

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, September 24, 1958.

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

QUESTIONS.**USED CAR DEALERS.**

Mr. DUNNAGE—At present used-car dealers are required to be licensed as secondhand dealers. Has the Government considered imposing a tighter control over them by compelling them to lodge a substantial bond with the Government as an added precaution for the motoring public?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—This matter has come under my notice on two or three occasions; once by letter from the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn). I have also received letters from Elizabeth and other places. It appears that many cars that are being sold are the subject of considerable dispute. Some are undoubtedly being purchased by persons who cannot afford them and who are buying rubbish under the belief that they are getting something worth having. Under present legislation cases of misrepresentation can be dealt with in civil courts, but I think a person would have great difficulty in proving misrepresentation, because normally representations relating to the quality of vehicles are verbal. The Royal Automobile Association has accredited people who will make a complete examination of any vehicle, and my advice to a person about to purchase a car is to take the precaution of having a thoroughly competent person examine it. That is the only intelligent procedure to follow. I state publicly that some cars today are undoubtedly being misrepresented as to their value. If the Government knew of any practical way to stop such misrepresentation it would take action, but these representations are oral between the parties and there is no written record of them. If we adopted the honourable member's suggestion of a bond it would still leave the problem of proving that misrepresentation took place. I do not know the best solution, except that every person buying a secondhand car should have it thoroughly examined beforehand. Such an examination can be made through the R.A.A. for a reasonable fee and I suggest that honourable members give that advice wherever possible, because undoubtedly many old, badly worn cars are being represented as serviceable means of transportation. I cannot emphasize too strongly that this is an instance where the buyer should beware.

WIDTH OF BICYCLE HANDLEBARS.

Mr. LAUCKE—The subject matter of my question may at first glance seem trivial, but it assumes importance when road safety is considered. There is a growing practice among cyclists of fitting extremely wide handlebars to their bikes and in traffic these are a hazard to the cyclists and a menace to motorists. Can the Chairman of the State Traffic Committee indicate whether there are regulations governing the width of handlebars, and, if not, will consideration be given to stipulating maximum widths?

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE (Chairman, State Traffic Committee)—I know of no regulations governing the width of handlebars, but if the matter is referred by the Government to the State Traffic Committee I have no doubt it will be examined. I deplore the growing tendency of creating new offences for people to commit and feel that such matters as the width of handlebars should be governed by good sense rather than by a tape measure.

PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS.

Mr. CUMBE—On several occasions I have asked questions concerning zebra crossings for pedestrians. I understand the State Traffic Committee has submitted certain recommendations regarding regulations relating to zebra crossings. Can the Minister of Works indicate whether these regulations have been discussed by Cabinet and whether a decision has been reached? If not, will Cabinet consider the matter soon and make an early announcement so that councils can reply to the many complaints received concerning the danger to pedestrians because these new regulations are not in force?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—So far as I am aware no Cabinet decision has been reached, but I will make further inquiries.

CARTAGE OF TIMBER.

Mr. HARDING—Recently the honourable members for Mount Gambier and Millicent and I received letters from the Penola District Council concerning the cartage of timber on roads from private and Government sawmills. I discussed this letter with the Minister of Forests yesterday. Has he a reply to it?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I referred the matter to my colleague, the Minister of Roads, who is reviewing the whole question. I will get a detailed reply next week.

CUT HILL STONE WALL.

Mr. JENKINS—Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked last week concerning the future of the stone wall on Cut Hill on the Victor Harbour Road?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The Minister of Roads has followed the practice, wherever possible, of retaining existing land marks in connection with places of historic interest, and in conformity with that policy it has been decided that the land mark to which the honourable member referred will be retained intact.

WALLAROO BULK HANDLING FACILITIES.

Mr. HEASLIP—Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked last week regarding facilities for loading wheat in bulk at Wallaroo? Crop prospects have further improved and it would appear now that still more wheat will be handled at the terminal. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I referred the question to the State Superintendent of the Australian Wheat Board and received the following reply:—

- (1) I have been in close contact with the Harbors Board and in view of what they told me, I feel that their bulk conveyor system will be ready to load a vessel programmed by us to be at Wallaroo on or about 28th inst. The Chief Engineer of the Harbors Board advises me that he feels confident that the plant will be quite ready for handling wheat in bulk generally by that date.
- (2) The wheat stocks at Wallaroo are the equivalent of five New Zealand cargoes, including the above vessel referred to for loading on the 28th inst.
- (3) We anticipate that shipping will be available and that this wheat will be cleared in time for the receipt of new season's wheat at Wallaroo.

ASSOCIATIONS INCORPORATION ACT.

Mr. KING—I understand that when organizations registered under the Associations Incorporation Act need to borrow money they can only give a security, other than a mortgage, by way of a bill of sale, which in some instances is a very lengthy document to prepare, contains a great deal of detail, and is very costly. Sometimes the chattels described therein are of such a nature that they do not last the length of the security. Under the Co-operatives Societies Act and the Companies Act security can be given by debentures

over the assets of the company. Will the Minister of Education ascertain from the Attorney-General whether the Government has considered amending the Associations Incorporation Act to give associations registered under it the same facilities as are available to companies and societies registered under the Co-operative Societies Act and the Companies Act, and, if not, will the position be examined with a view to simplifying the giving of securities for advances in such cases?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Speaking from memory, I think the matter was considered when the legislation amending the Co-operative Societies Act was discussed, but I will refer the matter to my colleague and discuss it with other members of Cabinet.

SHEEP DISEASE IN SOUTH-EAST.

Mr. HARDING—I recently attended a meeting of stockowners at Naracoorte, at which it was reported that the sheep disease known as salmonella, of which there are 400 types, is a most serious one. Up to 50 per cent of the stock losses in the Millicent district were due to this disease and the need for an investigation is urgent. Will the Minister of Agriculture get a report on the disease from his department and ascertain whether the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation is taking up the matter?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I know of the occurrence of this disease and attach so much importance to it that a special veterinary officer has been sent to the South-East to study every aspect of it. He left, I think, yesterday, and should be there now to start his supplementary investigation. I will keep the honourable member informed of its progress.

GLADSTONE BULK HANDLING BIN.

Mr. HEASLIP—Last year a bulk handling bin was erected at Gladstone. Normally wheat from that area goes to Port Pirie but as there is no terminal there the bulk wheat goes to Wallaroo, with the difference in the freight charge, I understand, being borne by the Wheat Board, subject to the bin being filled once only. Seasonal prospects are such this year that it seems that the bin will be filled twice or oftener. Will the Minister of Agriculture obtain a report as to whether the board or individual farmers will bear the extra freight charge if the bin is filled more than once?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—Yes.

MASTER PLAN FOR METROPOLITAN AREA.

Mr. DUNNAGE—I understand that the Town Planner, Mr. Hart, has developed a master plan for the metropolitan area. Can the Premier say whether it is available and, if not, when it will be?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have no information that the plan has been completed and I doubt whether it could have been completed so quickly, because it involves a tremendous amount of work, including work by a number of Government departments and local government authorities. I will make inquiries to see how far the work has progressed. The method of dealing with the plan is set out in legislation passed about two years ago. It must be presented to Parliament for approval.

IMPORTATION OF BASE METALS INTO U.S.A.

Mr. SHANNON—My question is based on reports regarding the new attitude by the U.S.A. towards the importation of base metals and the impact that policy is likely to have, particularly on the economy of this State. Has the Premier any information to give as to the basis upon which this new policy is being promulgated and can he say whether we can look for any relief from it in the future?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The ban placed on the importation of base metals into America arises from the fact that America has had a great business recession, and that at present a large stock of base metals is available, with the consequence that local producers are not able to dispose of their production at present. The position is complicated by the fact that every country always desires to promote local employment—Australia is no exception—and the ban has been imposed to protect local employment. I should think it will be of short duration, because already there are considerable signs that business is improving in the United States of America, and more than that, the long-term future of base metals appears to be essentially sound. Although the difficulty is acute and will have grave repercussions on the South Australian Budget and economy generally, I think that in time the matter will be adjusted. I notice with pleasure that the Commonwealth Government is taking action to make representations for a reconsideration of the ban, and I hope they will be effective.

TOWNSHIP ALLOTMENTS.

Mr. KING—For many years to my knowledge persons with township allotments held on perpetual lease in irrigation settlement townships have been able to convert them to freehold on a ratio of twenty to one—that is to say, twenty times the annual rental. That has become the recognized practice in river areas, and is generally understood by all concerned. However, I understand that recently the Land Board departed from this practice in a River Murray town and granted freehold at a ratio of sixty to one. Will the Minister of Lands state whether this is to become the new ratio, and if so, is it to apply to all new allotments in the irrigation areas? If the new rule is to be applied because of a change of circumstances, will the Minister consider ascertaining whether the facts are as I have stated, and possibly giving leaseholders time to convert from leasehold to freehold at the old rate before the new rate is applied?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—Although the question is an involved one, I think I have some knowledge of the transactions. At one time the ratio was, I think, three times the annual rental, which was then probably between 25s. and £2 a year. This meant that people got very cheap blocks. Even with the ratio of sixty to one, based on an annual rental of 25s., these blocks would still be cheap, and anyone who freeholded them would be in a good position to make a profit. I will have an investigation made of the other matters referred to, and report back to the honourable member.

INDUSTRIAL CODE REGULATIONS.

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

That regulations under the Industrial Code, 1920-1955, relating to employees' records, etc., made on July 17, 1958, and laid on the table of this House on July 22, 1958, be disallowed.

(Continued from September 3. Page 680.)

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—Since I moved this motion conferences have been held between the Trades and Labor Council and the Attorney-General, and the difficulties that I sought to correct in this motion have been satisfactorily ironed out. I therefore move that the motion be read and discharged.

Motion read and discharged.

APPRENTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Apprentices Act deals with a subject that is becoming more and more important each year with the techniques that are being introduced into industry generally, and the fact that more and more skill is therefore required. Also it appears that if an apprentice is not encouraged in every possible way to acquire skill in industry there can be social consequences. Members probably know that the introduction of machinery into every form of industry has displaced unskilled manpower, and that the opportunities for persons without skill to secure employment are decreasing as time goes by; so any consideration of matters relating to apprenticeship are of great importance.

This Bill proposes a number of amendments to the Apprentices Act. These amendments have been the subject of thorough investigation and discussion by a special committee set up by the Trades and Labor Council and they have been duly recommended by that committee, adopted by the Trades and Labor Council and further considered by the Advisory Committee on Industrial Legislation before being included in the present Bill. We regard the amendments as very important and essential for the efficient and satisfactory working of the Apprentices Act. The Act itself was passed as recently as 1950, but while it was a step in the right direction, it did not contain much that was new. In fact, it did not do much more than repeal and re-enact the Technical Education of Apprentices Act and the relevant apprenticeship provisions of the Industrial Code. In moving the second reading of the 1950 Bill, the Premier said:—

The Technical Education of Apprentices Act provides for the constitution of an advisory board called the Apprentices Advisory Board. It is proposed by the Bill to set up a board, to be called the Apprentices Board, which will have the advisory duties now committed to the present board, but will, in addition, have certain administrative functions.

We have had eight years' experience of the Act and, taking everything into consideration, we believe the legislation would be immeasurably improved if the board were given wider powers than were originally intended to be conferred upon it. If the powers that we now propose are conferred on the board, it will be competent to deal with a number of problems associated with apprenticeship that cannot be

satisfactorily dealt with under existing conditions.

As I have suggested, the main difficulty at present lies in the fact that the Act stresses the advisory nature of the functions of the board. Section 12 limits the board to such activities as "reporting" and "making such recommendations as it thinks fit" to the Minister on the various matters connected with apprenticeship, similarly reporting and making recommendations on specific matters submitted to it by the Minister and "discharging such other duties (if any) as are prescribed." This limitation of the functions of the board was no doubt a relic of the old idea that only the Government is qualified and capable of making decisions. It must not be forgotten, also, that the Act was introduced by the present Government. However that may be, it appears that because the board does not possess responsible, executive power, many things which we had hoped would be done after the passing of the Act have not been done and the improvement we had looked for has not eventuated.

One of the serious objections to the present state of affairs is that places of employment—at which apprentices are deemed to be trained in their trade—do not always guarantee adequate and appropriate scope for such training. It is most important not only for the apprentice but also for industry in general, that there should be proper facilities for training; and it is surely appropriate that the Apprentices Board should be clothed with authority necessary to ensure that apprentices shall have the benefit of whatever training is essential for their purposes. But the board cannot promote the interests of apprentices in this way unless it has power to inspect premises and otherwise satisfy itself that any particular place of employment offers the necessary scope, and unless it has power to enforce its requirements.

Clause 5 proposes to give the board power to refuse an employer the right to take an apprentice unless the place of employment measures up to its standards as to conditions, equipment, methods and qualifications of instructors and the scope of the employer's industry. As for the desirability of some such provision, let me quote a few actual cases. These cases are not confined to the smaller establishments—experience has shown that apprentices can be badly treated from a training point of view in large shops and small shops. In one instance an apprentice was prevented from getting an adequate, all-round training as a fitter and turner because of the

limited nature of the products manufactured by his employer. In another the apprentice could not be employed for any considerable length of time on work improving his skill because most of the work was repetition machining. In another instance the apprentice (motor mechanic) was employed in menial tasks, such as running messages and cleaning up the shop during his first year and as a greaser or semi-skilled assistant to tradesmen in his second year. In still another case, in which it was a question of transferring indentures, it was found that the apprentice could not be transferred to another employer because of his limited knowledge due to his having been employed almost exclusively on a turret lathe.

The principal amendment designed to overcome these objectionable features of the apprentice system is contained in clause 5, to which I have already referred. But if the board is given the power to approve or disapprove within the meaning of this clause, it will also have to keep a register of places of employment which it approves. This is provided for in clause 3. In addition, the board, or its representative, would have to have authority to inspect places of employment in order to determine whether they fulfilled the conditions required, and this is provided for in clauses 7 and 9. Clause 7 also provides for the appointment of investigating officers for the purpose of carrying out the actual work of inspection, etc., of places of employment. The relevant section 31 at present gives the necessary power to the board, but does not provide for its implementation.

Another important aspect of apprenticeship is the cancellation and transfer of indentures. In this connection it would appear that the board is merely a means of noting cancellations and transfers rather than the body to determine the matter. Here again, we feel that the board has not been invested with sufficient or appropriate power. Clauses 6 and 8, which deal with this matter, are designed to give the board this power. Clause 6 amends section 30, which provides that the board "may suggest arrangements for the assignment of the indentures . . ." The clause deletes reference to "suggest" and gives the board the right to make the assignment. Clause 8 provides that indentures of apprenticeship may not be suspended or cancelled without the approval of the board. It may be of interest to members to know the

position regarding cancellations of indentures. Unfortunately, the special committee of the Trades and Labour Council was unable to obtain up-to-date statistics from the Factories Department, which, I understand, is a long way behind with its records, but the official number of cancellations to November, 1956, was 128. However, according to the figures supplied by the metal trades covered by the Metal Trades Award, the Vehicles Industries Award and the Railways Metal Trades Grades Award, cancellations for the last eight years have been as follows:—1951, 16; 1952, 4; 1953, 9; 1954, 65; 1955, 93; 1956, 72; 1957, 63; 1958, 34. The total for the period is 356.

