates be granted in respect of all products consigned to and from the factory. Thirdly, concessions were also granted on water rates and electricity charges. Those are all tangible means of helping an industry stand on its own feet.

Mr. Shannon—Were they temporary concessions?

Mr. TAPPING—In most cases they applied for two years, and if during that period the industry made reasonable progress they were reviewed at the end of that time. After all, the first two years in the life of an industry is the most troublous period. This system has worked very satisfactorily in Victoria and there is no reason why it should not do so here. In 1943 Prestige Ltd. applied to the committee concerning a project for a factory at Ararat, about 130 miles from Melbourne. The committee inquired into the project and the Government eventually agreed to assist the firm. From information I received only yesterday I learn that that factory is progressing satisfactorily and employing hundreds of workers. It was granted railway concession rates of 50 per cent and was also assisted to buy land at Ararat. A Royal Commission should

consider such matters in relation to the country areas of South Australia. In 1944 £100,000 was provided by the Victorian Government to help establish industries in country districts, and since then that Government has put more money into the fund each year as it has been depleted. This year it is providing £50,000, which proves that it realizes that decentralization is all important.

In 1949 freight concessions were granted to three Victorian firms: Webb Industries, of Kerang (179 miles from Melbourne); May and Miller, of Horsham (203 miles); Ajax Pumps, of Kyneton (57 miles). Those industries have also been helped by the Government by means of concessions on water and electricity charges. Although the Industries Development Committee in this State has done good work, its functions cannot be compared with those of its Victorian counterpart. The South Australian committee can take evidence on any project referred to it by the Government, and if it considers it worth assisting it may recommend that money be lent and the capital, plus interest, repaid in due course. I consider, however, that that is not much inducement, for an industry, especially in the country, must find the interest charges burdensome and possibly crippling. By alleviating the burden on country industries, the Victorian Government has provided them with much more inducement than has the South Australian Government.

The press has reported—and I think the Premier has mentioned it in this House—that Holden's have obtained land at Elizabeth in order to establish a factory that would duplicate its Woodville plant, which employs about 7,000 and has done good work. However, if Holden's desire to establish another plant it should be in the country in order to relieve the aggregation of people in Adelaide and its suburbs. I do not say that it must go there, because members on this side do not stand for compulsion: they stand for inducement. If Holden's were given some inducement they would establish their factory at a place such as Murray Bridge or Wallaroo. Such inducements could take the form of concessions on rail freight and other charges.

Mr. Fletcher—What about Mount Gambier?

Mr. TAPPING—Earlier I referred to the progress made in Mount Gambier. Wallaroo has a deep sea port that can accommodate a steamer up to 16,000 tons gross register and the raw materials could be brought in and the finished products shipped to other parts of Australia and to New Zealand by sea. Wallaroo

is especially worth considering in this regard when it is remembered that the bulk handling system for the export of barley and wheat will soon operate there. This means that instead of 175 waterside workers being required there will only be work for about 60, and some alternative employment will be required or Wallaroo will tend to become a ghost town. In this connection the establishment of a plant by a firm such as Holden's would help Wallaroo to get on its feet again.

Murray Bridge, too, is in an ideal position as it is on the Adelaide-Melbourne railway line and therefore handy to transport. Not only has it adequate water supplies, but it also has power. Both Porth Lincoln and Wallaroo have fertilizer works. We know that production in the South-East will continue to expand and the establishment of fertilizer works in the locality would therefore help on the economic level. It has been recommended to the Victorian Government that fertilizer works be established at Portland, one of the coming ports of that State, but so far the companies have not seemed very interested. I believe that, if as a means of catching some of the Victorian trade, we established works at Cape Jaffa or some appropriate spot where we could produce fertilizer economically, we could also benefit the South-East, which has such a great potential.

Mr. Shannon—The fertilizer people gave evidence on that.

Mr. TAPPING—What applied years ago need not apply today or in the future.

Mr. Shannon—I believe it, would apply in greater measure because of the increased cost of building.

Mr. TAPPING—I read in the newspapers last week that Australia is capable of supporting a population of 100,000,000 people. I do not necessarily subscribe to that; it is difficult to visualize how great it will be, and my ideas are based on the future of South Australia in which we have so much confidence. Much has been said from time to time about a deep sea port in the South-East. One of the criticisms of it is the great cost involved, but it may not be necessary to construct a wharf as vessels could be loaded and discharged possibly by means of modern conveyer belts, which would be much less costly to construct. I think it was the member for Alexandra (Mr. Brookman) who asked, "Who is going to start this business?" and this brings me back to the question of inducements. I claim that if the companies were offered some inducement by the Government as regards freight

rates and even wharfage, they, knowing the potential better than we do, would be encouraged to establish fertilizer works there. All these things are possible and could be considered by a Royal Commission such as our Party believes should be set up.

Brickworks present another opportunity for decentralization. Although there are a number in the city and country there is no reason why the State should not set up a brick making plant. Members opposite may contend that it would not be a paying proposition, and in order to rebut that suggestion I have obtained from New South Wales the position regarding the State brickworks at Homebush Bay. On June 30 this year the State brickworks showed a profit of £54,885 and in addition—and this is very important—they paid bonuses totalling £19,226 to 345 employees. I have heard the Premier say that we have shale deposits throughout the country so there is no reason why we should not consider starting a brickworks, if not by private enterprise, by the Government, with the same profitable results as I have illustrated.

Over the years we have seen the progressive closing down of flour mills in country towns. I suppose that has been done because they found it hard to compete with the city mills. To offset that I suggest that concessions be given to the country flour millers to encourage the production of more flour and to take some of the workmen from the city to country areas. Of course, they would probably need concessions in railway rates and electric power. I am sure all members realize the importance of the fishing industry, and I am prepared to say that since Mr. Pearson has been the responsible Minister he has done all he can to stimulate it. Catches are increasing, particularly in Kangaroo Island waters and, without transgressing on the field of the member for Alexandra, I think we can say that it is obvious that Kangaroo Island has a mighty fishing potential. Consequently, we ought to pay attention to the establishment of fish canneries at Kangaroo Island and other parts of the State.

I could continue at length, but I content myself by asking members to divorce this question from politics, to lift it above that plane. The Labor Party has always advocated decentralization and I ask members opposite to consider the appointment of a Royal Commission for considering the question. As I said earlier, if it did no other good it would at least convince the Labor Party that we, as a Parliament, had tried to do something for

South Australia. The position is deteriorating. Each year there is this steady drift of population to the city and many of our country towns have become ghost towns. Admittedly, in a few places the population has increased fairly steadily, but on the other hand the metropolitan population has increased very rapidly and this will continue unless we do something about it. Let us tackle the question as a non-Party issue for the benefit of the State. If we do that we will achieve something. If we do not do something soon our hands may be forced. If members opposite would prefer a Select Committee I am sure that the mover would be prepared to alter his motion to provide for that, for our sole motive is to do something to overcome the impasse confronting us. I support the motion.

Mr. BROOKMAN (Alexandra)—I appreciate the reasonable way in which the honourable member put his case and his appeals to this side to agree to the motion for the appointment of a Royal Commission. I fear that he will be disappointed because, however nicely the motion has been put, it will fall on deaf ears.

Mr. Riches—I thought you were all entitled to speak and vote as you like.

Mr. BROOKMAN—I am only going on the fate of similar motions that have been moved by the Opposition in previous years, so I should say that this one has little chance of success. The Opposition has put forward a poor case, and much of what members opposite have said has been a complete misinterpretation or distortion of facts. The position is not deteriorating as the member for Semaphore (Mr. Tapping) said. The population of our country areas has increased rapidly. The Leader of the Opposition gave a list of country towns where the population had decreased, but it was a small list and showed the paucity of his arguments. On the other hand, the Premier gave a long list of country towns that had marked increases in population. The Leader of the Opposition cited some country towns that once had big populations, but they depended on mines which are now worked out or no longer used. How can anyone expect the population of a mining town to remain large or increase when there is now no ore there to be mined?

Mr. Davis—What towns?

Mr. BROOKMAN—Burra for one. Members opposite often say, "We will not force an industry to go to the country. We do not believe in compulsion, but in encouragement," or, as the member for Semaphore said, "inducement." I usually ask what they mean

by encouragement or inducement, but they say that is a matter for the Government. That is absurd. We cannot force industries to go to the country, but apparently the Opposition believes we can. If members want to encourage industries to go to the country they must put forward some worth-while suggestions. It would be futile to say to an industry, "You could get along all right in the country and make a profit." The word "decentralization" is often used by people without thinking deeply on the subject. It is a catch-cry that has apparently been found to go down nicely if the audience does not analyse the facts carefully, so the Opposition uses it a great deal. The Opposition does not stand for decentralization nearly as much as members on this side of the House do. They are unificationists. They do not even believe in State Parliaments, but want to centralize authority in one Parliament in Canberra. They have been talking about decentralization for many years and use many innocuous arguments, but not one of them will give any explanation of what they mean by "encouragement" or "inducement."

We must recognize that in South Australia there is a strong and natural tendency towards centralization. To sustain large centres of population in the country we must have good harbours, good hinterlands, or substantial mineral deposits. Conditions in South Australia are much different from those in, say, Queensland, which has a number of fairly large country towns. It has harbours, with good hinterlands, in many places and it has not been difficult to provide good transport facilities to assist decentralization.

Unfortunately, we have not many good harbours or rich areas to serve them. I think only 3 per cent of the State has a rainfall of 20 inches or more, so much of our State is semi-desert. Therefore, many large areas will always be sparsely populated, so we cannot expect a miraculous growth in the population of many of our country districts. This Government has done much more for decentralization than any other Government has done, and I am sure much more than the Opposition would have done if it had been in office. For instance, the Government has provided power, water, communications, and houses in many country areas. It has a record in this respect of which it can be proud. The Premier told us that the Housing Trust had built nearly 9,000 houses in the country.

Very important towns such as Port Augusta and Whyalla had been encouraged in their

growth by the Government by the provision of essential services. At Whyalla we have a progressive town in one of the driest parts of the State with ample supplies of fresh water, and the same applies to Port Augusta, which in addition has a large power station. I was interested to hear the Premier mention recently a list of things the Government had done in the country, and when he referred to Port Augusta the member for Stuart interjected, "Is that all you can do for Port Augusta?" I wondered what he wanted, as few places in the State, or even the Commonwealth, have had more done for them in recent years. It has grown phenomenally under the encouragement of the Government. The tendency towards decentralization will continue over the years because of the electricity generated at this centre. In the last decade we have seen a network of power lines extended throughout the State because of this Government agency.

The Government is also spending tremendous amounts on roads, which are now better than ever before. One often hears criticisms of the remarkable growth in road transport and the ruining of roads. I should say that the number of vehicles has increased threefold since 1939, and their weight and speed have also increased, but despite this our road system is one of which we can be proud, comparing favourably with that in other parts of the Commonwealth. For instance, better roads will not be found in Victoria. Generally speaking our network of roads provides a fast and safe access to almost any part of the State.

The Government has also made tremendous strides in afforestation, and it is now reaping the benefit by getting large returns from forest products. This industry will have a beneficial effect upon the development of the South-East.

The Opposition often asks why abattoirs are not established in the country. They must have an outlet for their products, such as export lambs, and be able to dispose of the other lines they handle. This particularly applies in the slack season between the export periods. An abattoirs could not afford to close down, but must offer continuous employment for its staff. One private company received a strong inducement to start operations on Yorke Peninsula, but turned the offer down, an offer which other private companies could hardly expect to receive. It was decided that the abattoirs would be too far away from the markets and that the time was not yet ripe

to enable it to make a profit. There is an abattoirs in my electorate not far from the city which is doing very well, and although it is not yet a big concern it is providing a useful industry and is prospering because of the good sense of the management. It has a fairly big population in fairly closely settled districts among which to dispose of its products.

Generally the State is progressing along very sound lines; the situation is not deteriorating, as the Opposition says. The only way to speed up decentralization would be by compulsion. The Opposition says, "Let us have concessions." However, I point out that big concessions are already being provided. For instance, the railways run at a loss in country areas, and if its object were to make profits, the Government would not have extended water supplies to the country. Therefore, it is true to say that it is making concessions. Also, there would not be tremendous electricity extensions if it were wholly a question of profit. The Government is making concessions in the country areas to encourage settlement, but we could not expect General Motors-Holdens Ltd. to go to Murray Bridge or any other country town. That would be absurd and most impracticable. One Opposition member asked why superphosphate works could not be established in the country and in reply to an interjection by me, although he did not say whom he had in mind, I believe he meant that the work should be undertaken by one of the present superphosphate companies. Surely these men know their own business and if they thought they could do good by going to the country they would do so. If they wanted to go to the South-East one of the first things they would seek would be help from the Government and no doubt they would receive generous treatment. In a dozen ways the Government could help, as it has in the case of the pyrites proposition at Nairne. It would assist any industry wanting to go to the country. If in view of this they do not want to go we should ascertain the reason. The manufacture of superphosphate in the country entails tremendous difficulties. First the raw material has to be taken there. Then there is the acid, which is an awkward material to handle. Some of the problems are elementary but they should be discussed by any member who suggests the establishment of superphosphate works in the country. More details should be given if schemes are to be in any way sound. South Australia starts far behind scratch because it has few large country towns but we have made great progress.

The remarks of the Opposition on the deteriorating position are absurd and I oppose the motion.