The number of cancellations would indicate that something more is wrong than merely unsuitability of apprentice, etc., and the duty of ensuring that indentures are transferred, if possible, and other matters associated with this particular phase of apprenticeship are attended to should be not only within the powers of the board but an obligation on the board. Clause 6 provides that the board shall take the necessary steps when any such matter is brought to its notice. I might state, in passing, that in many instances cancellation of indentures is sought because of the unsatisfactory conditions or terms of employment of the apprentice, so that these two matters are intimately associated. There is another matter which we think should be under the direction of the board; that is, the prescription, where deemed to be necessary, of an educational standard for an apprentice. This provision is contained in clause 5 and forms paragraph (b) of subsection (1) of proposed new section 26a, and is drafted so that the board, in determining what standard (if any) is necessary, will be guided by the appropriate trade committee. It will be realized that no one fixed standard would be appropriate for all trades. In some it may be considered that a fairly high standard should be set, while in others not so high. The body most qualified to advise on this matter is, of course, the trade relevant committee.

I have dealt with all clauses except clause 4. This provides in general that instruction in technical classes, as prescribed under section 18, shall be given in normal working hours and that it shall occupy not less than twelve hours a week. This matter has been carefully considered in the light of modern trends and in relation to the demands made on apprentices under the existing system.

Apparently the only justification for compelling apprentices to attend technical classes at night is that that always used to be the case. But the practice dates back to unenlightened times, as do many other industrial customs. An apprentice should not be expected to work all day and then attend classes, and the fact that he has to imposes upon him unnecessary hardship. In many cases the apprentice has to leave home early in order to be at work at the stipulated time and after attending classes in the evening does not arrive home until a late hour.

In this connection I draw attention to the fact that a Commonwealth-State committee has investigated apprenticeship problems and recently issued a report. On the question of technical instruction during the day-time, it is interesting to note that five of the nine members of the committee (including the chairman) were prepared to recommend that "wholly day-time attendance should be accepted in principle as Government policy and adopted as an objective to be implemented over a period of years." The other four members supported the suggestion that one-third of the time occupied in technical school attendance should be in the evening.

The movement for day-time technical education has steadily grown in Australia during the last 25 years. The general trend has been towards more day-time instruction and less evening instruction. In England advisory councils in a number of industries have adopted day-time instruction—eight hours a week, for three years. In U.S.A. most of the States have provided for part-time day attendance at special classes for young workers in industry.

In South Australia at present apprentices in trades to which the Act applies have to attend technical instruction for three years, and our proposal refers to this instruction. The clause also provides that if an apprentice has not reached the required standard in the first three years, he may be required to attend out of normal working hours and also that no apprentice shall be precluded from attending then to supplement instruction received in normal hours. I commend the Bill to the consideration of the House and trust that as a result of its introduction there will be an improvement in our legislation relating to the education of apprentices.

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

METROPOLITAN MILK SUPPLY ACT REGULATIONS.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Dunstan—

That the regulations under the Metropolitan Milk Supply Act, 1946-1957, varying the price of milk, made on November 18, 1957, and laid on the table of this House on June 19, 1958, be disallowed.

(Continued from September 17. Page 751.)

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Agriculture)—Last week, before I asked for leave to continue my remarks, I read the regulation which is in dispute and pointed out that it is operating under an Act which was passed through this Parliament in 1946. At that time the legislation received the support of the Opposition as well as the Government. There was no dispute as far as I can find out about section 42 at all. The Opposition's only concern appeared to be relating to industrial conditions. The principal Act provided in section 42 that the board could make an order about prices for cream and milk and this was later amended in 1948 to be by regulation rather than by an order. There was no comment on this matter when the Act was amended. In fact, the only Labor speaker raised no objections to the Bill.

The whole purport of the mover's speech in this debate has been to set up a protection for Mr. Read, who was formerly a semi-wholesaler. I point out that neither the original Act nor, as far as I can ascertain, anybody's speech ever indicated that semi-wholesalers should have been provided for in the Act. In fact, I suspect that had this been suggested, there would have been vigorous opposition from all sides of the House on the grounds that one middleman was enough.

The simple facts are that Read was supplying milk to a number of retail vendors in the Blackwood area and in doing this he was getting milk at a special rate from the Myponga Co-operative Dairying Society. These retailers fell out with Read and preferred to collect their milk direct from the Myponga Society at the Edwardstown depot. Without any differential charge for Blackwood—or No. 2 area, as it is known—these retailers would have been forced to pay 4s. 5d. per gallon for their milk at Edwardstown. By the regulation under dispute, the board provided that they may receive their milk, which was destined for No. 2 area, at the depot in No. 1 area for 4s. 4d. per gallon. The retail vendors in No. 2 area, other than Read and one man who is tied to him by reason of leasing part of

Read's round, all get their milk through their own arrangements and, I am reliably informed, have no wish or intention ever to deal with Read.

Mr. Dunnage—Where did you get that information?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I do not mind if members doubt it because that is their prerogative, but my information is that these retailers would not go back to Read.

Mr. Dunnage—That is different from my information.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I don't care what information the honourable member has.

Mr. Dunnage—And I do not care where you got your information because it does not sound correct to me.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I have the names of the vendors concerned, but will not disclose them to the House because I do not believe in revealing names in a debate of this nature, although I do not mind supplying them to members personally. I have a statement from one man that he would not go back to Read under any circumstances. There is no reason on earth why they should have to deal with Read, because after all this is a free country.

Mr. Dunnage—It isn't a free country so far as the milk industry is concerned.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—We should not force these people to deal with Read. I am sure this House would not want to do that. The only effect of the disallowance of the regulation would be to deny the vendors any concession for collecting their milk at Edwardstown. At present they get a concession of 1d. a gallon for doing it. Five vendors operate in the No. 2 area. One gets his milk from a firm other than the Myponga Society. Two collect their milk from the Myponga depot at Edwardstown. A third, who leases part of Read's round, gets his milk for that round from Read, but collects the remainder of the milk he needs from Edwardstown. The other two are the Read brothers. The Reads have their milk delivered to them by the Myponga Society, along with 30 gallons for the vendor who is leasing part of Read's round. The distance from the Edwardstown depot to Blackwood is only three or four miles. It would be absurd to prevent retailers from travelling this distance to collect their own milk and make them get it through an additional person's hands. As a matter of fact, at least one of these vendors lives in Adelaide and has to pass the Edwardstown depot on his

way to Blackwood. I ask the House to keep this matter in its proper proportions and not disallow the regulations.

Mr. Dunstan made a few statements that should be answered. Much has been made of the alleged contract between the Myponga Society and the Reads. I doubt very much whether there ever was a contract. What I think passes for a contract is correspondence between the society and the Reads. I have never seen a contract.

Mr. Dunstan—Can't a contract be constituted by correspondence?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I will not argue now whether there was a legal contract or whether there was correspondence. It does not seem to be a matter to warrant this House or the Milk Board getting into the argument between the Reads and the Myponga Society. I am willing to acknowledge from what I can see that the Myponga Society wrote a letter to Read giving him a concession of 2d. a gallon, but how long the Society bound itself to this or under what conditions I will not discuss. The society showed me a letter and so did Read, and as far as I could see it was the same letter, written on December 14, 1956. After that date relations between the Reads and the vendors started to get worse. The other vendors began to collect their milk as they are doing at present. Most of them get it from the Edwardstown depot. This meant that Read was no longer a semi-wholesaler. He was not handling other people's milk to any extent, but he was getting the 2d. a gallon concession on the milk that he actually retailed. The Myponga Society said it no longer felt bound by the letter, which, in effect, was a concession to Read only because he was a semi-wholesaler.

On July 1, 1957, the society wrote to Read saying that the concession no longer applied. The society gave as its reasons the new regulations of the Milk Board, in addition to the fact that Read was no longer a semi-wholesaler. I have gone to some trouble to check this matter and I find that the society cancelled the agreement only because Read was no longer a semi-wholesaler and because it was thoroughly dissatisfied with him and the cancellation was not actually caused by the regulations, and the society acknowledges that is the position. In effect, the letter of July 1 contained part of the reasons for the society's action. It was a diplomatic letter and said that Read was no longer a semi-wholesaler and that it did not feel further bound by the

original arrangement. A number of statements by Mr. Dunstan will not stand close examination. First he accused the chairman of the board of being disingenuous in giving the reasons for the regulations, which reasons Mr. Dunstan quoted. I have examined them and I find that they are statements of fact, and I wonder what is wrong with them. Later the honourable member said there were 16 semi-wholesalers when the board was established and that now there are only six, and that it was clear that the board's policy was to get the men out of business. When people make statements like this they should get the facts correct and as far as I can see the statements by Mr. Dunstan were not correct. I do not know where the information came from. I asked the chairman of the board for a statement on this comment by Mr. Dunstan and he said:—

I have no knowledge of 16 semi-wholesalers being in existence when the board was established nor that there are only six today. I am aware that there were a number of wholesalers operating and that at the present time this number has been reduced to six.

The chairman then gave a list of wholesalers—and I stress “wholesalers” as against “semi-wholesalers”—whose business actually ceased. I have this list here; none of the men was a semi-wholesaler at the time of the passing of the Act. Of the 10 on the list two are now operating as semi-wholesalers.

The member for Norwood said that a number of vendors in the district sent a letter to the committee supporting Mr. Read's representations, but I have been unable to find what was the support he referred to. By “committee,” did he mean the Milk Board? If he did, the board has not received any such letters. I inquired of the Subordinate Legislation Committee whether that was the committee referred to, but was told that it had not received any of the supposed letters. Considerable point has been made of the fact that Mr. Read has a refrigeration plant at Blackwood, but the fact is that nobody wants to use it. Many retail vendors in the metropolitan area have provided their own refrigeration, and maintain it without getting any direct return, but Read wants to be paid for supplying this service for his own milk.

We were told that the wholesaler drops milk at the roadside where it is left for vendors to collect, without any refrigeration. From the information I have received I find that is not so; it is actually taken to Read's property and left near his depot building. All over the metropolitan area milk is delivered in the

early hours of the morning, when temperature is low and there is freedom from dust. The general conditions at Blackwood would be at least equal in this respect, if not better. The member for Norwood asked that this man be given a “fair go,” but I think he has been given that. Whenever he has sought to put a case before the board it has always been prepared to listen to him and hear everything he has had to say. He has given lengthy evidence before the Subordinate Legislation Committee, which incidentally decided against him by a majority decision, and now he is being given a debate in Parliament on his business. If that is not giving him a “fair go,” I do not know what is. It seems to me that he is getting as much consideration as any citizen could possibly expect. Since last Wednesday, when the debate began, Mr. Read has come to see me. My door has always been open to him, and I know he has seen my predecessor in office. I know he has not tried to see me before, because if he had done so an appointment would have been arranged.

The member for Edwardstown (Mr. Frank Walsh) said that the vendors at Blackwood cannot supply suitable conveyances to take milk from the Edwardstown depot to Blackwood via Shepherd's Hill and sell it at 4s. 4d. a gallon. I am quite at a loss to understand what he meant. As far as I can find out, most of the vendors concerned who go to Edwardstown have utility trucks that are quite large enough to take all the milk they need. They pay 4s. 4d. a gallon at Edwardstown and retail at 9d. a pint or 6s. a gallon. It appears that Opposition members who have spoken wish to have semi-wholesalers recognized by the board through a price fixation. The board may have power to do this, but it would be inadvisable, and in any case it would not help Read, because he has no vendors and the existing vendors certainly would not go back to him.

The general impression given by the mover of this motion is that Read has been squeezed out by these regulations. My answer is that he has definitely not been squeezed out. He is perfectly free to go to the Edwardstown depot if he wishes and collect milk for 4s. 4d. a gallon, or to continue in the way he is conducting his business at the moment by having his milk delivered for 4s. 5d. a gallon. In fact, if he wishes to become a wholesaler, there is nothing to stop him except practical considerations. Nobody would prevent his becoming a wholesaler if he complied with the

conditions. The board is not attempting to squeeze anybody out of business. I suggest we leave this matter to the free choice of the vendors concerned, and not disallow a worthwhile regulation. If we do, we shall force these retail vendors to pay more for their milk. I oppose the motion.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood)—The Minister pointed out that when section 42 was written into the Act, no concern about the original provisions of section 43 was expressed on either side of the House. I see no reason why concern should have been expressed. That section is there to provide a power for the board, and one might assume that it would normally exercise that power in the manner in which every organization or body having a discretionary power is expected to exercise it; that is, for the benefit of the public generally and of the people in the industry concerned. But where there is the use of a power that is contrary to the interests of the public or the industry, it is for this House to scrutinize that use, and that is what I am asking the House to do on this motion. I am not protesting against the existence of section 42, but because the board sees fit, by regulation, to abrogate the legal rights of Mr. Read to a concession he obtained legally, by a legal and enforceable contract, from the Myponga Co-operative Milk Society. The Minister said, "Well, of course, the society cancelled its agreement with Read for reasons other than the existence of the regulations." The society can ascribe what reasons it likes, but they were not legal reasons. Had the regulation not been made Read could have gone to court and enforced his legal contract. He had a concession as a milk semi-wholesaler, but that did not stop the Myponga Co-operative Milk Society from giving concessions to other people, nor did it stop other people from coming down there. There was a validly enforceable contract. The Minister said all that was produced to him was correspondence, but if he refers to his neighbour on the Ministerial bench he will be informed of a simple proposition in contract law, that a perfectly valid and enforceable contract may be made by correspondence.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—While he was a semi-wholesaler?

Mr. DUNSTAN—No, in the correspondence no mention is made of the amount he had to take.

Mr. King—Was a definite term prescribed in the contract?

Mr. DUNSTAN—Yes, and it was beyond the term of the regulations. That is what I am complaining about. The Milk Board has seen fit, by regulation, to abrogate the legal right obtained by this man, and that is contrary to principle and justice, so I do not think this man has been fairly dealt with. As to the Minister's remarks about the attitude of the board towards people of this kind, and about the reduction of their numbers, the matter I put before this House was taken from the evidence given by the chairman of the Milk Board before the Subordinate Legislation Committee. It was on the basis of those remarks that I thought something was wrong with the reasons given by the chairman for this regulation, because these reasons did not disclose the whole case at all.

It is not true, as stated in this House, that Read's depot was closed. The only reason why it had a reduction in business was that the board drafted a regulation that abrogated his contract. The depot was open, and it could still be utilized if he could enforce his legal rights the board has taken away from him. The fact that the board could declare not only a maximum price, but also a minimum, and by doing so abrogate the rights obtained by legal contract is, I think, entirely contrary to the purposes for which the board was given a discretionary power, so I ask members to disallow these regulations. It is not true that a disallowance will force people who do not wish to deal with Read to do so.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—It will deprive them of a merited penny a gallon.

Mr. DUNSTAN—No, it will not. All I am asking the House to do is to make it clear to the board that we do not believe it should, by regulation, deprive this man of his legal rights. There is no reason why a concession cannot be given to others, provided this man's rights are not taken away. All I ask is that the board be told this is not a satisfactory regulation, and that this House wants a satisfactory regulation. I am quite certain that if a satisfactory regulation comes forward that will not abrogate Read's legal rights no member of this House will object. This would not force anyone who did not wish to deal with Read to do so. Nobody wants that: all we want is to see that this man's rights are not overridden. On this basis, I ask that the regulations be disallowed.

The House divided on the motion:—

Ayes (15).—Messrs. Bywaters, John Clark, Corcoran, Dunnage, Dunstan (teller),

Hutchens, Jennings, Lawn, Loveday, O'Halloran, Ralston, Riches, Stephens, Frank Walsh and Fred Walsh.

Noes (16).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman (teller), Geoffrey Clarke, Coumbe, Goldney, Hambour, Heaslip, Hincks, Jenkins, King, Laucke, Pattinson, Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Shannon and Stott.

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Davis, Tapping and Hughes. Noes—The Hon. Sir. Malcolm McIntosh and Messrs. Millhouse and Harding.

Majority of 1 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES.

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

That in the opinion of this House a Royal Commission should be appointed—

- (a) to recommend to the House during the current session new boundaries for electoral districts for the House of Assembly to give substantial effect to the principle of one-vote-one-value; and
- (b) to consider in the preparation of such electoral boundaries the advisability of providing for multiple member districts.

(Continued from September 17. Page 759.)

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens)—I oppose the motion, but I wish to say at the outset that I obtained the adjournment of this debate last week at the request of the Opposition. The Premier said that the time factor necessitated prompt attention to this motion, so instead of moving for the adjournment after it was moved by the Leader of the Opposition he proceeded immediately and continued his remarks the following week. The member for Gawler said he wished to proceed promptly, but the Opposition requested that it be adjourned last week, yet we on this side were given the impression that it was an urgent matter. It seems that having brought this matter before the House once again and given a certain amount of lip service to the motion the Opposition was prepared to let it drop quietly, but the Government is prepared to debate it at any time the Opposition cares to bring it up. The Leader of the Opposition talked around the motion at some length, but did not introduce any new material. It seemed to me that his heart was not entirely in it, but I now wish to correct some of his arithmetic. He said:—

When we analyse these figures a little further we find that of the 16 uncontested

seats only three—Hindmarsh, Mitcham and Semaphore—were in the metropolitan area, and 13 were in the country.

Burnside was not contested, so each Party had two uncontested seats in the metropolitan area. I would have thought that after the Leader had concluded his remarks the next speaker from the Opposition would be one of the three bright boys of the Labor Party. I call them the heavy battery of the Opposition, and I refer to the members for Norwood, Enfield and Adelaide, but instead we heard from one of the light horse brigade—the member for Gawler. He said that under the electoral system the State was suffering and country towns were decaying, and that generally the country was going to the dogs. All this was interspersed with numerous quotations from some American expert. The Leader of the Opposition and the member for Gawler did not put forward one effective argument in favour of the motion. They did not give one reason to justify appointing a costly Royal Commission, or why this matter should be proceeded with at this last stage of the session.

Surely the Opposition knew that it would be physically impossible to get all the machinery working through the Electoral Department this session to give effect to the motion, which says that it must be done this session. I believe the Opposition will go on to the hustings again and say its members did their best and brought this motion up but the Government knocked them back once again. What was the Opposition's real reason in bringing down this motion? We all know the Labor Party wants to form the Government next year, and I ask, "Does the Labor Party really want the people to have equal votes, as has been suggested, or does it wish to become the Government?" Why does the Opposition go to all this trouble to bring down this motion. Surely there is a far simpler way to become the Government, and that is to get a policy acceptable to the majority of the people. However, it must find a better policy than that of the Liberal and Country League. The people have the utmost confidence in the Government, which has been largely responsible for the great progress the State is making, so the Labor Party will have great difficulty in producing a better policy than ours.

I presume members opposite hold the same views as the Federal Labor Party. Therefore, they must subscribe to the policy enunciated on television recently by Mr. Eddie Ward when he said that farms and greengrocers would be nationalized and only personal belongings

would not be. He got up in the National Parliament and tried to explain that away, but he only made his case worse, for Federal *Hansard* published a report of his speech. I suggest that the people the Opposition seeks to champion would not give the Labor Party much support for holding such a view. That view has been expressed on a Federal level on more than one occasion in various ways and, if I recall correctly, the Labor Party as a result has been out of office in the Federal sphere since 1949 and is likely to remain so for a considerable period. I understand that word has gone out to Federal members and supporters of the Party that in the forthcoming election campaign they are to keep quiet about nationalization.

Mr. John Clark—Did you read that in the press, too?

Mr. CUMBE—Does the honourable member deny it?

Mr. John Clark—Yes.

Mr. CUMBE—Does the honourable member believe in nationalization?

Mr. John Clark—Of course I do, so long as it is within the bounds of commonsense.

Mr. CUMBE—The simplest way for the Labor Party to gain power in this State, without going to the humbug of this unnecessary motion, is to have an acceptable policy. It could gain power by winning three metropolitan seats: it is as easy as that. Members opposite complain about a gerrymander, yet why are they so confident they can win the next election? Why have they gone to the trouble of introducing this motion? The Opposition is at liberty to move such motions annually and I suppose this type of motion does read well in some electorates and it is possibly good for Party propaganda; but if a Royal Commission were appointed and effect were given to the so-called one vote one value system what would be the position? It has not been indicated whether there would be any alteration in the number of seats, so we must assume that the commission would work on the basis of 39 seats. The latest figures available from the Electoral Office reveal that the trend has been for the inner suburbs of Adelaide to decrease in population. For instance, the electorate of Adelaide has decreased by 1,820 since March, 1956; Unley by 1,060; Norwood by 1,482, and Torrens by 1,239. The tendency is for people to leave the older, more settled suburbs and settle in the newer suburbs. In March, 1956, 484,386 persons were eligible to vote. If that number were divided by 39, on the basis of one vote one value each electorate

would contain 12,420 electors. One subdivision of about a square mile in my electorate would contain as many electors as that, but on the other hand in order to secure the same number of electors in a country district the size of the electorate would have to be almost doubled. Many country electorates would have to be amalgamated. I would have a pocket-handkerchief-size electorate and a country member would represent a district of thousands of square miles. Is that the type of decentralization the Labor Party advocates and mouths at every opportunity? In his opening remarks the Leader of the Opposition said his electorate was too large, yet he now advocates that it should be doubled in size.

Mr. Riches—He does not.

Mr. CUMBE—He cannot have it both ways. Those are the words he used.

Mr. O'Halloran—They are not.

Mr. CUMBE—I suggest the Leader examine the first page of his speech in *Hansard*. Under this motion the Labor Party obviously hopes to get a majority of metropolitan seats, especially in the densely populated industrial centres. On the other hand, it is quite possible that many sitting country Labor members would lose their seats. I wonder how they feel about that? Are they behind their Leader on this question when it is regarded in that light?

Mr. Loveday—You say we are introducing this motion to win an election. It is not certain we would win an election even if this motion were accepted.

Mr. CUMBE—The only way the Opposition can possibly win an election is to get a policy, and not necessarily an acceptable policy. We have heard it frequently expressed here and on the hustings that all men are born equal and should have an equal vote. That is a nice-sounding phrase, but I contend that all men should have an equal right to be represented effectively in this House and should have an equal right to interview their representatives and express their views to him. If a constituent of mine wishes to see me at any time I can reach him within five or 10 minutes or he can visit me at this House. He can see me at any time of the day or night. Could a country elector do that with his member? Of course not, and the position would be twice as bad if this motion were accepted. At present country citizens are denied the opportunity of seeing their members as often as they wish, particularly when Parliament is sitting, and that is the time when

most constituents wish to see their members to express their opinions about the legislation the House is considering. It is physically impossible for all country electors who wish to do so to see their members, many of whom are only home at weekends. It is only on rare occasions that country members have an opportunity, when the House is sitting, of visiting the outlying parts of their district, whereas city members can see their constituents at almost any time. Is that equal opportunity? If we accept this proposal the situation will be considerably worsened and country citizens will be denied their basic rights of equal opportunity of meeting their representative.

Mr. Riches—What you say is sheer humbug because it is not written into the motion at all.

Mr. CUMBE—I am interpreting the motion as I understand it and I am expressing my views on the Leader's remarks. I have outlined the effect of the motion and it cannot be denied.

Mr. Riches—You cannot read anything about 39 equal electorates in the motion.

Mr. CUMBE—Nothing was said about that aspect and, as I said, we must base our remarks on that very assumption.

Mr. Riches—The motion distinctly refers to multiple electorates.

Mr. CUMBE—That is a different matter altogether. I am talking about the districts as they are. I wonder whether the Opposition is sincere in moving the motion. What would be the position if the electors who support them knew its true implications? On the one hand, members opposite advocate decentralization of industry and population, and on the other centralization of Parliamentary representation. Mr. John Clarke spoke at tedious length on this matter and quoted extensively from statements by Doctor Finer, who said, "Electorates must not be so large as to prevent personal contact between members and the electors." That is one of the essences of representation in this House.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—They are quiet on that.

Mr. Riches—We agree.

Mr. CUMBE—Mr. O'Halloran said his district was too large, and now Mr. Riches agrees with Dr. Finer, yet the Opposition is trying to make the position worse. We have heard much talk about how many votes were cast in favour of Labor candidates at the

last State elections, and how Labor won a majority of votes but a minority of seats. At first glance that seems to be a sound argument, but let us look at the position more closely. The Liberal Party gained 21 seats, Labor 15 and Independents 3. The primary votes cast were Labor 120,707, Liberal 100,452 and all other candidates 38,932. That gave Labor 20,255 more than the Liberals in 24 contested seats. The majority spoken of came in the main from districts where Labor was not opposed by Liberals. In other words, if those seats had been contested by other candidates there would have been fewer votes cast for Labor. Largely metropolitan seats were concerned and because of the large enrolments it increased the total Labor vote.

Let us examine in more detail the seats where the two major Parties did not oppose each other, and yet contests occurred. In Adelaide Labor polled 15,110 votes, and its candidate had a majority of 10,540. In Edwardstown Labor polled 15,366, and the majority was 10,049. In Port Adelaide the votes cast for Labor were 16,321, with a majority of 11,675. There were two seats where the Liberals won without any opposition from Labor. The total votes cast for the Liberals in Gumeracha was 5,457 and the majority was 4,752. In Onkaparinga the Liberals polled 4,189 votes and the majority was 2,403. In addition, in Burra the Liberal candidate polled 2,186, but the seat was lost to an Independent. Also, the Mount Gambier seat was lost to an Independent, and the Liberal candidate polled 2,988 votes. All this shows the fallacy of the Labor Party's claim. The total votes cast for Labor in these seats was 49,791 and for Liberals 12,522, so Labor gained a credit of 37,269 votes in the districts where the Parties did not oppose each other. If we take that credit from the total votes cast in the State for Labor, the Liberals gained 17,014 more votes than Labor, that is, where the two Parties were opposed to each other. If an Independent, a D.L.P. man or a candidate representing another organization, had stood in the districts where only the Liberal candidate stood the position would have been different. It has been announced that the D.L.P. people will contest every seat at the next State election. At the last Senate elections three Liberal Senators were returned, and what fairer method of voting could there be than for the Senate? The argument put forward by the Labor Party about the majority of votes it

gained is fallacious. It may have some propaganda value, but an examination shows the true position.

The Labor Party could have won the last State elections under the present system, and the next elections will be fought on the same basis, but the Party must have a policy acceptable to the people. Why go to the trouble of moving this motion when they know that it is impossible to get anything done in the time available? Let the Party get a good policy and then it will have a chance of winning the next State elections. I feel that there is no alternative but to vote against the motion. I cannot see that a clear-thinking person would support the setting up of a Royal Commission to do as the Opposition suggests. I have much pleasure in opposing the motion.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood)—There is no more important matter for the people of South Australia than the basis of their representation in Parliament. Two things would arise from the adoption of the motion. First, there would be the adoption of the principle of one vote one value; and secondly, there would be the setting up of a Royal Commission with power, in giving effect to the principle of one vote one value, to consider the advisability of multiple-member districts, which could provide more members in this House and mean that, because of there being multiple districts in every part of the State, no one would be disfranchised at the next elections. There would be no uncontested seats and the people could exercise their votes on every occasion. What is more important, the minority voice in every area could gain representation. What is the basis of our electoral principle? There can be no doubt about it. This principle has been relied upon and spoken of by leaders in all forms of political thought in practically every section of the British Commonwealth. What is democracy? According to Abraham Lincoln it is government of the people, by the people, for the people, not government of the many by the few for the few. The Greek word for "democracy" means "people's rule." In a democracy the people rule by their representation. It is not the places where people live, not their interests, wealth, poverty, or education that should count, but their existence as human beings. The basis of democracy is humanity. There can be no denial that that is true of the principle of one vote one value. No man should have in law a greater voice in

the government of his country than any other man. As Colonel Rainford so truthfully said in the Putney Army debates:—

The poorest he that is in England hath a life to live as the greatest he.

Shall the poorest he, then, have less say in the choosing of persons and policies which affect that life than the greatest he? Democracy shall rule, and we will obtain democracy even if the Government uses its minority-elected majority to vote out this motion. Let me turn to the arguments that have been adduced against the motion by members opposite.

Mr. John Clark—Have we heard any yet?

Mr. DUNSTAN—I have heard none that I can credit as sincere.

Mr. O'Halloran—They were not arguments, but excuses.

Mr. DUNSTAN—They were a lot of meretricious nonsense. I do not think that members opposite believe the things they put forward. I do not believe any sane and sentient being would put forward the sort of stuff that we have heard from them, but I pay them the compliment of going through what they said. The Premier began by saying that the motion spoke of the principle of one vote one value. He says it is not a principle at all, that it is not a principle accepted anywhere in the world. As the Premier knows, that is completely untrue, but when anything is unfortunate or inconvenient for him he says it does not exist. It is not only in this instance that the Premier has taken that attitude; it is his consistent attitude upon matters that are inconvenient to him, electorally or otherwise. He is like the three monkeys—who see no evil, hear no evil, and speak no evil. In this case the Premier sees no principle, hears no principle, and speaks no principle.