Mr. DAVIS (Port Pirie)—I support the motion. Mr. Brookman said that our proposal is almost impossible of achievement, but Government supporters should support the motion and then we could be told we were wrong if the Royal Commission did not support our view. Mr. Brookman mentioned the mines at Burra but they were closed over 60 years ago, although not worked out. In the early days water was the trouble but with modern equipment perhaps that difficulty could be overcome. He also said that large towns have been established in the country. Port Pirie is the largest but its population has only increased by about 3,000 over the last 20 years. The Government has not done much for Port Pirie, although it has established a uranium plant there. The Opposition has done everything possible to convince Government supporters of the need to increase the country population. A few weeks ago the Premier gave figures trying to show it had increased but he included Elizabeth, which is really a suburb of Adelaide, also Gawler.

Mr. Shannon—Why not include Port Pirie?

Mr. DAVIS—I can prove that Gawler is regarded as part of the metropolitan area. Country members get a small allowance but the member for Gawler does not get it. Mr. Brookman mentioned roads, but all the good roads lead to the metropolitan area.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—Have you seen the roads at Port Pirie?

Mr. DAVIS—They are in a deplorable condition but if there had been more Government support Port Pirie would have decent roads.

This is only through the neglect of this Government, which has never given country towns any support. We get very little return from the money collected in registration fees on vehicles in our district, and I would like the Western Australian method, under which councils get the whole of the registration fee, to be adopted. Then we could keep our roads in good condition. However, with the Government we have, we could not expect anything.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—Councils in Western Australia get only what is collected by local road boards.

Mr. DAVIS—I believe that they are the equivalent of councils.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—But the councils there only get the revenue from those boards, don't they?

Mr. DAVIS—I think so, but we get nothing. In opposing this motion, members opposite have said that what it proposes cannot be done, but the matter deserves more consideration than they have given it.

Mr. Hambour—Untangle yourself first.

Mr. DAVIS—I will deal with the honourable member later, and I will not use any gutter-snipe tactics as he did. When speaking in this House a member should be honourable, but if I said I was disappointed in the member for Light I do not think that would cover the position. I was disgusted, as were other members on this side of the House. I have been in this House for a number of years and I have never heard a member stoop as low as the member for Light.

The SPEAKER—Order! I ask the honourable member to resume his seat. He must speak to the motion before the Chair and not attack any member of the Chamber. I ask him to continue the debate in conformity with Standing Orders.

Mr. DAVIS—I agree with your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but I am sorry you did not give the same ruling when the member for Light—

The SPEAKER—Order! The honourable member cannot proceed in that tone. What he is saying is disrespectful to the Chair. I expressed my opinion, and the honourable member said he would bow to my ruling. I ask him to adhere to what he said.

Mr. DAVIS—I said I agreed with your ruling, Mr. Speaker, which I did. I realize that I said something that probably I should not have said; although it was quite true, I know I am not allowed to do that. However, I would like to bring to your notice that the honourable member for Light hurled an insult at me.

The SPEAKER—Order! The honourable member for Light will be dealt with if he says anything out of order, and I ask the member for Port Pirie to resume the debate. I ask members to address themselves to the Chair, not to interject, and not to address other members in the second person.

Mr. DAVIS—I am a nervous type, and I respect your ruling. I was only trying to bring to the notice of members the necessity of establishing industries in the country. It has been said that the Government cannot direct industry to the country, and I agree, but it can encourage and recommend it to go there. I do not know of any action of this Government that has encouraged industries to go to the country. I know that if a company applies for financial assistance, an investiga-

tion is made, but if a company notifies the Government that it desires to establish an industry in this State, I venture to say that it gets all the encouragement possible to remain in the metropolitan area, despite the fact that there are places just as suitable in the country. Three such places are Port Pirie, Port Augusta and Wallaroo. As far as Port Pirie is concerned—

Mr. Fletcher—You have everything.

Mr. DAVIS—We have.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—Can the honourable member speak for Port Pirie now?

Mr. DAVIS—Yes, I can, although I can only speak for portion of it because the member for Stuart (Mr. Riches) has pinched half of it because of someone's stupidity. Except for the poor condition of the wharves, Port Pirie has everything for the establishment of an industry—shipping, railways from all directions, and plenty of good land. In the Address in Reply debate I pointed out that, as most motor vehicles going to Western Australia pass through Port Pirie, it would be suitable for the establishment of a motor building industry. If we had such an industry there it would save a great deal of haulage. Although the member for Alexandra (Mr. Brookman) condemned the establishment of country meat works, three country towns are suitable for such undertakings.

Mr. Shannon—What has the honourable member to offer more than the Premier has already offered?

Mr. DAVIS—I am trying to offer some commonsense to Government members. I am sorry that it is falling on deaf ears. They have no desire to be progressive as members of my Party have, nor do they want big populations in the country because that would make a political difference in this House.

Mr. Fletcher—What about Leigh Creek?

Mr. DAVIS—I suppose the Government put the coal there!

Mr. Hambour—It is certainly responsible for taking it out.

Mr. DAVIS—Yes, but it required the aid of one of the greatest Prime Ministers Australia has ever known—Ben Chifley. The Premier will admit that he received more assistance from the Chifley Labor Government than he has ever received from any other Federal Government. This Government must also thank the Chifley Government for assistance in building the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline. Only one company has received benefit from the water transmitted through that line, but it has not fulfilled its part of the agreement.

Mr. Jenkins—Don't you believe in giving the Broken Hill Proprietary Company water?

Mr. DAVIS—I have not said that. I remember the people on the foothills between Morgan and Whyalla urgently required water for their produce. The Government made no attempt to supply it and water was not taken through that area until the B.H.P. Company cracked the whip.

Mr. Fletcher—That is wrong.

Mr. DAVIS—The honourable member should be sitting on the other side of the House so that people may know whom he represents.

Mr. Fletcher—I am for the honest worker.

Mr. DAVIS—I remember that when we were trying to provide workers with adequate compensation the honourable member refused to assist my Party; yet he claims he is for the worker. He makes my heart bleed. He forgets when he was an honest worker.

Mr. Fletcher—I never went to sleep on my job.

Mr. DAVIS—The honourable member was never exhausted enough. Mr. Brookman said that Port Augusta's population had increased as a result of the erection of the powerhouse there. The Premier told me at one time that the powerhouse was to be built at Port Pirie.

Mr. Riches—That was like a good many of his promises—entirely without foundation.

Mr. DAVIS—That is so. However, when the Premier found that it would cost 8s. 3d. a ton more to cart coal to Port Pirie than to Port Augusta, Port Pirie was discarded as a site. Another factor in favour of Port Augusta was the fact that the necessary depth of water could be secured at a lesser cost. I do not blame the Government for building at Port Augusta, but if it had not been constructed there Port Augusta would have remained at a standstill. Instead, its population has increased by about 100 per cent. That clearly illustrates the wisdom of the policy we advocate. If decent industries are established where possible in country areas the congestion in the metropolitan area will be relieved. I have heard frequent mention of ghost towns in the north. When an industry closes down in a country town it is the Government's duty to establish another industry to retain the population. Wallaroo, Moonta and Kadina were once three of the most prosperous towns in the State, but when the mines closed the people had to seek employment elsewhere. It is to the credit of those towns that they have retained as many people as they have. The Government should try to establish a suitable industry at Wallaroo.

Mr. Hambour—What about when a member from Wallaroo was Premier?

Mr. DAVIS—Everybody was working then and no new industry was necessary there.

Mr. Fred Walsh—And he was only Premier for five minutes.

Mr. Hambour—What about when Hill was Premier?

Mr. DAVIS—We are not going back into the dark ages. I point out to the honourable member that Wallaroo is a most suitable site for an industry for it has access to both rail and sea transport facilities. Probably in the next few days the people of Wallaroo will be told that an industry is to be established there soon, but such a promise will have no effect on the result of the by-election next Saturday for the people there have become accustomed to such promises by the Premier, as have people in the South-East who, over the past 20 years, have again and again been promised a deep sea port, yet are no nearer getting it today than when it was first mentioned. Prior to every election the Premier promises the people of the South-East a deep sea port, but he shifts it from one place to another.

Mr. Hambour—What's that got to do with decentralization?

Mr. DAVIS—Establish a deep sea port there and the population will increase.

Mr. Hambour—But you want a Royal Commission.

Mr. DAVIS—Yes, and I remind the honourable member that decentralization will also benefit the owners of chain stores in country towns, so I cannot see why he does not support the motion. Let a Royal Commission be the judge of whether the terms of the motion can be implemented or not. I appeal to Government members to vote according to their consciences and not as they have been directed by the Premier.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart)—In supporting the motion I express concern at the manner in which it appears to have been summarily dismissed by Government members without regard to the purport or importance of the matters mentioned in it. It states that a Royal Commission shall be appointed to inquire into and report on (*inter alia*) whether industries ancillary to primary production should be established in country districts; and no member, not even the Premier, has denied the alarming concentration of population in the metropolitan area. Indeed, a statement by the Premier at a function in Gawler recently, that eventually 1,000,000 people would live on the Adelaide plains between Adelaide and Gawler,

has caused concern in the country and doubts whether the Playford Government is doing its utmost to bring about decentralization and a better balance of population and industries. Surely it is incumbent on some Government member to demonstrate that this concentration of population in the metropolitan area is not taking place.

The *Statistician's Year Book* that is issued to members and accepted as authentic discloses that every year an ever-increasing percentage of South Australia's population is concentrated in the metropolitan area. For instance, in the past 12 months it increased from 60.3 per cent to 60.7 per cent. This state of affairs does not obtain in other States. In Queensland only 40 per cent of the population is in the metropolitan area and 60 per cent in the country, for Queensland has adopted a concerted policy to exploit its natural resources and develop its harbours.

Mr. Millhouse—Won't the position be even better under the new Government in Queensland?

Mr. RICHES—Yes, because it will apply the principle advocated by Labor members in this State. The last issue of the *Courier Mail* reported that the Queensland Government had established a Department of Development, with sub-departments, one of which would be at Townsville. According to the Minister the purpose of the Townsville sub-department would be to develop resources, establish industries and decentralize Government undertakings as far as possible in that part of Queensland.

We have heard much about the establishment of the power house at Port Augusta, and that project has been held up by Government members as evidence of the Government's desire to decentralize industry. I am grateful to members who have referred to the project in that way because it really illustrates what Labor members wish to place before the people. This motion, having drawn attention to the unbalanced concentration of population in the metropolitan area, asks for the setting up of a Royal Commission. The Premier seems to have some objection to this, and other members have said to me privately that somehow they think that the motion carries the insinuation that "something is wrong in the State of Denmark." I want the House to know that the building of the regional power station at Port Augusta followed the setting up of a Royal Commission to inquire into that very project, so what is wrong with the procedure that we are suggesting? We are merely embodying the

procedure that the Premier has adopted on previous occasions, and his change of attitude has nothing more to support it than Party politics at its worst. It was on the findings of that Royal Commission that Parliament eventually authorized the construction of the power station at Port Augusta. Let some member opposite explain that away. What has the member for Alexandra to say about it? He voted for it then. What is his objection to it now? Is it merely because it comes from the wrong side of the House?

Mr. Brookman—Obviously they had something specific in mind.

Mr. RICHES—These are the things that we think a Royal Commission might inquire into.

Mr. Brookman—Well, give it a little help.

Mr. RICHES—I propose to do just that. Are we to accept the idea that it is no longer possible to establish industries in the country—the defeatist attitude that we have no national resources capable of development, that no treatment works ancillary to primary production can be brought successfully into operation? Are we prepared to accept that, or do we really believe that South Australia has a destiny, that she can be developed if we have the vision and the willpower to get together and determine that our resources shall be developed here and not transported elsewhere.

As long ago as 1937, when the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Indenture Bill was introduced by the then Premier, the Honourable R. L. (now Sir Richard) Butler, he outlined what South Australia had missed by its failure to decentralize industry. I quote:—

We have lost many industries through lack of vision, initiative and capital. Furthermore, Governments and Parliaments believed that we should live by agriculture alone. We appear to have some hazy idea that the establishment of secondary industries would imperil primary industry. There was failure to realize that these two great industries should go hand in hand and that so long as primary industry is made our first consideration those engaged in that industry have everything to gain and nothing to lose by the establishment of secondary industries.

Am I being uncharitable when I read the same sentiments into the speech just delivered by Mr. Brookman? Heaven help South Australia if the outlook expressed there is the sum total of the vision of the people of this State. The Broken Hill Proprietary Company did not come to South Australia in 1937 saying, "We want to establish industries here." According to the Premier of that day he asked the company to come here, and in the negotiations that followed many things had to be

done; just about every law of the land had to be altered for the benefit of the company.

Mr. Shannon—In other words, we met them wherever we had to meet them in order to get them established here.

Mr. RICHES—I am going to say that in my own way. The point I want to make is that the initiative was taken by the State.

Mr. Shannon—That is correct.

Mr. RICHES—And if we are to have our national resources developed somebody must take the initiative and not sit down and wait for companies to come here. We will never get anything that way.

Mr. Shannon—That policy has been pursued by the present Government, following the lead of the then Premier. You have only to look at what has been done in your own district.

Mr. Corcoran—Why so much objection to the appointment of a Royal Commission?

Mr. Shannon—Because it would be waste of public money.

Mr. RICHES—It is not many years ago that the member for Onkaparinga voted for the setting up of a Royal Commission to do the very thing that we are asking for a Royal Commission to do today.

Mr. Shannon—I think we are in different fields.

Mr. RICHES—The honourable member will probably recall that he voted for a Royal Commission to inquire into the desirability of establishing the very power house at Port Augusta that he refers to. Was that a shocking waste of public money?

Mr. Shannon—I am not suggesting it was. That related to a specific programme and not a nebulous thing such as we have before us now.

Mr. RICHES—The terms of reference proposed are:—

To inquire into and report upon:—

- (a) Whether industries ancillary to primary production, such as meat works, and other works for the processing of primary products should be established in country districts.

Isn't that specific?

Mr. Shannon—We have already tried to do it. We do not need an inquiry in that field.