I shall now turn to what happened in the United Kingdom, and I shall quote not the words of Labor members or of Radicals, but of Conservatives. The Representation of the People Bill in 1917 effected the last re-distribution of seats that took place before 1948. Colonel Gretton, who was a leading Conservative said:—

I make the great admission that I think, on the whole, it is desirable that there should be some approximation to equality as to the value of one man's vote compared with another.

That was the principle on which the Conservatives acted when voting on the Bill which evened up electoral boundaries in Great

Britain, but it was not the only time the Conservatives had anything to say on this subject. I will now read what the Leader of the Conservative Party had to say on the 1948 Bill. It was as follows:—

In regard to the representation of the House of Commons there are two principles which have come into general acceptance. The first is: "One man, one vote." And the second is: "One vote, one value." The first has been almost entirely achieved . . . Of course, in regard to "one vote, one value" there can only be an approximation. . . . Redistribution is particularly necessary now because of the present over-representation of the Socialist Party. Only 30,000 votes are needed to return a member who is willing to upset and sweep away all that we have been able to build up across the centuries. Forty-five thousand votes are required to return a Conservative and 185,000 to return a Liberal. Making all allowances for the advantage which often goes to the winning side at a general election, this is an evil and a disproportion which has become a great abuse and cannot be neglected by any supporter of democracy. Therefore, we may say that there is a broad general acceptance of the principle of "one man, one vote" and also of making a steady approximation to "one vote, one value." . . .

The speaker was Sir Winston Churchill.

Mr. John Clark—He has never been to South Australia.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Members opposite do not refer to the views of their political colleagues elsewhere on a matter of this kind. Sir Winston Churchill, and those who supported him, would have been disgusted with the position in South Australia. They would have said it was a complete denial of the democratic principles which they themselves had sought and enunciated time and time again. However, we do not have to go as far afield as Great Britain when considering this matter. What happened across the border in Victoria? A re-distribution of seats was introduced on the basis of the Federal seats, which are fixed on the principle of one-vote-one-value. Members opposite do not care to refer to the House of Representatives when they speak on this matter, where the basis is a quota of 40,000 votes for each electorate, and that applies to both metropolitan and country representation. The re-distribution in Victoria was introduced by Mr. Hollway, who was a Liberal, yet one member opposite said only yesterday he had never heard of him. He introduced the two for one system—two State members for each Federal seat—with redistributions to take place after every census, as in the Federal Parliament. Mr. Hollway was expelled by the Liberals and he resigned his seat and

contested a seat held by the leader of the Liberal Party in Victoria and won the election on the principle of one-vote-one-value. The people were prepared to espouse that principle, and it was enshrined in the Victorian electoral system. The Labor Party supported that principle, though it is not now in power there, but considers it to be right and would vote for it time and again regardless of whether it was in or out of office. We on this side of the House do not consider matters from the point of view of whether they are politically expedient. That is not the criterion upon which we vote: we vote according to what is right.

Mr. Shannon—What about the Senate re-arrangement years ago? It was a long while ago, and you probably would not remember it.

Mr. DUNSTAN—I am perhaps not as ancient as the honourable member, and I have not yet reached my dotage. If he will let me proceed he will hear something. I hope he will stay here and not walk out, as many of his colleagues have done. The principle of one vote one value has been widely recognized. It is recognized by every leading political writer, such as Professors Finer and Jennings. The Premier said we have to compensate country people for distance and difficulty. It is true, as Professor Finer pointed out, that we must draw electoral boundaries according to convenience and equity. Equity prescribes that the electorates shall be as nearly as equal as possible and convenience that the electors shall have the opportunity of getting to their members. No-one can say that under the principle of one-vote-one-value any elector has any difficulty in getting to his member. We have a practical example of that in the Federal Parliament. The South Australian member best-known to his electors and famed throughout the State for his close attention to the problems of his electors is the member for Grey, Mr. Russell. He has the biggest electorate in the State, yet everyone in Grey knows him. That is why he always gets back, and the Liberal Party has never been able to defeat him.

The Hon. C. S. Hincks—Have you anyone to beat him?

Mr. DUNSTAN—We do not need to beat him. We are happy to have him in the Federal Parliament because he is a good member for his district. His electors have no difficulty in getting to him with their problems. I could mention other Federal members

representing country districts, but not all of them pay as close attention to their electorates as Mr. Russell does. Some State country electorates could be larger than they are without being inconvenient, but that would not be necessary under this motion. We do not wish to deprive country people of the chance of getting to their members.

Mr. Hambour—All you want is to deprive them of their proportion in this House?

Mr. DUNSTAN—Exactly. The proportions should be strictly in accordance with the number of people in the electorates, and the only departure from that rule should be when necessary because of the difficulties of drawing boundaries which are exactly equal and to allow some small tolerance in favour of sparsely populated areas.

Mr. Hambour—Are you prepared to tell the electors that?

Mr. DUNSTAN—Every member on this side of the House has put forward that proposition at elections. The member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) has enunciated that policy in his electorate, and the Leader of the Opposition did the same from the election platform before the Mount Gambier by-election.

Mr. Shannon—Yet the member for Mount Gambier still sits in opposition.

Mr. DUNSTAN—He won the by-election, and even the gerrymander will not save the Government at the next general election, though members opposite hope it will. The next argument put forward by members opposite—if we can call it an argument—was that it is necessary for the development of the country areas that they be given a greater proportion in this House. The Premier, on this point, said that there has always been a preponderance of country representation in this House. That was untrue. There has not. When the House was founded in 1857 the electorates were divided up on a quota basis. The city of Adelaide—the city proper—had six members; Mount Barker three and Clare and Burra three each. There was an almost equal number of people in each district but there were two exceptions—Encounter Bay which was difficult of access at that time and a district in the north. Otherwise there was one vote one value when the State was founded. It was not until 1902 that this House took the positive step of giving two votes to the country for every city vote. Until then the development of the country had kept pace with that of the city. There were still considerably more people in

the country than in the city in 1902, but from the very time the preponderance of country votes was written into the Constitution of this State the metropolitan area has developed far more rapidly than the country. Today there are almost four people in a metropolitan district in comparison with each person in a country district.

Mr. Loveday—It has not preserved the country.

Mr. DUNSTAN—No. It has done the opposite. Instead of keeping the country up with the State's rate of development it has had the opposite effect.

Mr. Hambour—Are you trying to prove that more metropolitan districts would develop the country more than country members?

Mr. DUNSTAN—Of course, because they would not have any electoral axe to grind. It would not make any difference electorally where development took place. Honourable members opposite know perfectly well that there are some things they don't want to see in certain country areas, including the taking of industrial workers there.

Mr. Shannon—As a result of one vote one value in the Federal sphere Sydney and Melbourne monopolize the policy of the Federal Parliament.

Mr. DUNSTAN—I point out that it was the Federal Parliament that provided the initial impetus to the development of this State both during and immediately after the war.

Mr. Shannon—Is that why Sydney and Melbourne have withered away?

Mr. DUNSTAN—I am not suggesting that for a moment. Members opposite on every occasion possible are fond of saying what magnificent development this State has had and yet when I point out the basis for our development they claim that has nothing to do with it. They would like to have their cake and eat it too. In one instance they claimed that Melbourne and Sydney monopolize the policy of the Federal Parliament but when I pointed out what had been done by the Federal Parliament for this State they immediately suggested that Melbourne and Sydney have benefited also.

Mr. Shannon—Don't you give this Government any credit for the development of this State?

Mr. DUNSTAN—Some, but I do not suggest as do members opposite that the Premier has done it alone and that he has been not only a Venus Anadyomene but a Jupiter Pluvius as well. The next suggestion was that

when the last re-distribution took place the Opposition did not divide the House or vote against it. That is perfectly true. Members on this side had bitterly fought against the instructions to Royal Commission because we contended they perpetuated a gerrymander. We stated our policy but it was rejected by members opposite and we were then given the option of accepting the report of the commission or retaining the then existing system. The report of the commission, contrary to one of its instructions, made a recommendation that was slightly better than the existing system so we accepted the lesser of the two evils.

Mr. Hambour—Do you remember the way the Labor Party applauded the redistribution in the press subsequent to the publication of the commission's report?

Mr. DUNSTAN—I do not know of any member of my Party who made a press statement upon this issue. If the honourable member can cite one member I would be interested to know his identity. Who said it, and if he did, when?

Mr. Hambour—It was in the press after the publication of the recommendation.

Mr. DUNSTAN—No doubt the press said that it was reported that members of the Opposition said something or the other. Give the facts! The honourable member cannot. Members opposite have a great habit, just like the Minister of Agriculture in a recent debate saying that I had been going around the countryside—

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—On a point of order, is the honourable member in order in referring to a previous debate.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Dunnage)—No. The honourable member is out of order and I ask him to confine his remarks to the question before the Chair.

Mr. DUNSTAN—I apologize to the Minister of Agriculture. I heard the Minister of Works recently say that I had been going around the countryside being all things to all men and was rather a chameleon in relation to the things I said. When I asked him to quote my remarks and show my inconsistency he said my statements could easily be found. He has never found them. This is the sort of thing members opposite are fond of doing. They make snide and contemptible allegations against their political opponents that have not the slightest basis of truth, justice or principle.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—On a point of order, is the honourable member in order in referring to remarks he alleges I made against him as being "contemptible"?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN—No. The honourable member is not in order and if the Minister of Works takes exception I must ask the member for Norwood to withdraw that remark.

Mr. DUNSTAN—I will withdraw the word "contemptible" and say that in relation to remarks the Minister has made about myself I have the utmost personal contempt, and I am not alone in this. The Premier and the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) said that there was not time for the Royal Commission to sit upon this issue. I have no doubt a vote will be taken on this matter next week and there will be ample time for a Royal Commission to sit and for the electoral rolls to be prepared.

Mr. Coumbe—Rubbish! The motion would not go through the two Chambers for a month or more.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Even so, it is some time between now and the next election and between now and when the Government has to call for the next election, and there is sufficient time for all the necessary procedure to be undertaken.

Mr. Coumbe—It would take six months for a Commission to come to a decision, and you know it.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Nonsense!

Mr. Shannon—Why was this matter adjourned last week?

Mr. DUNSTAN—Because we desired to introduce the second reading of another Bill.

Mr. Shannon—Apparently that second reading was more important than this motion.

Mr. DUNSTAN—No. There will be ample time for this matter to be debated. There is not the slightest reason why the Commission could not sit and come to a decision in due course. The member for Torrens asked whether the Labor Party wanted to form a Government. Of course it does. We want to form a government that will be elected upon a just basis of representation. The Labor Party whether in or out of office has always been consistent on this question of just representation and it is part of our policy—a policy which I will prove is acceptable to the people. Mr. Coumbe will hear a little more of it in his own electorate before next March and he will also hear a few remarks from his electors about the views he propounds when he votes in this

House against giving them an effective voice according to their numbers. The arbiters of whether our policy is acceptable are the people and in a few moments I will refer to Mr. Coumbe's analysis of how people voted at the State elections and whom and what they supported. It is not for members to say, "This is what the people shall have regardless of what they want." It is for the people to determine what they want and whom they want in government. The Labor Party's policy is an extremely full one covering many pages. It is far more extensive than the extraordinary series of pious statements that appear on one page of the Liberal Party's document. Included in such pious generalizations it would not be surprising or out of place to see "Home Sweet Home," and "Dog is Man's Best Friend."

Mr. Shannon—Does proportional representation still remain in your policy?

Mr. DUNSTAN—Yes.

Mr. Shannon—I thought it might. I may have a word to say about it in a moment.

Mr. DUNSTAN—I am not surprised that the honourable member wants to switch the subject away from the Liberal Party's principles, which only seem to contain one positive political idea and that is the maintenance of the present electoral system. That is the only specific plank in its entire platform and it is beneficial to its position. The member for Torrens referred to the manner in which this State voted and I was interested to hear him say that he thought the Senate vote was a fair indication. However, he then analysed the situation in relation to uncontested seats and seats not contested by both Parties in this State and said that we should not consider them in our calculations of the majority of support the Labor Party secured. From a statistical point of view that is an extraordinary argument. The honourable member said that one could take the Senate vote as a guide. Can we take the Senate vote for the whole State to show how people would vote at the State elections? We must examine the position closely to ascertain the contrasts between State election voting and Senate voting. I have some figures compiled by the Department of Political Science at the Adelaide University—and one of those who compiled them was a prominent member of the Liberal Party, Mr. Reid—in connection with the 1953 elections. Consider first the electorates in which the two Parties were opposed. A total of 83,554 votes were cast for the Liberal

Party and 86,850 for Labor. For the electorates in which the Parties were not directly opposed, instead of taking the State vote we can take the Senate vote corrected by the percentage swing to the Playford Government that was shown in the electorates where the Parties were opposed in that State election. That is more than fair to the Government because in the staunch Labor electorates which were not contested by the Government the swing shown to the Government borderline seats as compared with the Senate vote did not occur, or not in previous elections anyway. This gives a grand total, corrected by the swing shown in the Senate election, of 83,968 votes for the Liberal and Country League and 115,136 for the Australian Labor Party. Therefore, the very most that the Government could have got at the 1953 State elections was 42.3 per cent of the votes, whereas Labor would have got 55.7.

As to the 1956 election, let us analyse the position in the State electorates where there were contests either at the general election or at by-elections since; that is, where both Parties were opposed. The seats analysed are Norwood, Torrens, Victoria, Mount Gambier, Wallaroo, Glenelg, Unley, Frome, Millicent, Murray, Enfield, West Torrens and Chaffey. I have taken the Senate votes for each Senate team in these districts. The total shows 65,628 votes for Labor and 70,307 for Liberals. I also have taken the final figures for the candidates of the two Parties in those seats in the general State elections and the by-elections. This resulted in Labor polling 86,950 votes and Liberals 76,278. In other words, at the last State elections and the by-elections, the Labor Party polled 52.9 per cent of the total votes and Liberal 47.1, but at the Senate elections Labor polled 48.3 per cent and the Liberals 51.7. That meant a swing to the Labor Party, from the Senate to the State elections, of 4.6 per cent.

Mr. Coumbe—Why?

Mr. DUNSTAN—Because we have an acceptable policy. The majority of people in South Australia want a Labor Government. In this State some things are done by the State Government and some by the Commonwealth Government. Some people vote for the Liberal Party in State elections, but not in Commonwealth elections.

Members interjecting.

A Member—Is that because of Evatt?