Mr. RICHES—The honourable member may have all the information he needs on that question but there are many who think that there is room for further investigation, particularly now that the standard gauge railway has been taken right through to Marree and the transport arrangements for bringing cattle from the Northern Territory to South Australia so much improved. For the information

of the honourable member, every local government body on Eyre Peninsula has asked that meat works be established at Port Augusta in order to give them an additional market and an opportunity for the shipment of meat overseas. If the Northern Territory is to be developed, and if South Australia is to derive any benefit from it, we must be prepared to go out and get it, or give it to Queensland. The member for Onkaparinga may have the last word, but I believe that the people in the north of South Australia are not content with such an attitude. If this debate has done nothing else it has demonstrated to me that an inquiry along the lines suggested is necessary because of the conservative, placid and dangerously retarded outlook that members opposite have expressed in this debate. I shudder to think what will happen to this State if the remarks made by the member for Alexandra (Mr. Brookman) and the interjections of the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) are indicative of public opinion.

Mr. Shannon—Since you have been in Parliament we have always had a Liberal Government, and your district has prospered in that period.

Mr. RICHES—Yes, because it is well represented politically. What has proved to be a good thing for my district might be a good thing for other districts. The establishment of a regional power station was the most important factor in the development of my district, and that power station was established as a result of the findings of a Royal Commission. The development at Whyalla followed direct representations by the Government to the Broken Hill Pty. Co. Limited. Many Acts had to be amended for that purpose. A special Bill was introduced to provide for a water supply for Whyalla, the Act governing the tramway between Iron Knob and Whyalla was amended, the mining laws were altered so that the B.H.P. did not have to man its leases, and the laws governing the construction of jetties were altered. If any other industry wants to build a jetty it has to obtain permission from the Harbors Board and build it at its own expense. The jetty becomes the property of the Government after 21 years, but that does not apply to the B.H.P. I am not saying that all those amendments were not necessary, but my point is that those laws had to be altered in order to get the B.H.P. to erect a blast furnace at Whyalla.

Mr. Fred Walsh—You know that the B.H.P. is sacrosanct.

Mr. RICHES—I certainly do. I know it is easy to get the law altered to suit interests like that. It may be necessary for the Government to offer encouragement to other industries to establish in other places. We on this side of the House do not believe we have all the answers, but that a Royal Commission could obtain them. The member for Onkaparinga wanted me to give specific proposals for the establishment of industries, but will he tell me whether the last word has been said on suggestions put forward from time to time that it would be possible to have wool scouring plants in the country?

To establish industries successfully it is necessary to have available either raw materials or markets. It is difficult to suggest the establishment of industries in certain places until our natural resources have been fully explored by the Mines Department, but the north of this State produces millions of bales of wool, all of which is being transported in its dirty form. Are we in a position to reject out of hand the suggestions by wool growers that it might be washed and treated in South Australia before being sent away? It is someone's business to inquire into that. The motion specifically states "treating hides, skins, etc., and other works ancillary to primary production."

Mr. Heaslip—It is not even economical to treat skins in Adelaide, and it would be much more expensive at Port Augusta.

Mr. RICHES—I did not suggest Port Augusta, but I know something about the establishment of secondary industries because I am a member of the Industries Development Committee. Often men who now have successful industries have been told that it would not be economical to establish in the country. The problems must be tackled and ways found of making it economic to establish industries. For how long were we told that we could not develop the Leigh Creek coalfield because it would be uneconomic, that Newcastle coal was cheaper and of higher B.T.U. value? Nevertheless, the field was developed and it has been of great value to the State.

Mr. Shannon—What Government did that?

Mr. RICHES—It was a remarkable set up. It was a Liberal Government that carried the necessary legislation with the support of Labor votes.

Mr. Shannon—That is today's funny story.

Mr. RICHES—Where did the honourable member stand on that question?

Mr. Fred Walsh—Not on the same side as us.

Mr. RICHES—He opposed the legislation. I can remember the pleas he made against the

Electricity Trust Bill. The House has heard me before on the establishment of a steelworks in South Australia, and this is another example of decentralization. There has been much agitation for the establishment of a steelworks because when the B.H.P. Indenture Bill was before the House the then Premier asked Parliament to vote for it not on the basis of the erection of a blast furnace at Whyalla but on the basis that a steelworks and coke oven would follow as naturally as night follows day. He told us that that has been the procedure all over the world, and he also said that ancillary industries would be established at Port Augusta, Port Pirie and Wallaroo and right around Spencer Gulf. I was one of the mugs that took him at his word and gave him a vote, but I have never forgiven myself since. The State has lost those industries because the company has not honoured the agreement.

In reading the debates on that Bill one wonders how certain members can be so complacent now. Many industries have slipped through our fingers and been established in other States, whereas they should have been established near the place where we have rich natural resources, bearing in mind always that we must have natural resources or markets available to successfully establish industries. Members opposite say that their Government has done more than any other Government to establish industries, and that a Labor Government would not have done more. I claim that the greatest degree of decentralization Australia ever knew was implemented by the Chifley Labor Government during the war when factories were built and industries established, which, unfortunately, have not been able to continue and which we have let slip through our fingers. We have not even been able to establish an industry in buildings erected at Wallaroo and Whyalla. An industry established by the Commonwealth Government at the former place was not allowed to continue and has been idle for years.

Mr. Hambour—What do you mean by "not allowed"?

Mr. RICHES—As the honourable member knows, the Constitution provides that the Commonwealth Government cannot manufacture even an axe handle without specific authority and that a referendum was taken to give the Commonwealth power to establish industries and maintain industries already established, but it was lost and all the factories built by the Commonwealth Government during the war with the idea of carrying on industry during

the post-war years had to be disposed of because of the loss of that referendum.

Mr. Hambour—Does not the honourable member accept that?

Mr. RICHES—The Premier does not accept it—he is shaking his head.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—The honourable member is not correct in that. The Commonwealth can carry on any industry that is necessary for the defence of the country.

Mr. RICHES—What has the defence of the country to do with it? I admit that my authority was not very sound, because I was quoting the Premier of South Australia.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—You are quoting me unintelligently.

Mr. RICHES—I was quoting your remarks when you introduced the Commonwealth Powers Bill. I am not referring to defence. I know that the Commonwealth Government can do things in connection with defence, but when the war ended it was not allowed to continue.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—It could continue to operate defence industries.

Mr. RICHES—I think the Premier might have done better by the motion and by the House had he given full consideration to the matter, instead of reciting as an answer the result of investigations by the Mines Department over the last 20 years and by giving a record of what the Housing Trust has done, and holding that up as an answer to the motion and saying that because the Mines Department had been analysing the ores discovered by prospectors or by prospecting itself, and because the Housing Trust had been building homes, there was no need for a Royal Commission.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—And the Electricity Trust building a power station.

Mr. RICHES—The Premier might remember that the trust built a power station at Port Augusta following a resolution that he himself submitted to the House to the effect that a Royal Commission should be set up to inquire into the desirability of erecting a regional power station at Port Augusta. It was not a bad procedure when he introduced it, but now that we suggest a similar practice in connection with other industries it is all wrong, a waste of money and unnecessary. We say it is high time that South Australia took the initiative. Towns where industries could be established are languishing. Are we to accept the position that there can be no more development on the whole of the West Coast, as we would be led to infer from the remarks of Government supporters in this

debate, particularly those of Mr. Brookman?

Mr. Hambour—What about the Industries Development Committee?

Mr. RICHES—It is conceivable that a Royal Commission might recommend to the Government that the Industries Development Committee should be given power to initiate investigations. The Government, on the advice of this committee, has done and is doing excellent work, but the Committee cannot initiate anything. The procedure is that an industry has first to approach the Treasurer and seek Government assistance.

Mr. Hambour—Is not that the correct procedure?

Mr. RICHES—For that type of business yes. If the honourable member had read the papers recently he would have seen that other States are sending businessmen's delegations overseas to attract industries, and it should be someone's business to attract industries to South Australia and encourage people to establish them in the country. It can be and was done in connection with the establishment of a pyrites treatment works which are to be opened by the Premier at Quorn in a few weeks. We are seeking the establishment of a competent authority, with power to call upon the best brains available in South Australia, to inquire into a situation which has developed into a state of urgency and to report to Parliament on its findings.

I cannot understand why the Government is making this a Party matter. We are told over and over again that members opposite are free to speak and vote as they like, but we know that is not so, although we know that there must be team work or there would not be stable government. Surely, on an issue like this members opposite should be free to support the motion if they wish. No one can convince me that Government supporters representing country districts are not seized with the necessity of an investigation along the lines suggested. If they think that a Royal Commission is not the body which should make the inquiry, let some other authority, such as a select committee, or any other committee, undertake the task.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—You would not be able to bring it up every time there was an election if you did that.

Mr. RICHES—Perhaps if this debate were adjourned until after the Wallaroo by-election a little more sense would be shown. As I read in the press two days ago, negotiations are to be opened for the establishment of another industry at Wallaroo, but they will

break down after Saturday. It is amusing what a by-election will reveal. Members opposite cannot get beyond the Party view, but they should support the motion. Mr. Hambour made the charge that it was designed to do some ear-tickling in the Wallaroo by-election.

Mr. Hambour—Do you deny that completely?

Mr. RICHES—I do. The Labor Party has committees amongst its members, who are asked to apply their minds to problems in country districts: social problems, law reform and so on. The committee set up to consider country districts recommended this motion long before the session commenced and long before the tragedy which caused the Wallaroo by-election.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—It has been brought up two or three times in this House.

Mr. RICHES—Yes, with a slight alteration the same motion was moved three years ago. In every Parliament we try to do something because we believe decentralization is essential. We will not accept the view that nothing more can be done to advance country interests. I hope some members opposite will provide us with the necessary numbers to carry the motion. There would be no need for them to take that as a reflection on the Government or as a defeat of the Party. Let us divorce the Party line from this discussion. Any Royal Commission appointed would be set up by the Government. The Opposition does not say who should be its members. We ask for the same procedure to be adopted as was adopted by the Premier prior to the setting up of the regional power station at Port Augusta. Nearly every railway line built in this State was first the subject of an inquiry by a commission, and one investigated the proposal for the building of a new railway line from Stirling North to Marree. It is sound procedure and there is no reflection on anybody. All we are doing is to give voice to the belief that the utmost should be done to get industries to the country. We do not say that the Premier is not doing his best, but he has a terrific responsibility and this problem is bigger than any one man can carry full-time. It is too big to be an appendage to the portfolios already held by the Premier. This is a burning subject in every country district and I support the motion.

Mr. KING (Chaffey)—I oppose the motion, which includes the words "That in view of the alarming concentration of population in the metropolitan area." Before we decide whether or not to support the motion we must decide whether there is an alarming concentration of this sort. Up to now I cannot see that there

is any cause for alarm. Perhaps members opposite are alarmed that industries are not being developed in their districts. People live in the metropolitan area of their own free will and because they find the amenities attractive. Nothing will take the people to the country if they prefer to live in the city. We could agree to the building of houses in country districts, or help in the establishment of industries there, but we could not guarantee that people would go to the country to occupy the houses or support the industries. If we do not agree that there is an alarming concentration of population in the metropolitan area there is no need for a Royal Commission. This motion has been sponsored by people who subscribe to a political theory which means, by implication, that they like manpower regulations, such as we had during the war, more than we on this side do. The motion mentions the transfer of industries to the country, but what is really meant by that? If an industry is transferred obviously the workers in it must be transferred also, but we do not know whether or not the people would want to go. We on this side do not subscribe to that principle. We prefer to let the people decide where they want to live and work. The motion seeks an inquiry into:—

Whether industries ancillary to primary production, such as meatworks, establishment for treating hides, skins, etc., and other works for the processing of primary products should be established in country districts.

We do not need a Royal Commission to learn anything about this. The people in country districts already know what is wanted. We may get meatworks established in a district, but we have no guarantee that animals would be sold in a market which would enable them to be handled economically at the meatworks. We could not tell farmers in my district that they should sell their stock at Loxton, across the border, or at the metropolitan abattoirs. Before establishing meatworks in a country area we would first want to be assured that animals would be sent to it. Whatever the industry, we must be sure that raw materials will be available. Primary producers in my district have a flourishing set of secondary industries, but the population in the last seven years has increased by only several thousand. Many of these people are in permanent industrial employment in factories that process the primary produce of these districts. A Royal Commission was not needed to establish these factories; as anyone with any initiative would do, they made use of the co-operative legislation on the Statute Book. Some cases were referred

to the Industries Development Committee, and the Government, by guarantee, by straight out loans to the producers and through the agency of the State Bank, has made it possible for growers in these areas to control and develop their own industries. That is a tribute to the initiative of Australians, and I do not see how a Royal Commission would have made any difference.

All councils in my area are aware of the possibilities of future production, and of what industries can be established there. They are ceaselessly trying to find out what natural resources we have and what we can do with them. For obvious reasons I cannot tell members what those resources are, but one I can mention is a co-operative cannery that we are endeavouring to establish on the river. This will meet the needs of the people and also provide more employment. We in river districts are anxious to provide employment for our sons and daughters in our areas. In my first Address in Reply speech I said that I was in favour of having more people in the country. I did not mean necessarily by decentralization, but by natural production. If members study the statistics quoted by the Leader of the Opposition, they will see that the population in country areas has increased but the number of people engaged permanently in rural production has dropped from 44,000 in 1938-39 to 42,000 in 1956.

Mr. John Clark—That is exactly what we are saying.

Mr. KING—The corollary to that is that as the population has increased it is obvious that more people are now engaged in industry so industries must have been established in the country. Only 6,000 tractors were in use in 1939, but now 24,345 are used. In this period there has been a considerable amount of mechanization. When I went to the river several years ago there were 675 horses in the district of Berri, but horses in that district now are anatomical curiosities. They are only kept for sentimental reasons, and I suppose all finish in crayfish pots. Their passing is unfortunate, but it means that fewer people can produce much more.

The yield of crops has increased tremendously, although fewer people are engaged in rural production. Barley production has increased from 7,500,000 bushels in 1939 to 24,500,000 bushels in 1955/56; in that period oat production has increased from 2,080,000 to 7,280,000 bushels, field peas from 96,000 bushels to 584,000 bushels. Obviously, this increase must have been brought about by

mechanization, which permits the farmer to work larger areas with less labour. Wine production has increased from 10,000,000 gallons to 18,000,000 gallons in the period I have mentioned, and this has been due to mechanization. This has brought about a change of occupation, and in addition to having increased their production, farmers also have a great deal more leisure, which I think members opposite will agree is necessary. These facts show that we cannot make a simple approach to discover the reason for an increase of population in the metropolitan area while the population in the country is not increasing at such a rapid rate. This does not justify a Royal Commission, because it is a natural outcome of economic laws. If there is a district anywhere in South Australia with a problem that can be overcome by assistance from this Government, members opposite know full well that assistance will be given. We all know that it has been given, and given freely, in our own districts. I suggest that each member has a good look at the statistics before coming to any wild conclusion as to what might happen and why.

I do not see why members opposite should be particularly alarmed about the concentration of people in the larger areas because, when they can socialize everything, the metropolitan area will provide the pressure points through which socialistic experiments can be tried. I refer to such things as water and power supplies. I think Opposition members may have their tongues in their cheeks when they say it is alarming, because it is rather in accordance with the trends of Labor policy today.

The member for Stuart (Mr. Riches) said that people now lack vision, but I think it has been amply demonstrated in the last 20 years that that is not so. It has been said that people without vision must perish, but working conditions and amenities available to the people of this State not only indicate that we have vision, but show the realization of that vision in the achievement of the objective for which this Government stands. South Australia has been converted from a poor impoverished State to one that is the envy of the rest of Australia, and possibly the rest of the world. One has only to review the industries that have come here without the assistance of a Royal Commission; for instance, Actil, Philips Industries and Chrysler (Aust.) Ltd. They came here because this State had the conditions necessary for them to flourish. If an industry is forced to operate under condi-

tions under which it cannot flourish, it will not last long. It will be no better than the jetty built at Port Hughes by John Verran or the much maligned distillery at Wallaroo, which was the work of Ben Chifley. If industry is to be situated in the country it must have congenial conditions for its favourable development. It must be close to the markets. The only way we could possibly hope to establish an industry out of harmony with its surroundings would be by heavy subsidy, and then the general public would have to be taxed to meet the burden. I prefer even irrigation areas to be made financially sound and I hope one day to show how that can be done.

Mention was made of the amount of wool being produced in various areas. The increase in sheep population is due to the work undertaken by various Governments over a number of years. The hundreds of Albert and Alfred carry 315,000 sheep but the two hundreds on the opposite side of the river have only 75,000. The Government's policy of providing water reticulation in the first-mentioned districts has enabled farmers to carry sheep in proportion to the amount of fodder they have, but on the other side of the river, where there were no communications, the sheep population has been related to the amount of water that can be kept up to it. There are still opportunities to develop more production and maintain more people in the country, but they depend on water. I do not suggest we could not establish a wool-scouring business in the country, but many factors must be considered. Wool markets are mainly based in the metropolitan area where people send their wool for classing and sale. It is accessible to buyers. If it were scoured in the country the producers would have to sell by private treaty, but they prefer to take a chance on the auction market. Members will recall when an attempt was made a few years ago to destroy the free auction market for wool. The wool growers, as one man, fought to continue the then existing markets. I do not know that anybody would be brave enough to attempt to establish a wool-scouring industry in the country, or if it were established, to attempt to force wool growers to take wool there, merely for the sake of employing about 20 people. Primary producers are capable of minding their own business and do not need a Royal Commission to tell them how best to process or market their wares.

Secondary industries will be established in country towns if there is a market there for

the goods or if it is not too costly to transport goods to a market. I think it can be appreciated that if a country town were favourable for the establishment of a particular type of industry that fact would have been ferreted out by those concerned in the industry, or the people in the town would have made that information known. That is the natural procedure. Our Industries Development Committee—comprising a capable team of men—is continually examining industries and a Royal Commission would only be a waste of taxpayers' money. A new industry cannot be established in an unsuitable area.

I do not think there is any need for me to deal with the question of railway construction and maintenance work because the Premier has already done so. As regards housing, there is no point in building houses if people refuse to go and live in them. People will live where they want to and where they are handy to the things they desire, both from an employment and a recreational viewpoint. It is not right to arrogate to ourselves the power to tell people where to work and what to do with their leisure time. Personally, I cannot understand why people want to live in the city, but I would not force them to go to the country.

The final matter referred to in the motion is the provision of sewerage schemes to make country towns more attractive. The provision of such schemes depends on finance, but the Government is not financially able to proceed with the schemes already approved. While there may be some parts where such schemes are more necessary than elsewhere, local councils keep a close eye on the question of public health and a number of country districts have already adopted by-laws and regulations insisting on the provision of septic tanks for the disposal of sewage. There are general purpose septic tanks in use today that can cater for the whole of the waste disposal of a particular property. Many are used by the Housing Trust. There are very few places where these tanks cannot be installed and to that extent it makes it much easier for country towns to solve their sewerage problems. I know of some areas where councils have made money available—and even borrowed money to make it available—to ratepayers to enable them to purchase septic tanks as a long-term proposition and, as a result, a better standard of living has been provided.

South Australia does not need a Royal Commission to tell it how to maintain its industrial

development. Our primary producers are quite capable of developing the country as much as is possible. If we try to outstrip ourselves we will reach a state of inflation that will bring the State to its knees. If we continue at a steady rate of increase I am confident the State will flourish.

Mr. JOHN CLARK secured the adjournment of the debate.

METROPOLITAN AND EXPORT ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 21. Page 410).

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—This Bill, which has been introduced by the Leader of the Opposition, contains only one operative clause, which states:—

Sections 34 and 35 of the principal Act are hereby repealed.

Section 34 states:—

(1) If any dispute arises between any of the employees of the board, or any trades or other union, or any association or organization of or on behalf of such employees, and the board as to the wages or remuneration to be paid to such employees or other employees of the board, or as to their hours of work or any other condition of their employment, such dispute shall be forthwith referred to an arbitrator or arbitrators to be mutually agreed upon between the parties or, failing such agreement, to the Industrial Court constituted by the Industrial Code, 1920, or any Court to which the functions of the said Court are by any Act transferred.

(2) The award of such arbitrator or arbitrators or of the Court (as the case may be) shall be final and shall not be re-opened for a period of at least 12 months from the date thereof.

By deleting section 34, therefore, the Leader deletes the section providing for the special hearing of an industrial dispute by an arbitrator or, alternatively, the Industrial Court. Section 35, which deals with an associated matter, states:—

(1) If any of the employees of the board on account of any such dispute, discontinue their employment, or break their contracts of service, or refuse or fail after such continuance to resume or return to their employment they shall be guilty of an act in the nature of a strike; and every person, or trades or other union, or association or organization who or which in any way counsels, takes part in, supports, or assists directly or indirectly any such act shall also be guilty of an act in the nature of a strike.

(2) Any person, trades or other union, or association or organization guilty of an act in the nature of a strike, within the meaning of this section, shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding one thousand pounds, or in the case

of an individual to imprisonment for any term not exceeding six months, with or without hard labour.

That section was enacted when the original Act was passed and before the Industrial Code operated; it consequently prescribes penalties in excess, and out of line with, the general penalties provided in the Industrial Code.

Mr. Frank Walsh—I should say we'll get your support on that?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) said the other day that the Government never supports anything brought forward by the Opposition as an amendment, so the honourable member should not anticipate anything in this case because if I support him I will not be, according to the member for Murray, running true to form, which will be rather serious. In connection with the Bill two features should be borne in mind: firstly, the provisions in the Act are special provisions that were inserted before the enactment of the Industrial Code; secondly, they are out of line with provisions applying in other industries covered by the Code. Further, any provision at present operating in respect of the abattoirs at Gepps Cross is probably invalid, because most of the terms and conditions applying there have been determined by wages boards and similar bodies set up under the Industrial Code and any dispute under the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Act must first be referred to an arbitrator and not to the court. In those circumstances the Government is therefore willing to go a considerable way towards accepting the provisions of the Bill.

Firstly, the Government accepts without qualm the deletion of section 35, which provides for penalties of £1,000 and six months' imprisonment, whereas section 120 of the Industrial Code prescribes the following penalties: for failure to observe an award or order of the court, in the case of an association £250, in the case of an employer £100, and in the case of an employee £10; three months' imprisonment for any person disobeying a writ granted under the section; £250 for any association disobeying a writ. Section 120 of the Code prescribes penalties for the non-observance of orders made by the Industrial Court and I see no reason why special provisions should be prescribed for one industry that are completely out of line with those applying in another. The Government therefore does not object to the deletion of section 35 of the principal Act.

Concerning section 34, I suggest that the Leader's amendment be not accepted in its entirety, but that it be amended in the following manner:—

All words in subsection (1) after the words "referred to" in the seventh line are struck out and the following words are inserted in lieu thereof:—

The Industrial Board constituted under the Industrial Code 1920-1955 in respect of the industry or section of the industry concerned, or as regards any employees engaged in industries or callings not within the jurisdiction of an Industrial Board, to the Industrial Court constituted by the Industrial Code 1920-1955, or to any other authority to which the functions of the said industrial board or courts are by any Act transferred.

What we propose is not to strike out the section in its entirety, but to refer any dispute to the appropriate industrial tribunal.

Mr. Shannon—There would then be no provision under the Abattoirs Act to refer a dispute to any body.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Probably no general provision, but that does not break down the amendment proposed by the Leader of the Opposition. He wishes to take this away from the special arbitrator and to get back to the Industrial Court, and we are merely suggesting that any dispute shall be referred back to the proper industrial tribunal. Members will see that the purpose the Leader wishes to accomplish will not be impaired by my proposed amendment. It merely sets out the procedure to be followed normally in an industrial dispute and clarifies Parliament's intention that these matters shall be dealt with under normal industrial legislation rather than by special legislation as provided by the Metropolitan Abattoirs Act. I have always felt that it is bad in principle to deal with industrial matters under some Act where the industrial provisions can be so easily overlooked. In fact, that is the history of these particular sections. No one appeared to know that they were in existence until suddenly in 1955 someone discovered them on the occasion of an industrial dispute and they were invoked. Incidentally, I do not think that they contributed in any way towards the solution of the problem. There is always considerable doubt whether penal clauses solve industrial disputes.

Mr. Lawn—Hear, hear! We have always said that.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will not go beyond saying that there is no ground for having special industrial penal provisions in respect of one industry. If the

Leader, when his health returns, is prepared to move an amendment on the lines I have suggested, I am prepared to support the elimination of section 35 and the amendment of 34 in the way indicated.

Mr. Frank Walsh—The Leader of the Opposition practically agreed to that in his second reading speech. I do not know whether the Premier would desire to move in that direction.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have no particular desire to do so, but if the Leader desires it I would be quite happy. However, he would probably prefer to have the opportunity to consult the Parliamentary Draftsman himself. On the conditions I have outlined the Government is prepared to support the Bill.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide)—At the outset I wish to say that I am agreeably surprised by the Premier's remark. I would be astounded and amazed if it were not that I am never astounded or amazed at anything the Premier may do. We on this side do not put up a proposition simply to provoke Party discussion, but as the Premier has indicated that he is agreeable to the passing of the second reading and to the deletion of section 35 and the amendment of 34, my remarks will be brief. He said that the Metropolitan Abattoirs Act was passed before the Industrial Code, and that is true. The Premier raised the question of legality. I do not profess to be a lawyer, but I have heard it said on more than one occasion that where there is a conflict between Acts the latest one prevails. If that is so, the provisions of the Industrial Code would override those of the Abattoirs Act.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—The Crown Solicitor has ruled the opposite way in this case.

Mr. LAWN—I understand that two Crown Solicitors have ruled in two separate ways about the powers of councils to strike differential rates on pensioners' properties, so the Crown Solicitor's opinion is not the last word. The Industrial Code provides the general law for the conduct of conciliation and arbitration proceedings, and it prescribes penalties for lock-outs and strikes. It is not in the public interest to have a special provision in an Act such as the Abattoirs Act on these matters because abattoirs' employees feel that they should be treated the same as all other employees. The present set-up does not help towards better industrial relationships. Section 19 of the Industrial Code states:—

The President shall have power as a mediator to deal with all industrial matters in all

cases in which it appears to him that his mediation is desirable in the public interest, and such matter would, if submitted to the court, be within its jurisdiction.

In view of that section there is no need to have section 34 in the Abattoirs Act, even in the amended form suggested by the Premier. Section 20 (1) of the Industrial Code states:—

The President may, whenever in his opinion it is desirable for the purpose of dealing with an industrial matter, summon any person to attend, at a time and place specified in the summons, at a conference presided over by himself.

The Industrial Code gives the President ample powers to deal with industrial disputes. In view of the Premier's attitude to this Bill I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

LONG SERVICE LEAVE BILL.

(Continued from August 27. Page 277.)

In Committee.

Clauses 12 to 17 passed.

Clause 18—"Offences and penalties."

Mr. LAWN—The penalty of £50 seems very small; in New South Wales it is £500.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—The payment of a penalty of £50 would not relieve the employer of his obligations. He would still have to grant the employee the leave, and if he did not do so he would probably be liable for contempt of court. The penalty of £50 was considered adequate by the Parliamentary Draftsman, and I cannot imagine any employer being prepared to run into a penalty of £50 and still be obliged to provide the leave.