Mr. DUNSTAN—It does not say very much for the leader of the Liberal Party in South Australia, who is supposed to pull

such a strong personal vote, when the Liberal Party here got 4.6 per cent fewer votes than Bob Menzies did in the Commonwealth Senate elections. Let us look at the corrected results of the Senate votes in South Australia. They show that 208,425 people voted for Labor and 184,814 for the Liberals. Statistically that

system of analysis is completely irrefutable. If members have any way of disproving it I shall be glad to listen. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to have the schedule incorporated in *Hansard* without being read.

Leave granted.

The schedule was as follows:—

Seats contested by both Parties in State elections.	State elections, 1956 and since.		Senate vote, 1955.	
	Labor.	Liberal.	Labor.	Liberal.
Norwood	11,981	8,323	8,117	8,313
Torrens	10,601	8,382	7,180	8,865
Victoria	2,385	3,841	1,852	2,959
Mount Gambier	4,167	3,408	2,491	2,693
Walleroo	3,386	2,613	2,483	2,431
Glenelg	8,969	11,650	7,169	9,828
Unley	7,868	10,900	6,809	8,593
Frome	2,844	1,954	1,944	1,891
Millicent	3,201	2,918	1,898	2,624
Murray	3,533	3,340	2,399	2,841
Enfield	14,091	5,865	11,040	5,228
West Torrens	10,542	8,898	8,261	7,640
Ridley	1,487	2,054	1,516	3,406
Chaffey	1,895	2,132	2,069	2,995
Total	86,950	76,278	65,428	70,307
	Total ..	163,228	Total .	135,735
	%	%	%	%
	52.9	47.1	48.3	51.7
State totals above	86,950	76,278		
Corrected Senate balance	121,475	108,536		
(Senate votes in rest of State corrected by 4.6% swing)				
Total	208,425	184,814		

Mr. DUNSTAN—Members opposite would have us believe that they are a united body on this subject and that there are no people on their side of politics who do not think as they do. Of course, that is not the position. There is a member of this House who was heard in Liberal councils on this subject before he became a member. Mr. Millhouse was well-known on this subject in Liberal Party conferences, and he castigated the Government for its attitude on electoral reform. He was taken to task on one occasion by Sir Collier Cudmore, who said he spoke just like Mr. O'Halloran. At that time Mr. Millhouse was speaking as a true Liberal. Just before he became a member of this House a pamphlet was prepared by some young Liberals. Although I believe he had something to do with its preparation his name does not appear on the title page. If I am wrong in this he can correct me.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—He will correct you.

Mr. DUNSTAN—I shall be glad if he can assure me that he had nothing to do with it, but significantly it contains information given to him by me.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—It is all very well to score off him when he is not here. You wait. He will correct you.

Mr. DUNSTAN—I invite his correction. If he had nothing to do with it, maybe the information was given to someone else to use. If I am wrong about his views on this subject or his connection with the pamphlet I will apologise.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—Did you give that to him when you were a member of the Liberal Party?

Mr. DUNSTAN—No. This pamphlet was issued for distribution amongst Liberals only,

who are not supposed to make statements outside.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—The paper was available, not like the Labor Party's Constitution.

Mr. DUNSTAN—It was given to me. When I flourished it in this House Mr. Millhouse rushed down in concern to the Minister of Education, who said quietly to him "We cannot do anything about it." The remark was audible on this side of the House.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—The honourable member will correct that, too, when he comes back.

Mr. DUNSTAN—I shall be glad if the honourable member has something to say about the matter. Let me quote from the pamphlet:—

We are all convinced Liberals and have been members of the L.C.L. for many years. Indeed, it is precisely because we are Liberals that we urge reform. We are not ashamed of our ideals and are prepared to stand by them. We do not believe that our party or any other group of people is worthy of governing unless it is prepared to let its ideals be known, and then stick to them. So we find it too much to stand by idly and see many of the tried and tested principles of Liberalism deliberately flouted in South Australia for the selfish and cynical advantage of the very Party which claims to uphold them.

Several reasons, most of them to our credit, have caused the L.C.L. to become and to remain the largest group in the House of Assembly. But gradually one reason alone, and that not to our credit, has come to predominate—that is the electoral system sketched above. The electoral system has certainly not been the only reason for Liberal predominance, but it is fair to say that it is the only real one today. . . . It is wrong, gravely unjust, that one Party should always win elections and consequently always be the Government, even when the other Party gains an overall majority of votes. That is what is happening in South Australia now. At the last general election the Labor Party almost certainly won an overall majority of votes, yet the L.C.L. won 21 seats in the House of Assembly and the Labor Party only 14. . . . Why should there be the same vote for everyone? That is a question which goes to the very heart of Liberal philosophy—the philosophy which our Party should represent and foster. The answer is this, and we make no apology for going back to fundamental moral principles to give it. . . . In the eyes of God, every soul is of infinite worth. Because we mortals cannot measure infinity, to us every soul on earth must be regarded as being of equal worth. Therefore, every person is of equal worth and so is entitled to equal rights. Therefore it is the right of every person to have an equal voice in the choice of those who will govern him. Therefore, everyone is entitled to a vote of equal value to that of everyone else. There should be the same vote for everyone.

Then they analysed the position in South Australia and said:—

Can we then justify it for any reason at all? The answer is "No," for there is no justification for believing that we should always be in power and our opponents always be denied the legitimate chance of every Party in opposition—a chance to work the machinery of government if they can persuade a majority of electors to support them. . . . But what is the position in South Australia? Because of our electoral system the pendulum is permanently weighted so that it is always pointing towards the L.C.L. It is not free to swing unfettered. It is exceedingly difficult, indeed almost impossible, for the Labor Party ever to get a majority of members elected to the House of Assembly, and in fact it never has since the present system was introduced in 1936.

This in turn reacts on the Premier himself. He finds himself in his own Party, and in the Government, more and more powerful. His position has become, in effect, that of a dictator with all the disadvantages which dictatorship brings. The notice which a Government takes of the Opposition, indeed of the electors as a whole, is in direct proportion to its chances of electoral defeat. Therefore, the notice the present Government takes of any person or body of persons is virtually nil. The Government is more and more out of touch with the people.

Those are the views of members of the Liberal Party.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—How many authors were there?

Mr. DUNSTAN—There were three—Mr. Bettison, Mr. Cox, who is a law partner of Mr. Millhouse, and the late Dr. Marshall. There can be no doubt that the views they stated are widely supported among Young Liberals today.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—They were not expelled from the Party for expressing their views, like Mr. Chambers.

Mr. DUNSTAN—They did not express them publicly. Mr. Hollway expressed views publicly and was expelled, and, although he apologized, he was not taken back into the Party, nor were his associates. We are prepared to re-admit people who break the rules knowingly, provided that they are prepared to abide by Party rules in future. The Liberal Party was sore about Mr. Hollway.

Mr. Shannon—Can the honourable member name any person who has been excluded from the Liberal Party in South Australia?

Mr. DUNSTAN—I am talking about Victoria.

Mr. Shannon—And I am talking about South Australia.

Mr. DUNSTAN—The honourable member can talk about Victoria when it suits him, but if it does not he comes back to South Australia. To show that the Young Liberals are not alone in saying these things, I shall now refer to statements made by Dr. A. J. Forbes, another prominent member of the Liberal Party, when he was a University lecturer. Although he did not commit himself specifically, the implications in his remarks were clear. In the June, 1956, issue of the *Australian Quarterly*, he discussed the South Australian electoral system. I do not share the superiority complex of the member for Barker about the intelligence of his colleagues.

Mr. Shannon—Much!

Mr. DUNSTAN—I do not. I give members opposite credit for having more intelligence than he does. Dr. Forbes said:—

The principal arguments of the Government Party can be grouped under four headings. The first could be called "The country versus city" argument. In this it is suggested that because South Australia is mainly an agricultural State and its main wealth lies in its agricultural products, those who live in the areas which produce this wealth should have the greatest representation in Parliament.

This, of course, was the argument espoused by the Premier's grandfather when he was in this House. He said that if you find rogues, vagabonds, prostitutes or thieves anywhere you find them in the city areas, and they should not have the same vote as the more wealthy and more intelligent people in the country. That, of course, is the argument that Dr. Forbes has put, perhaps a little less crudely, here. He also said:—

The second could be called the "area" argument. In this it is suggested that if the principle of one vote one value were introduced, some electorates in the more sparsely settled areas of the State would be so large as to make effective representation by one man impossible. The third could be called the development argument. This argument asserts that the country areas are underdeveloped compared with the metropolitan area. If they are ever to be developed adequately, so the argument runs, they will require the largest possible application of country members both to the ground and to the Parliament in Adelaide. The fourth argument challenges the validity of the principle of one vote one value. Examples are put forward to show that there are many electoral systems based on other principles, and although it is fully admitted that in certain circumstances one vote one value may be appropriate, it is asserted that these circumstances are by no means universally present.

It is not difficult to pick holes in some or all of the above arguments, but such an action would scarcely be meaningful in the present

context. It would be of more value to examine the Labor Party's assertion that the above arguments are put forward in bad faith, *i.e.*, that they are a mere smoke screen for a Liberal and Country League attempt to keep themselves in office. In the opinion of the writer far too much Australian writing (particularly in academic circles) on political subjects makes the mistake of assuming that because an argument can be shown to be wrong a disreputable motive is thereby disclosed. This form of reasoning when applied to politicians almost certainly over-estimates their intelligence and under-estimates their sincerity.

These are the terms that he is applying to members opposite. I do not agree. I think they are more intelligent than he does. He went on to say:—

Motives are extremely difficult to determine in a case like this and the "obvious interest" motive should be treated as warily here as it is in a court of law.

Then he went on to analyse the Senate vote, but unfortunately he did not disclose the method he used to work out the figures, as I have sought carefully to do with the figures in the schedule to this Bill. I have attempted to justify his figures, and have had statisticians at the university trying to do so. The conclusions Dr. Forbes put in the schedule cannot be justified by any known arithmetical process, but that does not refute for a moment the view that he has clearly put, that there is not very much in the hotpotch that comes forward from members opposite on this subject.

What is the position facing the people of this State? They want the policy of the Australian Labor Party, to make the House responsive to the people, to be provided with greater social services, to have closer settlement of country areas and decentralization, and to have a Land Board break up the larger estates in order to bring about closer settlement. They believe they should have industrial protection, and legislation of the value and force that exists in most other States of the Commonwealth. Indeed, they want general things that affect the ordinary every-day life of the people of this State—social services in the way of housing, and better terms to enable them to obtain them. They want better industrial legislation, and the payment of a level of wages commensurate with those obtaining in other States. I am not talking about averages as members opposite are so fond of doing, but about the actual distribution of wages, because that is what matters. The people also want the provision of general social services, the things that ordinary people in need require. These are the things they are

after, the things for which they have consistently fought, but which have been consistently denied them.

This denial is a complete denial of the very basis of democracy. No Government, be it of my party or any other, can govern satisfactorily unless it has the fear that if it does not do what the simple majority of the electors want, it will be out on its ear after the next election. No Government governs satisfactorily when it is protected behind a rigged electoral system, brought into force for the sole, selfish and single advantage of keeping it in power despite the wishes of the people, and that is the position obtaining in South Australia; it is completely contrary to principle, morality and justice. The only way we can right it is by doing something about it immediately and not fobbing off proposals for reform with the sort of twaddle brought forward on occasions like this—the lame excuses we hear from members opposite, who say there is not time to do what we seek now. The time to do anything right is now, and that is why I ask members to vote for the motion.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga)—At the outset, I applaud the high moral tone on which my young and inexperienced colleague has based this debate. He has made it perfectly clear that he will not have a jot or tittle of the existing electoral laws in this State: it is a blot on our escutcheon. He went to some trouble to explain why he, disregarding his colleagues, voted for this very electoral law that is now the law in this State, but he omitted to tell us—and I think it would have been of some interest to the House—why he really voted for the legislation dealing with electoral re-distribution when it was before Parliament. He voted for it because he was instructed to vote for it. That is a very high moral code—the highest that I know of—to do what you are told to do by a junta that is not an electoral junta! That is the apex of morality!

Mr. Dunstan—Do you think I was against it?

Mr. SHANNON—I know jolly well the honourable member was, because I heard his speech and saw him vote. I have the utmost contempt for members who, on high moral grounds, take a certain stand and then, for an obvious expected advantage, vote in a different way, and that is what happened on that occasion.

Mr. RICHES—On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the honourable member

be corrected, through you, in the statement that he heard the speech made by the member for Norwood on that Bill. A reference to *Hansard* will show that only two speeches were made on it and the only speech from a member on this side of the House was that made by the Leader of the Opposition. The member for Onkaparinga has made an incorrect statement, and should be corrected.

The SPEAKER—It is no point of order. The honourable member for Onkaparinga.

Mr. SHANNON—There is another point on which I should like to take the member for Norwood to task. In reply to an interjection by me, which I admit was made with an ulterior motive, he admitted that his Party still has proportional representation as part of its platform. We have heard *ad nauseam* about one vote one value—so much so that I cannot believe that some people really believe in it. What does it actually mean? Let me analyse it. It provides for representation on the basis of the percentage of electors in each district. Those who propound this form of election to Parliament recommend that there should be not fewer than seven members to each district. It is an old system, so it seems an odd number of candidates must be elected. The last man elected, if five were required, would only require one-fifth of the number of votes that the first man elected received. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that under the Standing Orders you must count heads when a vote is taken. You do not count how many votes each member received at an election.

The Labor Party supports proportional representation under its platform. It believes that minorities should have some voice in Parliament, but members representing minorities would have the same voting power as those returned by an overwhelming majority. The principle of one vote one value seems to me to be one of those shibboleths which may catch many votes in the metropolitan area, but not so many in the country. I believe the member for Norwood realizes that. He referred to the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse). He knows him well, and I understand there was a time when their views were not far apart. I think he will understand me when I say that there are times when things are different, and when they are different they are not the same. Therefore, it is in the interests of his Party for him to follow the good old Party platform.

It is a pity we cannot all be so outspoken and frank as some of these greatly vilified

young Liberals. They have been courageous enough in their enthusiasm, and sometimes in their lack of judgment, to come out and say what they think. It is good for our Party and politics generally that they have that courage. They may have a different point of view from we older men, and I accept the charge laid against me by the member for Norwood that I am an elder statesman. Sometimes I feel I may have reached the stage where it is difficult to change my views and see the point of view put forward by younger men. However, I do my best to understand their views, and I hope the Labor Party has some enthusiastic and courageous young men, but I regret that their freedom to express their views frankly is not as great as in our Party. If that were so the Labor Party might get a new lease of life. I am not one of the those who think it is a good thing for one Party to be in power year after year. Our democratic way of life is moulded on the basis of a change of government now and again. It is a good idea to listen to the other fellow occasionally, but the Labor Party will remain in opposition until it becomes virile again and has some ideas to offer the people. How many different voices speak for the Australian Labor Party? How can members opposite expect to have a united front when the Party appoints men like Dr. Burton to high office?