Mr. Shannon—Plus the odium of the court case.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes. I think that the penalty is adequate to obtain due observance of the law.

Mr. LAWN—The Premier said he could not believe that an employer would face the odium of a court case, but that kind of thing happened in Melbourne, and in all there were three prosecutions. The matter went to the High Court, which said it was good legislation, and the Privy Council upheld it. Employers decided that rather than continue to be prosecuted they would pay for long service leave, not in accordance with the legislation, but as an *ex-gratia* payment.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The honourable member referred to a case where an employer refused to pay, but what he did not say was that it was a deliberate case to test

the validity of the legislation. It was a refusal not by an individual firm, but by a firm acting on behalf of employer organizations generally. What was more serious was that the honourable member said that the High Court considered it good legislation and that it was upheld by the Privy Council. Obviously, he has not seen the decision. They did not express any opinion whether the legislation was good or bad, but said it was within the constitutional capacity of Parliament to make it. I am certain that the £50 penalty provided is ample, and we would rather spoil our case if we assumed that every employer would try to beat the book. I found that employers' organizations in this State have acted fairly and honourably in connection with this matter. For instance, I received today from employer organizations one or two suggestions which are designed purely to improve the legislation and not to break it down.

Mr. BROOKMAN—I support the clause, and think that Mr. Lawn has shown how narrow-minded he is in connection with industrial legislation, on which he should be an expert. He has an anti-employer bias. Whatever the penalty prescribed against employers, he does not think it is big enough. All he can do is to repeatedly refer to New South Wales, but all he has a right to do is to oppose the Bill. I do not know that he has even the power to try to amend the clause to provide for a penalty of £100, or whether he is allowed to vote against the clause. His hands are so tied that his voice is ineffective. The best thing would be for him to keep quiet so that he could learn something and let the Bill go through without raising narrow-minded objections.

Mr. LAWN—Had it not been for the ignorance of the honourable member, I would not have risen again. He showed colossal ignorance by saying that I was not permitted to move amendments. I do not know who told him that. I have as much right as he to move an amendment. Earlier in the debate I said that unless the main principle of the Bill were changed it would be impossible to knock the measure into decent shape. For members opposite to say that I or other members on this side are not permitted to move amendments is a mis-statement of fact.

Mr. Brookman—You mean that you would be allowed to move an amendment, but would not be allowed to vote for it?

Mr. LAWN—Who is going to stop me? I should like to know what authority the honourable member has for his statement.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—It was in the *Advertiser*.

Mr. LAWN—The honourable member is incorrect. Either he has not studied the report or does not know the position. We were given an instruction but not that we cannot move amendments. There is nothing in the world to prevent me from moving for a penalty of £100 or £500.

Mr. Shannon—Perhaps you would not be wise to do that.

Mr. LAWN—I do not know about that, but I know who controls this House. I said earlier that I have no desire to move amendments, and that this Bill is nothing but an extension of annual leave. Earlier the Opposition did move an amendment to coincide with our views, but it was defeated. No amendments could now make this a good Bill.

Mr. SHANNON—I compliment Mr. Lawn on his consistency. Only a moment ago he opposed penalties in other legislation, and now he has got into reverse gear about penalties. He is all for their elimination in certain circumstances, but all for hitting the unfortunate employer. In his view the employer is fair game. If we approached this matter of penalty in a different way from the Premier's way it could have a harmful effect on the employee. If the penalty were increased to £500 a not very strong company might be financially embarrassed and wound up and then the employees would get no benefits.

Clause passed.

Clause 19 passed.

Clause 20—"Consent to prosecution."

Mr. LAWN—Can any Government member justify this clause? Under it if an employer does not give leave to an employee when it is due the employee cannot seek his rights in the court until he first gets the Minister's consent to a prosecution. When there is a strike it is not necessary to get his consent before prosecuting. There is no precedent for this clause. The Bill has been deliberately designed to be different from legislation in other States dealing with this subject. If an employee feels that he is being deprived of his rights he should be able to go to the court without first getting the consent of the Minister. Perhaps the Premier will say why the clause was included.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—This provision is not a rare one; similar provisions occur in many other Acts. For instance, under the Early Closing Act prosecutions cannot be launched without the consent of the Minister. This type of provision is frequently used to

deal with cases in which there can be offences of varying degrees, and committed unwittingly.

Mr. Shannon—An employer might be willing to make up his defection.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—That is so. This provision does not break down the rights of the employee; it merely provides what should be the procedure under all legislation, that before a prosecution is launched, it should be properly examined to see if there is a case for prosecution so that there will not be a prosecution under pretence of doing justice if there is a certain amount of vindictiveness associated with it. Quite often vindictiveness is found under these circumstances. Let me give a case in point. If the honourable member bought a shop that employed a number of people and was told none of them were due for long service leave, he would have no way of knowing whether or not that was correct, yet some employees might be due for such leave. This provision only ensures that before any matter is taken before a court for punishment there has been some wilful attempt to break down the legislation. It does not apply to inadvertence. We do not do any good if we seek to make harsh legislation, because that defeats its own ends. There is no suggestion that the Early Closing Act has been broken down because the Minister has to authorize, by certificate, every action taken under it. The Minister also has to authorize prosecutions under the Waybills Act and many others, but that does not mean that the Acts are not going to be observed. It simply means that Parliament is anxious to see that no trivial prosecutions will be made that will break down the legislation because of harshness.

Mr. FRED WALSH—I oppose the clause. In reply to the Premier I point out that, although it is true that certain Acts provide that the Minister's consent has to be obtained before a prosecution is launched, those Acts cannot be compared with this legislation. Under the Early Closing Act nobody suffers in the real sense of the term.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—I do not agree with your general statement.

Mr. FRED WALSH—You may not, in comparison with an Act of this character; put it that way.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—I do not agree with that, either.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Then I will try to convince you. In a prosecution that might be launched under this Act a worker might be denied his rights.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—This provision does not apply to that sort of case. I think the honourable member misunderstands me.

Mr. FRED WALSH—If that is so I am prepared to take my seat.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Under the Industrial Code numerous offences can be proceeded with only by the Chief Inspector. Under our ordinary law, a complaint can be laid by just about anybody. In a case like this there may have been some involuntary breach of the Act; it may have been only a technical breach.

Mr. Lawn—What the member for West Torrens said is still correct.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—But he used the word "denied." It could happen that there is no denial at all; leave might not have been asked for and the employer might never have realized it was due. If an employer said he was not going to comply with the terms of the Act, do members think for one moment the Minister would not prosecute immediately? That is not the type of case we could have here; the type we could have here is the case in which a person might not be aware that he has any obligation. Under this Act the Minister can deal with people who are not permanent employees.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—The employee might not even know he is entitled to leave.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—That is so. Good as Public Service records are, we frequently find that there is some doubt as to what the obligation is. Although the Auditor-General has to certify every case, there is some difficulty in some cases for him to give that certificate. Only a few days ago he had to decide whether a man's service was a certain number of days or 11 days shorter. These matters are not always clear, and I can assure the honourable member that this clause is not designed to break down the Act. It does not stop an employee from proceeding to get his long service leave.

Mr. Lawn—He cannot proceed until the Minister gives consent.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The clause does not stop an employee from getting leave, but merely enacts whether there is to be a prosecution or not. Every day of the week the Police Commissioner, when a traffic offence is reported, decides whether it is sufficiently serious to warrant prosecution. Probably only 50 per cent of traffic offenders are prosecuted. A due observance of the law will not be gained by making vindictive clauses, and I can assure

members that the Minister will do his job. Can members opposite give an instance in which the Minister has refused to prosecute when something has deserved prosecution? Under these circumstances, I suggest that members opposite view the matter in the way it should be viewed. If there is an attempt to avoid the provisions of the Bill, the person will be prosecuted, but if it is an unwitting offence—and it could well be—the situation is different.

Mr. FRED WALSH—I appreciate the Premier's reply, but I cannot see eye to eye with him. This is industrial legislation and is different from that to which he referred. An inspector has authority to prosecute under the Industrial Code, but so too, have trade unions and employees. Before a prosecution is launched by the Factories Department it seeks advice from the Crown Law Department as to whether such a move is likely to be successful. That is understandable because it would be futile to take a case to court at public expense if it had no chance of success. Although this clause might relate to trivial offences, there are some that can be serious—cases where an employer has deliberately offended against an award or determination.

Mr. Jenkins—In such cases the Minister would give a certificate.

Mr. FRED WALSH—In one case with which I was concerned the Minister would not give a certificate. A wine producer was deducting money from the salary of his employee and was keeping false records. The employee signed for what he actually received, whereas beneath the false sheet he signed was an authentic record. An amount of £40 was involved. The Minister would not take action and it was only when we approached the Customs Department and it threatened to remove the subsidy paid on wine that the employer was brought to book. Perhaps breaches of this legislation would not be so glaring, but we are afraid that there may be breaches in respect of which the Minister would not launch prosecutions. An employee or his trade union, should have the right to prosecute. The Factories Department should also have the right to take action against an employer after receiving appropriate advice from the Crown Law Department.

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

Mr. DAVIS—The Premier tried to explain this clause by referring to the powers of inspectors under other legislation, but I consider that the need to obtain the Minister's

consent to a prosecution is most unfair. Indeed, even if Labor were in power I would oppose the clause just as strenuously because I believe the law should decide whether a breach has been committed. A worker who may not know the procedure for launching a prosecution may go to his solicitor for an opinion, but under this clause the Minister will decide whether action shall be taken. Under other legislation an inspector has to form an opinion on whether action is advisable and it would be wrong for him to have to go to a Minister for a decision. Is the Minister in a better position to judge than an inspector?

Mr. LAWN—I gather from the Premier's remarks that there is a misunderstanding on the clause for he seems to have in mind an offence against the Act that may be committed by an employer unwittingly, whereas I had in mind a dispute where the employee claimed to be entitled to long service leave. Several employers who are outside the scope of this legislation are making agreements with unions to apply the provisions of legislation operating in other States, and one of those employers has said that any disputed cases of long service leave entitlement can be ironed out between the employer and the union after the agreement has been signed. I have in mind such disputed cases. If an employee claims long service leave under such legislation but the employer says he is not entitled to it because he has not worked seven years, who will determine that question and what redress has the employee other than in the court?

Under this clause the employee would have to go to the Minister who would have to hear both sides of the case before it went to court, whereas under other legislation, if an employee believes he is receiving a wage lower than the award rate, he must prosecute the employer and the court determines the matter. He need not seek the approval of the Minister before launching the prosecution. The Premier referred to the purchaser of a business who might be misled as to the long service leave commitments of the vendor, but I am looking at this clause from the point of view of an employee who claims long service leave at the expense of an employer who says he is not entitled to it. The workers' only redress is in the court.

Mr. Shannon—He may go to the Minister, and the Minister may tell him that he should go to court.

Mr. LAWN—The honourable member for Onkaparinga cannot speak for the Minister. The disputed cases to which I referred may

have to be determined in the court, whereas under this clause an employee cannot go to the court unless he first applies to the Minister, who will be forced to hold an inquiry. Further, the Minister must believe the employee is in the right before consenting to a prosecution.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I draw the attention of the honourable member to clause 14, which states:—

Any sum of money due to any person by virtue of this Act may be recovered by action in a court of competent jurisdiction.

Therefore the recovery of money due does not depend on a prosecution: it may be recovered in the normal way. A worker is not barred from taking civil action for the recovery of any money due to him. We are dealing, not with that provision, but with whether prosecutions shall be entered into without due respect for the circumstances, as sometimes happens at present. Some members have said that there is no provision in the Industrial Code similar to this one, but the Code has many provisions that have been put there wisely. One union secretary made a fetish of going around to employers and saying that they had an obligation to keep a time book, but those employers did not know that the court had made a common rule to this effect. It would not have been fair to prosecute those employers. Again, some employers at Murray Bridge did not know that a common rule had been made under a certain award and they were breaking the law unwittingly. Every worker will have his rights protected, but if members opposite want the clause amended I will examine any amendment they move.

Mr. LAWN—The union secretary mentioned by the Premier was only doing what employers say should be done, that is, advise them if they are not observing the award. That gives the employers the opportunity of carrying out the provisions of the award without being prosecuted.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (21 and 22) passed.

Title.

Mr. FRED WALSH—I regret that at the proper time I did not rise to speak on an important clause that affects many employees.

The CHAIRMAN—Is the honourable member speaking on the title of the Bill?

Mr. FRED WALSH—No.

The CHAIRMAN—He may speak only on the title of the Bill

Mr. FRED WALSH—I was going to ask your advice, Mr. Chairman, on how I could get a recommittal of clause 12.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—That was not one of the clauses that I indicated the Government would re-commit, but this afternoon certain associations brought forward suggestions on clause 12 that are being examined now. There are some problems in regard to exemptions that are fairly difficult to handle, and if the honourable member has any suggestions on this matter I shall be pleased to re-commit clause 12 if considered necessary.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment; Committee's report adopted.

HOLIDAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL: FURTHER ADJOURNMENT OF SECOND READING DEBATE.

Order of the Day No. 7, "Marketing of Eggs Act Amendment Bill," having been called on,

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Acting Leader of the Opposition)—On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I was under the impression earlier, having been called away for a time, that the House was discussing Order of the Day No. 3, whereas it was really dealing with Order of the Day No. 4. Would it be possible for me, with the leave of the House, to ask that Order of the Day No. 4 "Holidays Act Amendment Bill: adjourned debate on second reading," be made an Order of the Day for September 18 instead of September 4?

The SPEAKER—Order of the Day No. 4 has been made an Order of the Day for September 4. On September 4 that Order of the Day can, with the concurrence of the House, be made an Order of the Day for September 18.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I realize that, but it is my desire to move today to make it an Order of the Day for the 18th. I want it to be on the top of the Notice Paper.