Mr. Dunstan—That is in the Federal sphere.

Mr. SHANNON—I regret the honourable member is not sufficiently frank to admit that what I have said is true. Some Labor leaders say the Party must pipe down on nationalization and other things which apparently do not appeal to the rank and file. Then others, such as Mr. Eddie Ward, come out on the other side and say they would even nationalize farms. No Party can attain office if it does not make up its mind on what it wants to do. How can it expect the electors to support it if the Party's would-be leaders do not know themselves which way they want to go? It is not in the best interests of good government to have divisions or splinter groups within a Party. I regret that these things have occurred in the ranks of the Opposition, and it seems that now they are whistling in order to keep their courage up. They will not get into power until their ranks are closed.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Are you referring to the Federal or the State sphere?

Mr. SHANNON—Both, because the Labor Party has splinter groups everywhere, and I regret that this is so. I am no supporter of the Democratic Labor Party, and if I had my

way I would cut their throats tomorrow. Members opposite may use that on the hustings against me if it is of any use to them. The motion is more remarkable for what it does not say than for what it does. Sometimes it is wise to frame a motion in broad terms, but we are dealing with an important matter and we should know what is in the mind of the Opposition. It is a matter of life and death to members of Parliament, and the motion should be worded as specifically as possible. We have not been told how many districts there would be, or how many members would represent each district. We have not been told whether proportional representation will be introduced. I understand that proportional representation will not work without multiple seats.

At present there are 39 members of this Chamber. That number is not divisible by five or seven. Does the Labor Party propose 40 members, with five from eight districts, or 42 members, with six from seven electorates? I have certain views on the division of the State into electoral boundaries, and on the services that should be rendered.

Mr. Jennings—Why don't you give evidence to the commission?

Mr. SHANNON—I will give it now. I do not know whether the honourable member will give his evidence now, or whether he is recommending eight districts with five members each or six districts with seven members.

Mr. Jennings—Curb your impatience. I am only waiting until you finish talking.

Mr. SHANNON—I am going to continue talking, like the member for Norwood. Perhaps I shall convince myself as he did himself. Members opposite have said in effect that a commission should consider all the matters that need to be taken into account and that at this stage Parliament should not be concerned with all the pettifogging and annoying details. I have some personal interest in the matter; as a member of Parliament I 'naturally am concerned about the system under which I was elected. I do not think we should leave it to a Royal Commission to determine whether there should be eight districts with five members each, six districts with seven members or five districts with eight members. The motion leaves this aspect completely in the air. It is obvious, in any case, that acceptance of the motion would result in larger electorates. If we divide the State to provide for this so-called one vote one value, with equal numerical strength in electorates—and for the sake of

argument we shall assume there will be six districts with seven members—I think it is obvious that the metropolitan area would get four districts. We have had some experience of equal numerical strength in electorates. Ever since Federation we have had it in the Federal arena. What has been our experience as a result? I think every member will admit that the preponderance of voting strength granted under that system to the eastern coast of Australia—and particularly to the big cities—has not been in the best interests of Australia, or aided the development of Western Australia, South Australia, or Tasmania. It has not encouraged a dichotomy that would give more remote and sparsely settled areas an indication that they would be developed and ultimately play a part in the national economy. We on this side are often accused of representing vested interests.

Mr. Jennings—You are not doing a bad job for yourself at the moment.

Mr. SHANNON—I have admitted that I have a vested interest in this particular motion. I may be a mug to admit it, but I am looking after myself in this matter. However, the vested interests in these big capital cities have seen to it that the Australian fiscal policy was so arranged that they were assured of a livelihood irrespective of what happened to our main source of wealth—our primary industries. As a result of this system the Grants Commission has been established to iron out these anomalies. There would be no need for the commission if South Australia, Western Australia and Tasmania had been allowed to progress in step with the major cities which they could and would have done. I think every person in South Australia knows by this time that if it had not been for Tom Playford and his Government, and the policy it has pursued over the last decade, this State would not have been nearly as happy as it is today. Why are we starting to step up in the economic field of the Commonwealth? Why are we starting to take our place? Only because of the virility and drive shown by the Premier and his Government, which has given us the more balanced economy between our secondary and primary industries that the eastern seaboard has enjoyed almost since Federation because of the fiscal policy of the Federal Parliament.

Had it not been for the tenacity of our Premier in seeing that we got our share of industries we would still be a mendicant

State. For these reasons I find it difficult to work up any great enthusiasm for this shibboleth of one vote one value. It is obvious that members opposite themselves do not agree with it. If they did they certainly would not be fostering their present policy of proportional representation. They would not foster a system which would give some small group of enthusiastic and well-wishing people, with an ideal in one field, the same voice in the affairs of this State as the great majority of people in the same electorate. I am sure the member for Norwood, on reflection, will realize the error of his ways and when he gets an opportunity of speaking at a Labor convention will say, "Let us get rid of proportional representation first and then we can get back to enunciating our policy of one vote one value. While we have proportional representation on our platform it is physically impossible for us to enunciate such a policy." I am sure his legal training will lead him to that conclusion as soon as he gives the matter some thought.

The Leader of the Opposition represents a vast area comprising almost one-third of the State, and whilst it is an easy task for most members, including myself, to visit every section of their electorates, I doubt whether he can do likewise. I sympathize with him in that regard. How would he be affected under the proposal? These factors must be borne in mind. The Leader said that the size of electoral districts must be considered in re-arranging boundaries. I think members opposite realize that there is such a question as the size of electorates and that the people who live in electorates should have means of communication with their fellow electors and that there should be some community of interest. These are all desiderata that should be taken into account if we are going to come to a reasonable understanding of what we should do with electoral boundaries. I am not worrying about the other States. I will not give any figures. I have heard figures quoted *ad nauseam*, and I do not think they are helpful. Electoral results can be analysed *ad libitum* and different answers obtained. There must be a certain amount of guesswork in connection with electorates that are untested. There is always a drift to be taken into account when we compare State and Federal elections, for the issues are quite different. When we try to analyse these things over a period we do not get anywhere. Under Parliamentary government it is essential for us not to lose sight of the sources of the State's

revenue. After all, the man who pays the piper calls the tune, and there is a fundamental soundness in this old adage. We should not delude ourselves into believing that we can forget the man who produces wool, wheat, dairy products and minerals, and still survive as a State. These men are fundamental to the economy of the State, and therefore their voice in this place should be sufficient to make itself heard. As soon as we give the metropolitan people a commanding voice in this matter we shall reap the whirlwind.

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield)—I was interested in the remarks by Mr. Shannon and Mr. Coumbe, and I shall refer to them later. First I want to deal with some of the Premier's remarks. We had from him one of those unedifying and odious speeches that he resorts to at times when he knows, and everyone else knows, that he has no case. Then he turns to the cheer squad behind him, and, with hooligan gestures and intemperate language, looks for its support. It pays homage to him in his fight to save seats for the Liberal Party. The Premier and Mr. Coumbe referred to the time factor. It was said that we cannot appoint a Royal Commission and receive its report before the end of the session, but I believe it is possible. The motion specifically mentions the current session. There is no reason why the session should finish on November 28, December 6, or December 18, or why members should not come back in January and sit until February. It is absurd for members to sit twiddling their thumbs for seven months of the year and then have the Parliamentary business rushed through in five months. There is no reason why the Royal Commission should not have plenty of opportunities to examine the evidence tendered and submit a recommendation for ratification by Parliament, even if it goes on till early in the new year. There would still be time to print the new rolls before the day of the election.

Once again the Premier has come forward with one of his specious excuses in an attempt to cloud the issue. He gave us exactly the same speech that we have heard many times before when he has opposed moves by the Opposition for electoral reform. He always takes us on a Cook's tour. He goes all over the world, but never goes to Victoria, where they have recently adopted the principle of one vote one value. Another example, which is conspicuous by its absence, is the House of Representatives. It is not mentioned because under the Commonwealth Constitution the districts must be of approximately the same numer-

ical strength. We always hear, too, about the glorious democracy in America but I am not at all impressed because, rightly or wrongly, I do not consider that country to be a great democracy, although some members may think differently. We are told that Tasmania, with its limited population, elects as many senators as New South Wales with its far greater population. Once again I am not particularly impressed, for the Labor Party wants to abolish the Senate because it is recognised as a Party House and because the purpose for which it was designed is not being carried out. It is undoubtedly a Party house, and according to the system under which we work it is inevitable that any Chamber must be a Party House. We are told that the South Australian Upper House is not a Party House, but when the vote takes place we see just what type of House it is.

We should look at this matter as Australians, and from an Australian point of view the Senate election method is not democratic, although not so bad as the election for this House. In the Senate the electorates contain a wide section of the community, and that gives fair representation. We have a different position here where an industrial area of 20,000 people elects one member, and a completely rural electorate with 6,000 voters elects one, with all members having an equal vote. We have been told about the position in Western Australia and have had pointed out to us the disparity in the numerical strength of the various electorates. The Premier has made these statements before and they have been refuted by the Opposition but he still comes up with the same argument. There is no sound argument against our proposal for electoral reform, so the Premier uses the arguments that have been exploded many times before. In Western Australia there is numerically a great disparity between country and metropolitan seats but, instead of having two zones as we have, there are three, and the electorates within each zone are fairly equal numerically. The result is that each area returns members fairly accurately representing the total vote in the area. The final result is that the membership of Parliament is much more indication of the way people vote than it is in South Australia. We hear from Government members that there is a need for extra country representation. In Western Australia during the regime of a Liberal Government the very sparsely populated northern areas had the number of electorates reduced by one for the reason that the people voted Labor instead of

Liberal. There were fairly solid mining pockets there with a considerable number of Labor voters, but although in South Australia it is a sacred principle to give weighted electorates to country areas, in Western Australia, where they were faced with having a small country representation working to their detriment, they did just the opposite to what is claimed should be done here—one of the country seats in that sparsely settled area was abolished. Even though the system in Western Australia is not as good as it should be, it is no argument for the Premier to say that it is a justification for the rotten system we have here. Labor members certainly are not ashamed to say that they do not believe in the system in Western Australia either, nor I think does the Western Australian branch of the Australian Labor Party believe in it. However, it was introduced not by a Labor Government, but by a Liberal Government. We have never claimed that Liberals, if they happen to be in Western Australia, are less politically depraved than here or anywhere else. As far as we are concerned they are all tarred with the same brush, and whilst we certainly do not agree with what has been done in Western Australia, it is not fair to advance that system to justify a greater wrong.

The Premier referred to certain States as "other States," because even though in some ways he may have got some help from them, he must have known they did not provide a very strong case to justify his attitude. Another perennial brought forward when a Bill of this nature is being discussed is the progress of South Australia. It is said that this progress has come about purely and simply because we have this peculiar form of electoral law, plus—and I feel sure that this is always an undertone in the Premier's remarks—the fact that we have had the inestimable blessing of having him as Premier. Whilst the State's progress has been quite considerable, I have yet to be convinced that the progress made in the last 20 years—which is the period always mentioned, and it coincides with the number of years the Premier has been in office—is irrevocably bound up with the electoral system. This seems to me to be typical of Fascism, Communism, Nazism or any form of totalitarianism. The attitude of a dictator is "We know what is best for you. We know better than you and we will do the best for you." I have no doubt that in many instances these totalitarian forms of Government and the people who lead them believe sincerely that they know best, and want to inflict on the people what is best

for them, always, of course, with the mental reservation that whilst it might be best for the people concerned, it is equally good for them.

The Premier also said that the reason why the Leader of the Opposition introduced this motion was that the Labor Party wants to get control. The member for Norwood has dealt with that fully and effectively. The Premier went on to say—and he was echoed by the member for Torrens—that all we have to do to obtain control is to have an acceptable policy. It is manifest, and cannot be denied by anyone from the figures given to this House today and previously when matters like this have been debated, that we obviously have a policy that is acceptable to most people in this State. That is obvious because the majority in this State has consistently, in the last nine or ten years, voted for Labor. That much, therefore, is just eyewash, designed to draw attention away from the real issues of this debate. Our policy is certainly acceptable to the people, not only in the city, but in country areas, as was shown recently in two memorable by-elections.

Now that the Labor Party in this State is making its policy clear to people in the country as well as in the city because of the extra facilities available, country people realize just as much as those in the city that they have been hoodwinked for years by this gerrymander, and that instead of being in their interests, it is a weapon against them. They have seen plenty of evidence of that over the years in the way the country has been neglected, only because the Government and Government members would inevitably suffer politically through increased population in country electorates. Although we do not fear the results of the next elections even under the present system, we still regard it as an obligation on us to endeavour to obtain fair representation for everyone in this State, and this motion is one way to achieve that.

The Premier mentioned our attitude to the recommendations of the previous Royal Commission. That was also mentioned by most of his supporters who spoke on this motion. The Premier pointed out that every member on this side of the House voted for those recommendations, but he conveniently forgot to point out that we fought tooth and nail the terms of reference setting up the commission. We agreed that very little good would come of it, but when the recommendation came back and it was obvious that things as between country and the metropolitan area had been

improved without affecting at all the overall injustice, we felt we had justified our consciences in opposing the restricted terms of reference, but were quite justified in supporting the Bill because it made things slightly better than before. If we had not supported it—and this was made clear by the Premier in one of his usual intimidatory speeches—it would not have gone through the House. As a result, I think we were quite justified in accepting something slightly better than before, and I make no apologies for doing so. The Premier certainly did not mention in all his long and interesting, but completely irrelevant, speech on this motion that we fought tooth and nail against setting up the commission in the way it was set up. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

BENEFIT ASSOCIATIONS BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

[*Sitting suspended from 6 till 7.30 p.m.*]

BUDGET DEBATE.

In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from September 23. Page 853.)

Grand Total £73,413,000.

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla)—To me one of the most important provisions in the Budget is the proposal to establish steelworks at Whyalla, but I shall not speak on that now because the matter is being inquired into by a Select Committee. We are all very conscious of the industrial development of the State, but there is one aspect to which I should like to draw attention. It is very noticeable that in attracting big and important industries we have had to grant special privileges in most instances, and they are demanding concessions as their price of establishment here. Others are making profits which many consider very excessive, and in one instance these profits are mainly going overseas. There is not the slightest doubt that if that is repeated often it will considerably affect our exchange position. Apart from the question of the State's progress, this granting of concessions results in providing employment; but at the same time we are being told it is also necessary to foster hire-purchase to the limit to provide employment. To provide work for our people we are being put in the position of having to give to big industries concessions that we are not prepared to give to others; and these big industries are assuming such power that it is

questionable who will be governing this country in the years to come, because their influence on the political and economic position will be felt in every direction. Many of them are assuming the nature of monopolies. It is surprising to find that this trend receives the support it does from a Party which prides itself on free enterprise and particularly on competition, because there is no doubt that competition is being stifled in many directions because of the concessions and privileges that are being granted.