The SPEAKER—The matter can be brought before the House on September 4 as an Order of the Day and the honourable member can then move that it be made an Order of the Day for September 18, or any other date he desires.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I accept your decision as to how it could be done, but I was under a misapprehension at the time as to the Order. Is it possible under any circumstances at this stage for me to move that it be made an Order of the Day for September 18 instead of September 4?

The SPEAKER—At present Order of the Day No. 7 is before the House, and it cannot be done while that Order is before us. If

there were no particular Order before the House it could be done by suspension of Standing Orders. The honourable member has made it clear how the mistake arose, and I think the proper course is for him to deal with this matter on September 4 if he wishes to have it made an Order of the Day for a subsequent date.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that later this evening before the adjournment the matter be recommitted to permit me to make the necessary correction?

The SPEAKER—It is as I indicated, procedurally possible, but it cannot be done at present, and I suggest that the honourable member consult the Clerk at the table with a view to getting the information he desires.

Later:

Mr. DUNSTAN moved—

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move forthwith the rescission of the order of the House made this day.

Motion carried.

Mr. DUNSTAN moved—

That the order of the House made this day for the adjournment of the second reading debate on the Holidays Act Amendment Bill be rescinded.

Motion carried.

Mr. DUNSTAN moved—

That the adjourned debate on the second reading of the Holidays Act Amendment Bill be made an Order of the Day for Wednesday, September 18.

Motion carried.

MARKETING OF EGGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Agriculture)—The purpose of the Bill is to extend the operation of the Marketing of Eggs Act for a further three years. If its operation is not extended, the Act will end on September 30 next. The principal Act was first passed in 1941. Its operation has been extended from time to time, the last time being in 1954. The marketing scheme created under the principal Act has become an important part of the egg industry. Under the scheme, the South Australian Egg Board markets all eggs produced by commercial egg producers. The board consists of six members—three representing producers, one representing wholesalers, one retailers, and the sixth member (the chairman) is the Chief Poultry Adviser in the Department of Agriculture. The board

works through agents and collectors. Continuance of the legislation is of particular importance at the present time when our traditional export market in the United Kingdom is very difficult due to increased production resulting from the British Government's heavy subsidies to its own egg producers. It is estimated that these subsidies last year cost the United Kingdom taxpayer £35,000,000 and that they have increased egg production in Britain from 556,000,000 dozen before World War II to 830,000,000 dozen in the year ended May 31, 1956.

Orderly marketing is especially important to the South Australian egg industry and to consumers in South Australia, where periods of surplus production alternate with periods of shortage. Without legislation, the market would show violent fluctuations, which would be embarrassing to both producers and consumers. Overseas exports of eggs are regulated by the Australian Egg Board, on which the South Australian Egg Board is represented. The export market, particularly for shell eggs, is on a consignment basis and it is frequently four to five months after the eggs have been received by the board from producers before the realizations for the eggs are known. To bridge this gap, the Australian Egg Board makes an advance payment to the South Australian Egg Board at the time the eggs are packed. Final adjustments are made at the end of the season.

The South Australian Egg Board is endeavouring to increase local sales of eggs. Advertising, window displays, recipes and other sales features are continually being utilized by the board towards this end. Some success can be reported. Last year, local sales of eggs increased by 10.85 per cent over the previous year, which in turn was 2.41 per cent higher than the preceding year. Local sales in 1956-57 were 4,250,000 dozen and in 1955-56 3,750,000 dozen.

In the year 1956-57, the South Australian Egg Board received 11.37 million dozen eggs compared with 11.82 million dozen eggs in 1955-56 and 9.66 million dozen eggs in its first full year of operation, 1943-44. Net returns to producers last year for all eggs received were 3s. 2.46d. per dozen. The South Australian board's handling costs at 6d. per dozen are considerably less than in other States. This handling charge includes agents' charges and all costs of receiving, grading, testing and packing eggs and accounting to producers. The industry faces serious problems because of the great difficulty in placing

eggs on the United Kingdom market. The Government believes that the industry should continue to receive the support of the legislation in the marketing of its eggs. I therefore commend the Bill to the House. It does nothing more than extend the existing provisions of the Act and the operations of the board for a further three years. It is a simple Bill and I commend it to the House.

Mr. TAPPING secured the adjournment of the debate.

AUDIT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 7. Page 296.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Acting Leader of the Opposition)—In effect, this is a machinery amendment. The Auditor-General is to be commended for his mature consideration of the matter. Clause 3 is the interpretation clause and it defines "public moneys." Clause 4 deals with section 7 of the principal Act and amends paragraph (d) so that if the Auditor-General absents himself from duty for more than 15 working days in any financial year he shall be deemed to have vacated his office. This brings the position up to present-day requirements. Clause 6 amends section 12 of the principal Act by repealing subsection (1) and substituting another in lieu thereof. This also meets present-day requirements. It may be satisfactory for the Treasurer and the Auditor-General to ask for these changes but there are other matters to be considered. We all know that often money is voted for a certain public works but when the financial statement for the period is presented we find that more than the amount voted has been spent, and so the matter has really to be considered. Section 5 of the Public Purposes Loan Act 1956 says:—

(1) There may be issued out of the Loan Fund any sums not exceeding £28,135,000.

(2) The sums so issued shall be applied for the purposes mentioned in the first schedule. The schedule is at the end of the Act, and then subsection (3) states:—

If the amount mentioned in any line of the first schedule as the proposed expenditure for the work or purpose mentioned in that line is insufficient for that work or purpose the Treasurer may issue additional money from Loan Fund for that work or purpose . . .

The time has come for us to consider whether it is not desirable to have a Public Accounts Committee to watch expenditure on public works. The principal Act says the Auditor-General can take certain action either at the

request of the Treasurer or on his own initiative. I do not dispute the desirability of the amendments in this Bill but we should have a Public Accounts Committee. We heard a lot about it previously but not much in these days. I would like to have the views of the Premier on this matter.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra)—Clause 4 amends section 7 of the principal Act, and in his second reading explanation the Treasurer said:—

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 cannot 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.

Section 7 of the principal Act sets out that if the Auditor-General does certain things he is deemed to have vacated his office. Why is it necessary to have this amendment? According to my interpretation, he automatically loses his job if he is away for 14 consecutive days, as he would if he were away for 28 days in all in 12 months. Section 7 contains a list of things for which he would lose his job, and I ask the Premier to indicate how this amendment comes under this section.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Vacating office."

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The member for Burra asked why it is necessary to insert this amendment. If he looks at it, he will see that it alters the 14 consecutive days mentioned in the section to 15 working days, which is the number of working days that constitutes the annual leave given to public servants at present.

Mr. Quirke—Why is it necessary to have a list of things for which the Auditor-General would automatically lose his job.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Auditor-General is an officer of Parliament, and it is his duty to be on the job and to report to Parliament. In providing a code under which he is appointed, Parliament has provided that he must not be absent for more than this number of days without leave without its affecting his office, in the same way as

a member of Parliament cannot be absent for more than a certain number of days without leave.

Mr. QUIRKE—I thank the Premier for his explanation, but if in addition to the ordinary leave to which he is justly entitled the Auditor-General stays away for 28 days in 12 months, this would automatically cause him to vacate his office.

Clause passed.

Clause 5 passed.

Clause 6—"Auditor-General's duty to report."

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Is it necessary for the Auditor-General to report every small matter to the Treasurer?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—In the tremendous volume of accounts he has to deal with, matters of no significance whatever arise every day, and under the Act he is obliged to report them to the Treasurer, although they may not involve matters of procedure. This clause gives him discretion to report only matters he believes the Treasurer should see, and takes away the necessity to prepare trivial reports.

Clause passed.

Clauses 7 to 17 passed.

Clause 18—"Repeal of sections 42 and 43."

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Penalties have been discussed frequently in the last few days and the sections it is proposed to repeal provide penalties in respect of misappropriation of public money and forgery. Can the Premier indicate what safeguards will exist after they are repealed?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—As I explained in the second reading, 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. It has been the procedure over the last 25 years to take action under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act.

Clause passed.

Clause 19 and title passed. Bill reported without amendment and Committee's report adopted.

LOAN ESTIMATES.

In Committee.

(Continued from August 20. Page 370.)

Grand total, £24,905,000.

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray)—I have frequently referred to the desirability of providing water supplies to certain parts of my district. I am happy that within the last week pipes have been laid for the commencement of the Pallamana-Hungry Hill water scheme to which I have referred on numerous occasions. I trust this work will proceed before the summer and so alleviate the difficulties people were confronted with last summer when, although connected to a supply, because of the small pipes and the increased demand arising from the increased population, they did not receive adequate supplies. I am sorry that the pipes will not be sufficiently large to permit of extensions to the scheme at a later date. People living as far away as Mypolonga urgently require water because of the high salt content in their bores. When the weather becomes warm sheep die through the poor quality of water. The Minister of Lands has been approached concerning a water supply for areas outside the present irrigation scheme and I trust this will meet with some consideration before long. We have been told that a large proportion of the State has been supplied with water. Much of my district, although close to the Murray River, does not have a water supply.

I have referred to the rich potential of the Bremer Valley and apparently my suggestions have been noted because I received a letter stating that the Minister could not comply with my wishes because of the cost involved. Together with the member for Stirling I led a deputation to the Minister some time ago. We were told that the scheme would cost about £1,000,000 because of the cost of pumping to the Tungkillo tank. I was rather surprised in view of the fact that, because of the unduly dry conditions this winter, water has been pumped at full pressure day and night through the Adelaide-Mannum pipeline. I believe the Tungkillo tank could be kept filled through that pumping and the cost need not then be levied against the proposal. Residents in the Speaker's district on the other side of the ranges have presented petitions asking that they be supplied from this tank. Townships involved include Millendilla, Cambrai and Sedan. So far nothing has been done, but I trust that both schemes will be further considered by the department. Last year a small scheme

was approved for the hundreds of Seymour and Burdett and I trust that this work will soon be put in hand. Stretching away from that district is a large expanse of country where there are many consumers requiring a reticulated supply, but precluded from obtaining it. I refer to people as far away as Wynarka in the Ridley electorate and Bowhill in my district. The people at Cooke's Plains have been crying out for water and now people as far away as Keith are asking that attention be given to their needs.

I would have thought that water would be in ample supply for Murray Bridge, which has a population of just over 5,000, but the people there have been told that the increased demand on the existing mains by gardeners in that area has meant a deterioration in the town supply. Murray Bridge is an admirable place to grow vegetables, particularly gherkins, which have proved a money spinner for the town and have been processed in many places, and I hope that the position will be remedied so that these gardeners can draw on the mains without imposing hardship on the people in the town. We have been told that the cost of pumping water to the tank on White Hill is heavy because of the lift involved, but surely lower sites could be used to reticulate water for Murray Bridge and at the same time increase the supply both for residents of the town and for the vegetable growers.

Tomatoes, too, have become a big industry in Murray Bridge and the Minister has made certain remarks on the consumption of water by the owners of glass houses in that area, but I point out that the glass houses do not draw on the water scheme in the peak summer periods because the tomatoes are grown prior to the peak demand on the mains. Indeed, in most cases the growing of tomatoes in glass houses is finished by Christmas. Concerning the potential of the district for gherkin growing, a recent edition of the *Murray Valley Standard*, under the heading "Gherkin markets still wide open," stated:—

Largely because of the influx of New Australians, and their changing of our food tastes, the gherkin has a big future, Murray Bridge and district growers were told on Monday night. An Adelaide company which purchased more than 150 tons of gherkins from Murray Bridge alone in the season now concluding, invited growers to a social gathering to discuss the next year. The managing director said his company would have been happy to go on buying up to double the quantity available here. He hoped the output would be considerably stepped up. It was proposed to erect a building in Murray Bridge for complete grading here as the district base.

One day, perhaps, it would be practicable to process at this point, also.

This industry means much money for the Murray district and I hope steps will be taken to increase the water supply so that it may grow into a useful industry. The Town Planner recently visited Murray Bridge and said that as many places in the metropolitan area previously occupied by market gardeners were now being subdivided into building blocks, the low lift areas around Murray Bridge would be admirable areas on which to grow vegetables for the city market, for they were close to Adelaide and had abundant supplies of water. I have even heard it suggested that water be made available to gardeners at pumping cost only in order to encourage growers to increase their holdings and output to supply the city market where it is expected there will be a shortage of vegetables as suburban market gardens are turned over to home builders.

Tailem Bend is also having difficulty with its reticulated water supply. Although this town is on the River, the lift is over the cliffs, and although the Engineering and Water Supply Department in conjunction with the Railways Department has supplied the town for some time, the original mains were installed when the population of the town was far less than the 2,000 people living there today and the mains are consequently inadequate to service the town. I received a complaint from the Meningie Council, which covers this area, asking that the reticulation system of Tailem Bend be investigated, and after forwarding it to the Minister I recently received the following reply:—

Reports which I have received from the District Engineer for Water Supply show that the supply to consumers in Tailem Bend generally by the Engineering and Water Supply Department is satisfactory. This is borne out by the fact that only a few isolated complaints were received by the District Superintendent last summer. These were investigated promptly and in every case were found to be caused by blocked meters which were immediately cleaned.

However, that is not entirely the case. I have since received a number of requests for a better water supply to the area and have been told that in most cases a 2in. pipe is all that supplies the area, which means that the supply is severely limited on a hot day. I have been told, for instance, that on a hot day the local slaughter house has no water with which to hose down the premises, which is a most undesirable state of affairs from the point of view of health. A doctor told me he did not get enough water on a hot day to flush his septic

system, and that condition, too, is detrimental to the health of the town. Only today I received a letter from the Tailem Bend Brick and Block Supply Company, asking that it be included in a water supply scheme. As I cannot see that an adequate supply can be made available with only a 2in. main, I ask that some improvement be made to the supply because this industry employs several men and cannot manage without an adequate water pressure. Tailem Bend is in dire straits in relation to its water supply even though the Minister apparently does not agree with me on the subject.

I now turn to the subject of railways. The people of Murray Bridge and Tailem Bend are pleased that the Bluebird diesel car is running to their towns. I do not know whether those rail cars have been provided as a result of my pleas, but I, and the people of Tailem Bend, appreciate the fairly regular and comfortable service that is now given. I now want to draw attention to the shunting yards at Tailem Bend. They are not large enough or long enough, and I am told by railway employees that they are frequently congested, mainly because of the extra freight that can be carted by the trains drawn by diesel locomotives. I presume that the Railways Department is aware of this and is taking steps to improve the position.

The Loan Estimates provide £100,000 for Murray River flood banks, which are being resited. This matter was discussed fairly fully previously, and questions are still being asked about it. I believe that this £100,000 will be well spent because these banks will provide protection against any future floods. They may not cope with an emergency at all places, but they will protect the property and personal belongings of many people should the river come down in flood again, but I hope it will never again reach the height it did last year. Yesterday I asked about the Lord Mayor's Relief Fund, and I understand that the Minister will have a reply tomorrow. Those who lost their homes in the flood were the hardest hit. They have received a welcome gift of £300 from the Lord Mayor's Relief Fund and they are grateful to the public for the magnificent way they contributed to help those in dire need. Only £93,000 has been allocated from the £450,000 in the fund, so a large amount has still to be allocated. A good deal will be paid out on account of loss of production, but I hope that those who lost their homes will get considerably more to assist in re-establishing themselves. It is not possible to get a house with a deposit of £300,

and I hope that loans will be made available by the State Bank to assist these people in rebuilding. Many of them have purchased blocks on high land. I commend them for that because they are anxious to get out of the path of any future flood, but after they have purchased a block they have little money left for a deposit on a house. Therefore, I hope that they will get more from the Lord Mayor's Relief Fund.

I have had telephone calls and letters asking me how the money in the fund is being allocated. I must say that I have received the utmost consideration from the secretary of the fund. He has treated me courteously and has endeavoured to help me at all times, and I think other members representing river districts would support my remarks. I have every confidence in those administering the fund, but people outside have little knowledge of these matters and I may ask a question tomorrow on whether it would be possible for a balance sheet to be published so that those who so generously donated to the fund would have some idea of how the money is being spent. It would not be necessary to publish all the details, but perhaps it could be shown that a certain amount went towards housing, how much was allocated on account of loss of production, and in what areas the money was spent. People would then confidently support any future appeal to meet an emergency. The public usually rise to the occasion magnificently in times of emergency, but sometimes irresponsible people make rash statements about the way the money is being used and cast aspersions on the committee administering a fund. Sometimes I have been asked whether I have any complaints about the Lord Mayor's Relief Fund, and I have said that after it has been wound up I will say whether I have, but at the moment I do not intend to criticize because those administering the fund are entitled to the opportunity of explaining how the money has been spent.

An amount of £10,000 appears on the Loan Estimates for new residences for the Education Department. Recently I approached the Minister with a view to getting a house for a teacher in my district, but I was told that money was not available for this purpose. The £10,000 now provided will be sufficient for only three houses, which will not be nearly sufficient for the needs of the Education Department. Many towns want houses for their teachers. I am president of the High School Council at Murray Bridge, and I suggested an approach to the Minister to see whether a teacher in my

district could get a home. An approach had already been made to the Housing Trust, but the trust could not allocate a house for him. It has been suggested that this teacher could be shifted to some other area, but it is not always possible to secure a suitable house. I hope that much more than £10,000 will be provided on next year's Loan Estimates for houses for the Education Department.

At Mannum the science and craft rooms at the school are well under way, for which the residents are appreciative, but no commencement has been made on similar accommodation at Murray Bridge, although a tender was let about Christmas. I hope it will not be much longer, as there is urgent need for a craft room there. I was interested to read in the *Mail* last week that Dr. Callaghan (Director of Agriculture) had stated that adult education needed a boost in the country, and I agree with him. That also possibly applies in the metropolitan area. Not enough attention has been paid to adult education, and in saying that I am not criticizing the department, because the Minister has tried to improve the position. However, I would suggest that instead of having part-time registrars in the country full-time officers be appointed. Murray Bridge, Mannum and other places in the district favour consolidation so that they could have a full-time officer to devote all his time to adult education, as is the case at Gawler, where a good job is being done. The man in charge is very active and I believe that adult education is advancing much more rapidly there than at Murray Bridge, where a registrar who has other employment is engaged.

The construction of court houses at Murray Bridge and Tailem Bend is well on the way, but I was disappointed that at Tailem Bend full use was not made of the land available, as construction has been begun 18in. to 2ft. from the alignment. The people feel that it would have been an advantage to have the building larger, but apparently the architects thought otherwise.

Last week I asked a question in the House regarding week-end shearing by Roseworthy agricultural students, and in reply the Minister of Agriculture said that this was part of their training. I consider they should receive this training in their ordinary school hours. Professional shearers would be prosecuted if they worked after 5.30 p.m. on Fridays, and the same should apply to students at the college, because they are competing with other shearers. In my district individuals who have 100 to 200 sheep find no difficulty in getting

professional shearers. I appeal to the Minister to see that the practice does not continue at Roseworthy.

Recently I was at Moonta when the question of a fishing haven at Moonta Bay was discussed. The mayor of the town at the time introduced a deputation to the Government and I believe he received some assurance, and had he left it at that a haven might well have been on the way by now. However, unfortunately, he later presented a petition for a haven from people at Port Hughes, and thus confusion arose and it was stated that the people evidently did not know their own minds. As a result nothing has been done. A fishing haven in the area is necessary. The local people were very disappointed to think that more than \$275,000 was to be spent on the Patawalonga pleasure resort to accommodate light craft as they consider the project at Moonta Bay far more important.

It is desirable that a Government hospital should be established at Murray Bridge, similar to those at Port Augusta, Mount Gambier, Port Pirie and elsewhere. I noticed in the *Mail* last Sunday that a long-range plan is being prepared for extension to the Port Augusta hospital, and although I am not opposing that I should like to see something similar done for other large country towns. Recently there was a campaign at Murray Bridge to raise \$7,500 for improvements at the local hospital, but because of the Murray flood last year and the dry conditions this season difficulty is being found in raising the amount. As to hospital charges workers in different localities come under different categories. When a working man on £13 a week goes into a subsidized or private hospital he has difficulty in meeting his commitments. Often, after he has had to pay £22 a week whilst in hospital he is in debt for the rest of his life. Tailem Bend has not a subsidized hospital. The hospital receives a small grant of £350 a year and has to care for patients over a large area. Tailem Bend is a railway town. There is a need for building extensions. I have been told by the Hospital Board that the position is difficult. This outbreak of influenza has hit the hospital very hard and it has had to cater for a number of accidents. It is proposed to ask the Government for assistance in connection with the building extensions and I hope it will be provided. I support the first line.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River)—I regret that Mr. Jennings is not present because I want to refer to remarks he made in this debate. I heard them in this place, but when

I was on my way home in my motor car I heard them high-lighted over the air, and as a fellow-member of Parliament I did not feel very proud of them. He said:—

It has achieved no object except the establishment of an officer class—an army with more officers than men. The Navy has enough officers to sink a ship if they all got on it together, and we have an Air Force that can always depend on being equipped with the most modern obsolete weapons.

It ill becomes a member to cast such a slur on men who are prepared to fight in the defence of Australia. We cannot do without officers. In the last two wars the loss amongst officers was greater than amongst the other ranks. Mr. Jennings cast a slur upon men who are prepared to fight and die whilst he stays at home. I was not at all proud to know that these remarks came from a member of this Parliament.

Mr. Bywaters referred to shearing at the Roseworthy College, which trains potential primary producers. If the students are to compete as primary producers they must work more than a 40-hour week. It is stupid to say that they must not shear after 5.30 p.m. The college is training the boys to become shearers. They do not rob professional shearers in any way. We cannot get enough shearers. If, through the scheme, some of the boys become professionals the State will be all the better for it.

It is generally accepted that the Playford Government has done a wonderful job but I am free to criticize it. I have done it before and will do it again because no Administration is perfect. When we do think that a Government is perfect it is time for us to get out of the business. Often suggestions can improve an Administration, even the Playford Government, which is pretty good. Over the years the amount spent on water reticulation has got out of balance. In 1947 the sum of £13,500,000 was employed on the reticulation and conservation of water in country areas. At the same time £6,000,000 was employed on the Adelaide water district. Last year, nine years later, £21,000,000 was employed in country water districts and £20,500,000 in the metropolitan area. In other words, in the last nine years we spent £7,500,000 in the country and £14,500,000 in the metropolitan area. The amount spent on water conservation has got out of balance; either we are spending too much in the metropolitan area—and I do not think too much can be spent—or more should be spent in the country.

Of the £5,400,000 provided in these Estimates, £3,050,000 is to be spent in the Adelaide district and only £2,050,000 in the country, which covers the rest of the State. Of this amount £196,700 is for the Barossa district, practically all of which is to supply the township of Elizabeth, which is really part of the metropolitan area, and the huge total of £43,000 is to be spent on the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline! This will not give us any more water, but only cushion the pressure of extra pumping through the line. The pumps are now working 24 hours a day to supply water to the northern areas to save a complete collapse of the reticulation scheme, and that is a serious position. In previous years, when we have had a good rainfall, it has been easy to supply enough water through the pipeline, but this year there have been no intakes. The Bundaleer Reservoir, which has a capacity of 1,400,000,000 gallons now has only 523,000,000 gallons, and if we strike another dry summer we will have severe rationing. We have not yet had the report regarding the deviation of the pipeline, which we have been told will give a better supply to Port Augusta and Port Pirie to augment the Beetaloo and Baroota reservoir supply. After the Government gets this report, it will have to go before the Public Works Committee before the work can be commenced, after which it will take between 12 months and two years to complete it. Unless we get ample rainfall there will be huge losses of stock and severe rationing in the northern areas for the next two years.

I feel that there has been too much emphasis on the metropolitan area water supply. The Mannum-Adelaide pipeline is now operating at top pressure and we are spending £630,000 to supply Adelaide, not because it is short, but to avoid rationing, yet the northern areas face severe water shortages. We can find money to build power stations to provide electricity, so I think we should find it to develop the country, yet practically all the money in these Estimates is for the metropolitan area. We will spend £10,000,000 in the next 10 years on electricity, including Port Augusta power station, but that would never have been started but for the demands of secondary industry in Adelaide. We have done a good job in establishing secondary industries, but the time has now arrived to pay more attention to primary industries.

Mr. Corcoran—Have you any faith in rain-making experiments?

Mr. HEASLIP—I have a lot of hope, which I trust is justified, but no faith. More

emphasis should be placed on the reticulation of water to northern areas because, unless we have several inches of rain, which does not appear likely at present, they will face severe rationing. The Orroroo people have done a splendid job in helping themselves in the provision of a water supply, as I think the Government will agree. They have a local water scheme, and they asked me last summer to make representations for a bore to be sunk to augment their supplies. Unfortunately, nothing has been done. It would only require about £1,000 to complete the necessary work and it would mean the difference between an adequate water supply and an extreme shortage. I support the first line.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood)—The member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) saw fit to attack the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) for remarks he made earlier in this debate. Mr. Jennings rarely needs defending because he is quite capable of looking after himself, but I think that what has been attributed to him was certainly not attributable to him.

Mr. Heaslip—I quoted exactly what he said.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Yes, but the honourable member put a gloss upon it and I want to refer to that gloss. He said Mr. Jennings cast aspersions upon the personnel of Her Majesty's forces in this country. That was not correct.

Mr. Heaslip—Have you read what he said?

Mr. DUNSTAN—I have and I can understand it, which is probably more than the member for Rocky River can do. Mr. Jennings was not referring to the personnel, but to the formation and the people responsible for the formation of our present defence force. Mr. Jennings has not been alone in the criticisms made of our defence provisions. Indeed, considerable strictures upon our defence expenditure have been made by the Public Accounts Committee of the Federal Parliament which contains, and is headed by, members of the Government Party. Mr. Jennings was echoing strictures which have been made upon uneconomic defence expenditure in this country and pointing out that our Loan monies in this State should not suffer for the provision by the Commonwealth of uneconomic defence expenditure. I trust that improper and unfair glosses are not going to be put upon honourable members' remarks in this House.

Mr. Millhouse—Before you leave Federal matters, do you agree with the attack made by the Federal member for Adelaide, Mr. Chambers, upon—

The CHAIRMAN—Order!

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—He will give his judgment in chambers.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—The honourable member's remarks here are, of course, privileged.

Mr. DUNSTAN—I am not in order, of course, in discussing matters which are not contained in these Estimates. Suffice it for me to say that I am a member of a Party to which I have given my loyalty and support and that loyalty and support is continued, and I have no aspersions to cast upon any elected leader of this Party and I disagree with anybody who does so.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—I should think that Mr. Chambers, being a former Minister of Defence, would be capable of commenting on defence.

The CHAIRMAN—Order!

Mr. DUNSTAN—Mr. Chambers has made considerable strictures upon defence, just as has the honourable member for Enfield. Mr. Chambers' strictures were much more pungent than those made by Mr. Jennings. As a former Minister for Defence, Mr. Chambers has had much to say about it and I agree with him. Turning now to the Loan Estimates, I notice an item for the provision of £5,000 to the Housing Trust for temporary and emergency accommodation. The Premier's comments on this particular item were:—

No large commitments are foreseen for temporary housing this year, but £5,000 is provided to cover any small jobs which may become necessary.