I noticed in the Treasurer's remarks an almost complete absence of any reference to the financial relationships between the States and the Commonwealth, and I could not help feeling that this was possibly due to the fact that a Federal election is approaching. This year the States will have £14,000,000 less for works than for 1951-52, although in the intervening period there have been increases in costs of about 50 per cent; but the Commonwealth this year will spend £18,000,000 more on works than in 1951-52. Despite the great progress referred to by the Treasurer, our State public debt now totals £296,000,000, an increase of more than £20,000,000 compared with last year. It is worthwhile comparing the State's public debt position with that of the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth's public debt has decreased from £1,771,000,000 to £1,589,000,000, a fall of £182,000,000. We have heard nothing about this very important aspect of the relationship between the States and the Commonwealth. The States are in quite a different position. In 1951 their public debt amounted to £894,000,000, but in the same period it has risen to £1,965,000,000, an increase of £1,071,000,000.

The Treasurer has been very critical of the Commonwealth concerning the Snowy River Waters Agreement, but with a Federal election looming he remains silent on this very important question of the financial relationships of the States and the Commonwealth. I understand that the money the Commonwealth Government receives from the Commonwealth Bank and from its deficit financing at one per cent will be lent to the States for their works programmes at about $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, so it will make a profit of about £4,000,000 at the expense of State development. Why have we heard nothing of this position in this Budget? These factors are having an ever-increasing adverse effect on our policy to deal adequately with housing, education and other allied problems.

The member for Light (Mr. Hambour) made some remarks on finance generally and I was rather struck with one or two of his statements. He said that every penny of money which comes into existence comes in the form of debt. He was referring to a statement of Mr. Quirke's. Mr. Hambour went on to say, referring to the remark just mentioned, "That is true, but if I said that the grass was green it would be true." The position is that grass is naturally green provided the weather is not too dry, but it is certainly not natural that every penny of money which comes into existence should come in the form of a debt.

Mr. Hambour—I was referring to Mr. Quirke's statement.

Mr. LOVEDAY—You said that you agreed with it. The honourable member overlooked the fact that a long time ago money was regarded as the medium of exchange, but for a long time now it has been regarded mainly as a commodity by the community. It is still used as a medium of exchange, but that has become a minor factor in the community. I shall refer to a statement made regarding the question of monetary policy which I have repeated before in this Chamber and which I think bears repetition, because it has a bearing on what Mr. Hambour had to say. He was discussing the provision of cheap money and said it was all a question of how much and where it went. I interjected and referred to a statement by the Governor of the Bank of England, Mr. Vincent Cartwright Vickers. He was Governor of the bank in 1910 and resigned his appointment in 1919. He wrote a very interesting book on the economic tribulations of economic conditions in Great Britain, with particular reference to the monetary situation and its problems. After discussing these monetary problems he concluded by making this general statement in regard to the direction of future policy:—

The main objectives, however, should include State control and State issue of currency and credit through a central organization managed and controlled by the State . . . Any additional supply of money should be issued as a clear asset to the State; so that money will be spent into existence, and not lent into existence.

He referred to the desirability of the abolition of the debt system where all credit is created by the banks and hired out at interest to the country. I commend that statement to the member for Light (Mr. Hambour) because I think that, had we paid more attention to this aspect of the issue of low interest money which I am quite certain could have been

done), many of our housing and allied problems could have been dealt with far more effectively than is the case today.

Unfortunately, however, we are not getting any support for progress in that direction from any members of the Liberal Party. I have never found that that Party has anything to say on this question which leads us to think that we shall have any reform of this monetary question. When one has been here for a few years, one can see that most of the problems besetting the State have at their base the monetary problem. Until that is tackled, I fail to see how we can make much progress in alleviating the housing situation as it should be alleviated.

Turning to railways administration and costs, I notice that the Premier made some remarks about the losses incurred by the Railways Department. This, of course, has been a sore point for many years and any suggestion that can be made to cut these losses is well worth consideration and inquiry. I was reliably informed recently of an instance which I think, throws light on what has been happening with our railways and those responsible for heavy losses on freight. A case was put to me about seven cartons of goods sent to Melbourne. The freight on those goods, including the cost of cartage from the factory in Adelaide to Mile End by motor transport, and then on to Melbourne by rail, was 44s.; but the private carrier in Melbourne charged 38s. for those seven cartons to be taken three-quarters of a mile from the Melbourne rail terminal to the final point of delivery. The cost of sending the same goods by road from the point of origin to the final point of delivery was about 1s. 6d. under the sum of those two amounts—82s. Consequently, road transport would get the job. By equating the cost of the short delivery at the Melbourne end, the private carriers can compete against the railways in this fashion.

We have heard much about the damage to our roads by road hauliers who are evading reasonable payments to compensate for road damage. There is not the slightest doubt that our railways are being subjected to particularly unfair competition along these lines. A result of this competition is that much freight is being forced off the State railways on to the roads. Many firms have taken their carrying away from the railways for this reason. I could mention the names of several, but do not think it is desirable to do so here. I suggest that a full inquiry is needed into this aspect of railway freight loss, and that steps should be taken

to rectify the situation. It may require conferences between the States to ascertain why some States are not running their own motor transport so that the goods can be carried from the railway terminals to the point of delivery, since that appears to be the weakness of this situation. If this was investigated, we would find that a tremendous loss on our railways system was resulting from this completely unfair competition.

The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) said something about the need for a great increase in productivity and suggested that we could overcome that difficulty by incentive schemes. Nobody is more conscious of the need for higher productivity than those who work in the factories, irrespective of whether they are staff members. I am certain from my experience in the Labor movement that the manual workers in factories are just as conscious of the need for higher productivity and desire it as much as anybody else; but when incentive schemes are talked about, as a rule they meet the stiffest resistance. The honourable member said that many workers desire incentive schemes. Perhaps many of them are young men without much knowledge of what incentive schemes have meant in the past; perhaps some of them have had no experience of that sort of thing. There are some fundamental reasons why incentive schemes are objected to and meet with great opposition.

Let us consider the employee in a factory and see why he has such an objection to these schemes. It is worth talking about because one so often hears it said that incentive schemes can be applied with the greatest of ease. In the past many such schemes have been introduced, as the honourable member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) mentioned last night, and the rate of production has been stepped up to a certain level. The men have been told that they are expected to keep that high rate of production going; they have seen their rates cut and have been left high and dry. There are other objections too. In the first place the introduction of incentive schemes in a factory generally produces a situation where many set out to gain the best sort of job, to the detriment of their fellow workers. They soon learn which are the most payable, because rate-fixing is a difficult and intricate problem and, no matter how good the rate-fixer is, there are bound to be some anomalies.

There is the situation, too, where the older man cannot keep up with the younger man. He finds himself at a grave disadvantage despite, possibly, a whole lifetime of service in a parti-

cular works. We find also that, as a rule, it results in disunity in the factory, which is objected to by anybody who works there with a sense of trade union unity. The trade unionist knows perfectly well that unity amongst the workers in a factory is the only strength they have and the only bargaining factor worth while. As an individual, the worker is fairly helpless. If he realizes the importance of that, as most workers do, he knows that the introduction of any incentive scheme that produces disunity is something to be opposed. He knows also that, with an increase in production in any particular place, there is always the danger that, when a certain level is reached he may be put off. I have noticed that people who have investments to make and are interested in a large industry are conscious of the fact that they desire complete security for the money they are investing; but the security of their investment, in view of the fact that most of that money is spare, is nowhere near so important as the security of a man's job. So the employee is always thinking of the possibility that, if production is raised to a certain point, his services may be dispensed with. I have heard of very few places where a guarantee is given that, if production is raised to a certain point, other work will be found for the worker. We have no system in this country yet under which employment in another direction is guaranteed if production is raised to a point where a certain works no longer requires the same number of employees. The workman himself knows perfectly well, when put in that situation, that he may have to sell his home and live elsewhere in consequence of being unemployed. He may lose heavily on that movement. He may see the work of a lifetime around his house disappear in one stroke. These factors weigh in the men's minds when they hear talk of incentive schemes and unless this problem is approached on the broadest angle and all these points are taken into consideration I am sure the workers will never enthusiastically embrace incentive schemes. The only incentive schemes they would accept are those in which they feel sure of their economic future and believe that disunity will not be created in the works, and in which the lowest worker—the man who is doing a job for which it is hard to fix a rate—will be in with the others on the job, because after all every worker in a factory is a necessary part of that factory.

Mr. Hambour—That is a pretty negative attitude to build a nation on.

Mr. LOVEDAY—The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) said last night that the initiative in these schemes lay with the management. It does, because the worker in a factory can do nothing of his own accord concerning the points I have mentioned. Unless the management is prepared to view the question as a whole on these broad issues there will be no real co-operation, nor can there be because the worker must watch his own personal economy, welfare and future just as much as the investor desires to secure himself against every possible contingency—and, believe me, investors today are doing that particularly well, as the honourable member will see when he examines one or two matters that will soon come before the House. The investor is prepared to protect himself against every possible contingency in perpetuity if he can. If this is a negative attitude on the part of the worker it is equally a negative attitude on the part of investors. The initiative rests with the management. If a move that is made by workers or their organizations in a factory does not receive the approval of the management it will get nowhere because management has the last word in any industrial organization.

I will not apologize for once more discussing the Bush Church Aid Society, which I feel should receive more consideration. I have been able to secure some satisfaction, but not as much as I hoped for. The latest report on the activities of the society shows that it has just added the hundredth out-station to its network. The service was opened in 1953 with one out-station and a small shack as a control station. It now includes an increasing fishing boat network and a 60-member radio school. The first transmissions were made to Cook Hospital at 9 a.m. and 6 p.m. each day. Now there are 10 sessions a day, plus school lessons. The station handles 5,000 telegrams a year and 1,000 air medical consultations and covers an area of 500,000 square miles. The radio school, running in conjunction with the South Australian Correspondence school, has been chosen as a model for the newly opened Port Augusta Radio school run by the Royal Flying Doctor Service. Increased operating demands have rendered it essential to extend the control stations. A new sound studio is being built and new electronic equipment is being installed, and to raise the £1,000 necessary the society is making a birthday appeal through the network to those interested in the work.

I pay a tribute to this organization and to the Royal Flying Doctor Service, both of which operate in my electorate. They are doing a

wonderful job. I raised this matter in speaking to the 1956 Budget and I referred to a request which the society had then made for an increase in assistance from £500 to £1,000 to help meet the increasing maintenance costs of £2,000. No increase had been made in the grant of £500 since the Government first gave assistance. Last year I pursued the matter again and it was inquired into. I asked that the grant be increased from £500 to £1,250. The matter was investigated and in view of all the circumstances a recommendation was made that the grant be increased to £750. It was mentioned in a letter I received from the Premier and the Auditor-General that in addition the society received the benefit of the Penong Hospital grant of £300 bringing the total assistance to about £1,000. I contend that the grant to the Penong Hospital should not be taken into consideration because it really did not come within the ambit of the usual form of assistance to flying doctor services.

Prior to the grant of £300 to the Penong service the Penong doctor left the area and the Ceduna doctor who filled the gap found that he was losing money on the service. To overcome the difficulty, the Bush Church Aid Society volunteered to help and agreed to fly the doctor to Penong. I point out that if the society had not offered to do this the Government would have been obliged to assist and I think that is admitted by virtue of the fact that the grant was made to the Penong Hospital. The money is still paid to that hospital but it finds its way to the society and is used for the purpose of transporting the doctor to Penong when required.

It has been admitted as a result of the inquiry that was made that it costs far more than £300 a year to transport the doctor from Ceduna to Penong as required. The return trip is 100 miles and the normal charge of medical men is at least 3s. a mile. Information I have concerning the number of trips reveals that the cost of the society is in excess of what it receives. In this connection the Auditor-General said:—

It is worthy of note, however, that in 1955 there were 56 'plane trips to Penong and based on the average cost a mile of operating the aircraft the actual cost to the society of these trips was in excess of the £300 granted.

In effect, the society is doing something to aid the State Government, but is not receiving sufficient to recompense itself for the cost involved. I hope this matter will receive further attention and that a different approach

to it will be made. I trust it will no longer be contented that this amount is part of the normal assistance. I desire to make a suggestion about assisting the future operations of the society. The financial assistance given to the Bush Church Aid Society is different from that given to the Royal Flying Doctor Service. The report of the latter society for the year ended June 30, 1957, said that the South Australian service, which covers Alice Springs and Port Augusta, received a South Australian Government subsidy of £1,000 and a Commonwealth Government subsidy of £4,091. The Bush Church Aid Society receives no assistance from the Commonwealth Government, and this year it will receive only £750 from the State. The Government should take a different approach to this matter. It should assist both societies on the basis of so much a mile, and I suggest a subsidy of 9d. for each mile flown as a fair arrangement. I believe this would stop the criticism that these societies are not being treated in the same way by the State Government.

I cannot see any reason why they should be treated differently. They both perform excellent services over a vast area, and the importance of those services cannot be overestimated. The Bush Church Aid Society told me it would be willing to forgo the Penong grant and still carry out all its work if a simple formula, such as I have suggested, were adopted. Its mileage is about 40,000 a year, and the 1957 report of the Royal Flying Doctor Service stated that it flew 56,000 miles in that year. When the Auditor-General inquired into this matter he suggested that in order to cut costs the Bush Church Aid Society should consider chartering aeroplanes. I do not know whether it is realized that the society provides aeroplanes not only for emergency calls, but for regular, scheduled flights to Kingoonya Hospital and Cook Hospital, and to other places on the east-west line. Therefore, a chartered aeroplane could not meet all the society's requirements. Furthermore, it would be useless to use chartered aeroplanes for emergency calls, for badly injured patients could not be given prompt attention, especially if the aeroplane had to come from Adelaide. I hope this matter will again be investigated to see whether the formula I have suggested can be adopted. I am sure it would give satisfaction to both societies, which deserve all the assistance the Government can give them.

Recently, we have heard much about Government assistance to country districts, and that

it is necessary to retain the present electoral system for the benefit of country people. One way the Government can assist people in the country is by providing more assistance to these flying doctor services. Many other societies will be assisted generously under the Budget, but their needs are not so urgent as those of these two services. Early in the session the Leader of the Opposition asked questions about X-ray machines in shoe stores. This subject cannot be adequately dealt with by way of question, so I will discuss it now and ask whether further action can be taken. The Leader of the Opposition asked:—

Will the Premier see whether these machines are being used to any extent in South Australia and whether action is necessary to protect the health of those using them?