I am astounded that this is all that is being provided. The position that faces housing in South Australia and the people in need of temporary and emergency housing is acute. It has been made more acute by recent actions in this House—actions which were vociferously supported by members opposite when they were taken. At the end of last year this House passed certain amendments to the Landlord and Tenant (Control of Rents) Act and at that time I had certain comments to make about those amendments. I was accused by members opposite in somewhat pungent terms of being, to say the least of it, radical in my opinions on that matter. Indeed, members opposite pooh-poohed entirely the prognostications I made upon the effect of these amendments to the law. I said that there would be a rental racket in South Australia as a result of the provisions being enacted. Members opposite said that could not possibly happen and one of the honourable members who, by interjection, has been so talkative on the Government benches, said this was the veriest

nonsense and that this sort of thing could not possibly happen. So far from the truth were members opposite upon this issue that this Parliament was called together within a matter of weeks to remedy the very matter about which I had been talking at the time and the Premier had to admit that a rental racket had ensued upon the passing of the provisions of section 55c of the Act. When members opposite do not like what is said on this side of the House—particularly by myself—they are in the habit of saying that these things could not possibly happen and that, although I am a lawyer, I am talking out of the back of my hat and do not know what I am talking about. Unfortunately for the people, on this occasion I was proved correct—as I have been on other occasions.

Mr. Millhouse—It sounds as though you are getting a persecution complex.

Mr. DUNSTAN—I can stand persecution from members opposite and can defend myself quite adequately. The effects of section 55c did not end there. I said at the time that if the amendment to that section were passed, by August of this year we would see a spate of evictions and that people who had nowhere else to go would be put upon the street without any investigation of the circumstances or the merits of their case. That has come to pass. Last Monday there was an alarming increase in the number of section 55c cases in the court and a survey of the present list shows that the increase will continue steadily. When the amendment was passed a number of lawyers in Adelaide said, "We've been waiting for something like this. We could not get people out under the old legislation for the court would not make an order because the hardship would have been too great, but now the houses will be pulled down and the people evicted."

In January and early February this year notice after notice under section 55c was issued and numbers of pensioners in my district received them. They were good tenants who had nowhere to go; their only fault was that they had insufficient money—often through their own misfortune—to provide their own homes. They received these notices and have been taken to court. True, the cases are rarely being fought because one cannot fight a section 55c case; indeed, one cannot oppose it. The only cases on which evidence is called are those on which no lawyer acts for a defendant because, if a defendant goes to a lawyer and says he has a notice under section 55c and it is in order and a declaration has been

served with it, the lawyer can only advise that the tenant bargain for as long as possible. The maximum period for bargaining is only two months for the court has laid it down that the Legislature did not intend a long-term order under the section.

Members who voted for that provision bear a heavy responsibility for there were many cases last Monday morning and this state of affairs will continue. Order after order was made for the eviction of people who had nowhere else to go. True, we may be able to find some vacancies for them for a short period because a few people are moving from or dying in cottage flats, but what is the position regarding emergency accommodation? There are over 5,500 outstanding applications for emergency accommodation with the Housing Trust, yet no emergency homes have been built since 1953 and only £5,000 is provided on these Estimates for the provision of temporary and emergency accommodation. Then where are all these people to go? There is no answer, for nobody can say that the housing position is getting better. We are not catching up on the back lag in South Australia. For a Housing Trust rental home the waiting period is now considerably longer than it was when I first became a member. It was then four or five years, but now it is at least six years in the average ex-serviceman's case and seven years for others. The position is getting steadily worse: we are getting further behind.

Where are these people to go? Apparently the Government has no answer. When members ring up the Housing Trust, the officers there are tearing their hair trying to find accommodation for people, and often members are told, "We are not able to help at the moment. After the applicant has been evicted, tell him to keep in touch with us and we will try to find something later." I have seen families split up, the children going into church homes and the parents living separately simply because there is nowhere for them to go.

Mr. Hambour—Can't any of these people help themselves?

Mr. DUNSTAN—They try to, but when a man has had sickness in his family and does not receive a high wage, how can he save enough money to be able to pay the extraordinarily high prices demanded for the most tumbledown houses in Adelaide? He cannot buy anything that is unlikely to bring an order from the local board of health for less than £800 deposit. How do you save even that amount out of £14 a week when you have

a family to keep and have to pay rental? It is impossible.

Mr. Bockelberg—Couldn't he sell his motor-car?

Mr. DUNSTAN—Most of these people have not got one, and even if they have, it is only the veriest old rattletrap bought on time-payment, the saving of payments on which would not allow them to save money for a deposit on a house. Members opposite are out of touch and should talk to the people, including pensioners, facing these conditions. They should suggest to the pensioners in Mr. Lawn's district who were in court last Monday morning that they sell their motor cars to provide the £800 out of their pension in order to buy a house. Let them do so and see what answer they get. That is about the amount of reality we can apparently expect from Government members on an issue of this kind. Here we have a real human problem and unless members face up to it we will be faced with a real tragedy in South Australia. It is about time the Government members, instead of adopting a Party attitude as they have done previously over section 55c, took note of the remarks made by those who have had practice in this law to see what actually occurs as a result of legislation passed by this House. The result is a very real and grave hardship to many poor, hard-working, and innocent people. If members opposite do not believe me let them attend the local court on Monday morning, see the number of section 55c applications going through, talk with some of the people against whom eviction orders are being made, and ask them where they are going to go.

Mr. Jenkins—Aren't the houses they are evicted from occupied by somebody else?

Mr. DUNSTAN—In some cases yes, in others no.

Mr. Hambour—They're left vacant?

Mr. DUNSTAN—No; some are obtained to facilitate their sale for the purpose of demolition, especially in Mr. Lawn's district. Quite often when an application is made to facilitate a sale the person who buys has already some accommodation, but he pays a price for vacant possession of the house and the evicted person has nowhere to go. The original purpose of the Landlord and Tenant (Control of Rents) Act was to do justice in a difficult situation. We were faced with a housing shortage and we are still faced with it. The purpose of the original legislation was to see that the hardship was borne by those best able to bear it and that justice was done on the merits

of each case. The court was allowed to investigate each case, go through all the situations facing it, take into account all the contrasting factors, and then decide whether to make an order and, if so, what order would be appropriate. That right however, was substantially taken away by Parliament when it passed section 55c and later amended it last year.

What are we going to do next? Is the Government going to remedy the mistake it made? If not, what is it going to do to house the people? Where is the housing to come from? It is not being provided by private building. True, some flats have been built in Adelaide and if pensioners can manage to pay £7 7s. a week in rent alone they may be able to get one; otherwise they cannot. It is obvious that pensioners cannot go into houses such as those. Even people with substantial incomes cannot go into those houses or flats. Private enterprise is not building houses for letting now because it has not found building economic. That is so despite the fact that there is no restriction whatever now on the rents of houses built by private enterprise for letting. The same position exists as before the war concerning the building of houses by private people for rental.

Mr. Hambour—You would not advise a client to build houses for rental because they would not pay?

Mr. DUNSTAN—They do not compare with the profits that can be obtained in other ways, such as through hire purchase investments.

Mr. Hambour—You are not blaming people for not building houses for letting?

Mr. DUNSTAN—No. I am only saying that members opposite cry loudly about the virtues and the sheer magic of private enterprise and how it can provide all we need.

Mr. Coumbe—What do you suggest?

Mr. DUNSTAN—I say that the only way in which we can provide housing in this community is for the community to get together and provide the houses.

Mr. Corcoran—It is the responsibility of the nation.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Of course it is, but what is the Government doing about it? Certainly if a person has sufficient money to build his own home he will do so. Some can get finance under the Homes for Settlers Act, but those in the lower income groups cannot provide homes for themselves in that manner. The only way that these people, and those on pensions, can get houses is by the community providing them. It is our duty to see that people in indigent circumstances are provided not only with the

means of livelihood but with a roof over their heads as well. We are our brothers' keepers, but what are we doing about it? The Government has seen fit to destroy the basis of the legislation that protected people in a housing shortage, but where is its answer to the situation it has created? There is none in the Loan Estimates. Only £5,000 has been provided for emergency or temporary accommodation, but that is not a drop in the ocean compared with the need.

Mr. Hambour—Plenty of rental homes are being built.

Mr. DUNSTAN—There is a six to seven year wait for those houses, and pensioners do not get a double unit house. Only families with children get those. The only provision for pensioners is 75 cottage flats, but there are more people being put out every month. I have heard no answer to these problems, but an answer must be found. Obviously, there will be political ramifications arising from the Government's failure to provide the housing accommodation needed, but I am concerned at the moment with a real human problem of the people who are being penalized under the provisions I have mentioned, and I know of nothing that the Government is doing to meet the situation. I urge members opposite not to ignore what I have said tonight, but to investigate the facts for themselves. They should go to the Local Court and see what happens on Monday mornings there. They should ask the social service workers of the churches, or Father Roberts. They will tell members of what they are facing in looking after the people of their congregations who at the moment have dire housing problems. Members opposite should take heed of what I have said and not sit silent. They should do something about this problem. It is not a matter of just ignoring the situation and letting the problem settle itself, because it cannot settle itself. We are at an impasse as a result of what has been done by this House. If something is not done for these people this State will become a by-word concerning what happens to its old and its poor under our landlord and tenant provisions and our failure to provide sufficient housing.

Mr. KING (Chaffey)—I support the first line. I wish to refer particularly to the lines where provision is made for loans to producers and loans for settlers. Much has been said today of the need to encourage people to live in the country, and I commend the Government for what it has done in the past and hope that it will continue its policy in the future

because one way in which the country can be developed by individuals is through loans made by the State Bank as agent for the Government in granting loans to settlers.

Mr. Lawn—Do you agree with the member for Rocky River that the Government is spending all its money in the metropolitan area?

Mr. KING—Obviously, it is not. In my district much of the country would remain dormant but for the help given by the Government, and I hope the Government will continue to assist those who are developing it. Many people on the river would be glad to develop land and install plant and equipment and pay for power available from the Electricity Trust with assistance from the Government. This has been demonstrated at Taylorville. A few years ago this area was undeveloped except for pastoral pursuits, but now there are 200 or 300 people there who are opening up hundreds of acres by their own efforts. Some of them took punishment in the flood, but they are back on the job again, and the example of those settlers is being followed from one end of the river to the other. That shows that loans to settlers and loans to producers are of great assistance in developing our country areas. Much help has been given to co-operatives under the Loans to Producers Act, and I hope the Treasurer will continue to provide assistance because industries can be fostered under this Act to serve the needs of primary production. I hope that before long we will be able to make heavy demands on it.

On land development generally, I have mentioned previously what could be done with water reticulation in building up our sheep population. When the time is opportune and money is available a vast amount of country adjacent to the Murray could have its carrying capacity considerably increased. That applies not only in my district, but also to the west, north and north-west of the Murray. There is a strip of land at least 20 miles deep where there is a big potential for increased capacity. Good transport conditions, coupled with electricity, will enable this country to be rapidly brought into production as soon as water is available. Good fruit tree land is also available in the highlands in the existing irrigation areas and I believe there is great scope for planting this country. When irrigation schemes were first laid out water was taken as high as practicable, but the land had to be graded in order to be watered by channels or pipelines. With the sprinkler irrigation system a settler if he can afford to do so, can lift water to the high lands and reticulate it through the spray

irrigation system, which ignores the contours of the land and enables a man to get straight into production. I was speaking to a University authority who said that a producer could have a 90ft. lift and still grow fodder crops and make cattle raising a payable proposition. Some people along the river have taken pipelines 20 miles inland to develop station country, and one man has undertaken the intensive growing of fodder by irrigation and has increased his carrying capacity tremendously.

If the Government made additional land available to settlers so that they could use sprinklers, there might be up to 1,500 acres which with little extra cost, could be planted and brought into production and could produce revenue which would benefit the Government to the extent of £25,000 a year without increasing administration and other charges.

Mr. Quirke—They would pump from existing channels?

Mr. KING—Yes, and it would bring fresh land into production and the only additional cost would be for pumping. Afforestation is another matter referred to in the Loan Estimates. At Berri along the 120ft. channel a piece of land has been reserved for afforestation to see what can be developed under natural conditions. The National Trust has acquired much property along the river as the result of gifts from local people and some of this land has still much natural timber on it. The Government could use these gifts as the basis for further work. The Woods and Forests Department has been of great benefit to the fruit industry, and I compliment the Government on its having kept up case supplies for a rapidly increasing citrus market. However, there is a strong tendency for other fruit-producing countries to abandon the use of cases in favour of cartons. That possibility will have an effect, but much of the packing equipment could be converted for carton packing. Although it may make a difference to the sawmills, there will still be a big demand for cartons made from wood pulp, which the pine forests could supply.

I hope the Government will give some priority to the work of altering the courthouse at Renmark. The staff there has been greatly augmented by the fruit fly inspection staff and we have the spectacle of the officer in charge of the police station having a two-way radio crackling in the room while he has to interview people. Mr. Bywaters mentioned the Lord Mayor's Relief Fund and said he hoped it would soon be wound up and a statement produced. I

do not think he need have any fear that the funds will not be properly distributed. My experience is that adequate precautions are taken. Reference has been made to our loan funds being reduced because of expenditure on defence. Although economy may be necessary, it is obvious that we should have a strong nucleus of officers to train a rapidly expanding force in emergency. Consequently, money spent in training officers is money well spent. I support the first line.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

VETERINARY SURGEONS ACT AMEND-
MENT BILL.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON, having obtained leave, introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Veterinary Surgeons Act 1935-52. Read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.05 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 29, at 2 p.m.