He said that on June 6 the *Advertiser* published a report from Sydney which stated:—

X-ray machines in shoe stores were "inventions of the devil," the Assistant Director of the Commonwealth X-ray and Radium Laboratory (Mr. J. F. M. Richardson) said today.

Later the Minister of Works gave the Leader of the Opposition the following reply:—

I have received the following report from the Director-General of Public Health (Dr. Southwood):—

"X-ray machines in shoe stores in South Australia are checked at intervals by the State Department of Public Health to ensure that they are sufficiently shielded to prevent anyone working in the vicinity receiving more than the recognized safe dose of ionizing radiation. Owners of machines are given notices to put on the machine."

A copy of a notice is attached to the report. I do not think we are permitted to bring exhibits into the Chamber, but if the honourable member desires he can see it. The report continues:—

"These notices warn the public about being X-rayed too frequently. At the last survey in 1957 there were 23 machines known to be in use."

A report I received recently showed that this question requires more attention than is being given to it. The *Medical Journal of Australia* recently described shoe fitting with X-ray machines as being farcical and dangerous. It said that the danger was confined mainly to shop assistants who may expose their own feet repeatedly in demonstrating the machines and run a risk of both somatic and genetic damage. A recent survey of shoe fitting fluoroscopes in New South Wales has shown that one Sydney salesman who operated a machine for several years has already a gonad dose greater than the 50R laid down as the safe limit for people occupationally exposed. There is also a small

but possibly not insignificant risk to customers who try out shoes in the machine. A child using these machines for several fittings a day might sustain damage to bone formation. Adults and children could sustain damage to the skin, but the genetic risk is the cause of most concern. Women shop assistants may contract X-ray dermatitis after 10 years of working a machine several times a day.

A survey of New South Wales shoe fitting machines that was conducted by Dr. Bell and Mr. H. M. Whaite, senior scientific officer of the Industrial Hygiene Division, covered 37 machines in 14 Sydney stores, and six other stores in three country towns. They said that only four of the machines fulfilled all standards of safety that had been adopted as a reasonable minimum. Therefore, they recommended that shoe fitting machines be banned in New South Wales. Failing that, they suggested that their use be restricted to trained persons with the necessary status and authority to resist unnecessary customer demands, and who had adequate technical knowledge and an understanding of foot abnormalities. Sales people operating some of these machines could get a gonad dose greater than the permissible limit of 50R if they worked under existing conditions for 50 weeks of the year for 12 years. Assistants working the two worst units, which were both at major city stores, would only need to make three exposures a week with one and 18 with the other over the 12-year period to exceed the safe gonad dose. One machine gave customers a skin dose of about 86 rontgens for every 10 seconds exposure, 40 times greater than the Bell and Whaite safe standard of radiation from shoe fitting machines.

Surveys showed that few of the sales people had much idea of the hazards involved. Some had had no instruction in the correct use and some machines faced seats where customers sat. Victoria has banned these machines and I point out that the safe dose for a man's entire lifetime should not be an exposure to more than 200 rontgens of radiation for his whole body. The matter should be taken up more thoroughly than it has been and more adequate inquiry made, with consideration being given to banning the machines if thought necessary. It has been thought necessary elsewhere and there seems to be no reason why they should be allowed to operate if they constitute a danger to public health.

Many points warrant a full discussion on the proposed steelworks at Whyalla but although that matter concerns my electorate

I prefer to leave it until later. I support the first line.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Edwardstown)—This Budget should have contained more references to the prosperity that is supposed to exist in secondary industries. In the Loan Estimates debate a reference was made to the activities of the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department. It was said that people were encouraged to believe that more employment was available here than elsewhere and that during the time some people were waiting for particular types of work they could get assistance from the department. More can be said about this matter but I will leave it until later. Before members were asked to discuss the Budget the Auditor-General's report should have been available, as it has been for the last few years. It gives members an opportunity to check on Government expenditure. Mr. Hambour spoke about expenditure on public works. Almost always the estimated cost is exceeded. For instance, originally the cost of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital was to be about £2,000,000, but so far about £6,500,000 has been spent on it. The Auditor-General's report would have given us more information on this matter. Mr. Hambour suggested that when it became known that the hospital would cost so much more than the estimate the project could have been referred back to the Public Works Committee for further investigation, but I cannot agree with that. Mr. Geoffrey Clarke has always been a keen advocate of the appointment of a Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. Corcoran—The Government opposed it.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Apparently Mr. Clarke was unable to convince the Government of the need for such a committee, but if we are to watch Government expenditure properly we should have one. The Commonwealth Public Accounts Committee has done a very good job. Of course, the Public Works Committee exercises some rein over certain Government expenditure, but I cannot see why a Public Accounts Committee should not be appointed and given the complete oversight of all Government expenditure.

Unemployed people from other States may come to this State in an effort to find employment. A contract for nearly £4,000,000 has been let for the Myponga reservoir, and the work may last for a couple of years, so people may assume that employment is to be found there. However, the increasing use of machinery takes away the need for much unskilled labour. People may think that work will soon be available at the proposed oil

refinery, but from the evidence submitted to the Select Committee, I do not think the company has decided when it will commence operations, even if both Houses agree to the Committee's recommendations. The Budget speech could have contained some reference to the expected date on which the proposed steel-works will commence operations. Although all these undertakings will employ some men, unskilled labour is not used as much now because of the greater use of machinery, so they will not have a very big effect on unemployment.

A security block is to be constructed at the Magill Reformatory to accommodate juveniles who are now sent to Yatala. Also, as we learnt from the reply given by the Premier to the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan), the Government intends to enlarge the Glandore Industrial School, which was formerly known as the Edwardstown Industrial School. This institution already cares for three types of children—those who are a little subnormal, those whose parents have deserted them, and those who are not prepared to go to school or who have committed some small misdemeanours. It is also used to accommodate wards of the State sent out on rural work who have to come to the city for medical or dental treatment, as well as those over the age of 14 employed in various trades.

The Treasurer said greater use should be made of Struan. Is it the responsibility of the Chief Secretary, or of the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Board, or is it Government policy that the Treasurer is unable to achieve what he desires in this matter? If reform is necessary, this State should be able to deal with that problem, and if these young people are to be given an opportunity to become good citizens, facilities should exist for removing them from the bright lights of the city. Whatever the accommodation provided at Glandore, it is not adequate for the training the Superintendent desires to undertake. It is the Government's obligation to solve the problem with an approach that is different from that now proposed.

It is seldom that I am concerned about some of the remarks introduced into this debate, but last night I listened to the member for Light (Mr. Hambour), who related how he was entitled to certain freedom as a member of his political Party. I believe in the Party system of government and make no apology for that attitude, and I believe that when a member of a Party enters Parliament his first duty to that Party is loyalty.

Mr. Hambour—And we give it.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—The honourable member's loyalty should be first to the people who returned him here.

Mr. Hambour—I made the statement that we are free.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—If you were as free as you suggest I should question your loyalty to your Party.

Mr. Hambour—At least we are not dictated to from outside.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—As a result of an interview with the management of Chrysler Australia Ltd. at the time the "Horror" Budget was introduced by the Menzies-Fadden Government, I was asked to convene a Party conference in the company's office. I was able to get members of the Federal Opposition to interview the management, but even if Government members had been prepared to meet the management this would have to be arranged through their league headquarters at North Terrace. Is that the freedom to which the honourable member refers?

Mr. Hambour—You had better talk about something you understand.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I understand the position, because I was involved in it, and as a result of my efforts members of my Party were prepared to discuss the matter in Canberra on a national basis, but this did not apply to Government members. They had to be loyal to their Party and Leader in Canberra. I ask Mr. Hambour to remember that when he refers to the freedom of members of his Party.

I am concerned about the present set-up at the Edwardstown primary school. The Minister of Education will know that this school has been established for many years and possibly has at least 800 children attending it. The headmaster has a makeshift office, which I am afraid has become permanent. Only two cupboards in a lean-to shed are provided for a library and for the schoolbooks required by scholars. This section of the school has become dilapidated and is not appropriate considering the numbers attending.

Another matter I should like to bring to the Minister's notice is the type of tutoring there. Although the Edwardstown school has at least half an acre of ground, the headmaster has no say over it because it is used for elementary agricultural training purposes. My information indicates that this is at the moment denying about 300 infants reasonable access to it as a playing area. I understand

that this area is under a Mr. Ninnies for this purpose. On certain afternoons students from Wattle Park, Flinders Street and Gilles Street schools and the Teachers' Training College have to attend there for agricultural classes. In all, there would be an attendance about every Monday, Thursday and Friday afternoon and one Wednesday morning every fourth week, and some 334 students would be receiving tuition from Mr. Ninnies. In view of the numbers now attending this school, the department may consider transferring this type of activity elsewhere. If there is sufficient room at Wattle Park, at least those students should be able to attend in their own area, but I believe that the Urrbrae High school, at which there is agricultural tutoring, would be a more appropriate place for these teacher trainees.

Also, the committee of Edwardstown primary school hopes it may be able to build a multi-purpose hall. It has been able to accumulate about £1,000 towards the project. The urgent need is for at least another two classrooms that could be used for all purposes. If the Minister would give some attention to these matters, it would be well received by the school committee which is anxious to get a multi-purpose hall. The only district hall is Edwardstown Institute, at least a mile from the school, and it would not be large enough to accommodate the children even in the primary section of the school, let alone the infant section.

In 1955 approval was given for the construction of the Tonsley spur railway line. Since then there has been a recession in the industry carried on by Chrysler (Aust.) Ltd. and consequently the erection of new buildings at Tonsley has not proceeded as was expected when the company bought the land at Tonsley Park. I understand that the Public Works Standing Committee had two proposals to examine about the Tonsley spur line. Whether it was to join up the hills line at a point near Clapham was investigated. The other proposal was that it should proceed south near West Street.

As a result of certain public meetings and the hostility rightly displayed at that time, a further submission was made by the Marion corporation, and then the Railways Commissioner made a submission so, in all, the Public Works Standing Committee had four different routes to examine.

Eventually it adopted the last submission, made by the Railways Commissioner, that the line should proceed south from a point between Ascot Park and Woodlands Park, and almost down Charles Street. Has the Minister of

Works received information from his colleague about the number of blocks, roads, etc., mentioned in the *Government Gazette* a fortnight ago? I am keen to know whether there is to be a spur line from the Brighton line extending toward Darlington and, if so, whether it will be necessary for the Public Works Committee to make further investigations. Have the blocks and roadways mentioned in the *Government Gazette* any bearing on this suggestion? I believe it is desirable to provide a rail service to people residing in the Seacombe Gardens and Darlington areas. The Housing Trust has already commenced a major building plan in the area beyond Tonsley and is only waiting for the ground to dry out in the area known as Western's before it clears it and commences building operations. My constituents are anxious to know the Government's intentions concerning this rumoured spur line.

I am concerned with the number of flats that are being constructed and advertised for sale. I believe that if a person purchases a flat he should have the title to it. I have questioned the Government about this matter but it considers the problem too big to legislate to overcome it this session. If a person owns an allotment and seeks a loan under the Advances for Homes Act he must produce a title to that land before he can secure accommodation. In many metropolitan electorates flats are being offered for sale, but under the Town Planning Act the purchasers cannot secure titles. In Melbourne, and elsewhere, people are persuaded to become shareholders in companies and their stock in the company is a flat without a title or a flat with a thousand year or some other long-period lease. I do not agree with that form of business. I believe that if a person has an equity in anything he should have a clear title to it. If he pays £2,500 to £3,000 for a flat he should have a title, particularly as he may desire to seek a loan from an approved lending institution. I believe the Government should amend the legislation to protect the purchasers of flats.

I realize that many people who have been naturalized have become very successful and are engaged in constructing flats and operating used-car companies, but it would be interesting to ascertain how much of the capital is their personal property and how much has been contributed by their former countrymen. An investigation of the flats being erected on Anzac Highway and of used-car companies on

Goodwood Road might reveal interesting information. In respect of flats that are being erected I should like to know whether they will be under one ownership or whether they will be sold individually without titles.

The question of town planning has me concerned. I supported the second reading of the Town Planning Bill, but now I find that the Highways Department does not always compensate landowners when it requires a strip of land for widening a road. That practice may not create hardship in new subdivisions, but it can adversely affect owners of land in settled areas. It is not always possible to sub-divide land to provide the minimum of 7,000 square feet for each building block as laid down under the Act. It is time the Government considered bringing down legislation to amend these provisions.

I am a firm believer in providing open spaces in settled areas, but I am not prepared to grant them to commercial undertakings. For instance, the South Australian Jockey Club says that most of its profits go back into the sport, but I am not prepared to see the Marion Corporation lose £5,000 in rates and the West Torrens Corporation lose up to £600 because this club wants open spaces on its land. I doubt whether we were wise in passing the relevant sections of the Town Planning Act. I support the Estimates, but I should like the Treasurer to tell me who has been appointed Deputy Commissioner of Police, for provision has been made to reimburse him for the cost of a uniform.

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray)—The Estimates provide £10,156 as an initial payment towards the new Tailem Bend hospital. It will have 24 beds and cost about £70,000, and I am sure it will be a great asset to the district. Tailem Bend is noted for being a dry spot in limestone country. It is hardly a place of beauty, but I am sure that the many enterprising residents will effect a transformation in the near future. A row of trees will be planted on both sides of the railway line. The Riverside Hotel, which is a new community hotel, was built last year and has greatly improved the appearance of the town. The erection of this hotel and the proposed erection of the new hospital have greatly enhanced building prospects in the district. I was present at a function held recently in Tailem Bend when over £300 was raised towards the Tailem Bend hospital. A virile band of enterprising people conducted an amateur hour, and I am sure they have a keen community spirit. In a few months they have collected about £7,000 towards the

new hospital, and soon they will have enough money to start building in the new year. Their efforts will be of great benefit not only to the present generation, but to later generations too.

As the Tailem Bend hospital faces the railway line, it has had to contend with a soot nuisance. It has often been overcrowded because there are many road accidents in the district. Accident cases are admitted on practically every public holiday. Therefore, the hospital serves not only the people in the district, but also people from other areas, even from other States. It has been an effort for the people of Tailem Bend to maintain the hospital in its present state, and I am sure that the new hospital will serve the community much better. This £10,000 will enable the committee to go ahead with enthusiasm and commence the work next year. The Premier referred to the reclaimed banks along the Murray River, mainly between Mannum and Wellington, about which there has been much discussion during the last few years. It is necessary for the reclamation work to be done and I commend the engineers for the fine job they are doing. Several years ago the Leader of the Opposition said there was insufficient protection for the settlers in the lower Murray areas and pointed out that even with minor high rivers there should not be any uncertainty about whether the banks will hold. He was commended by the settlers for his remarks. It is pleasing to see good materials being used in the reclamation work on the banks. I suggested to the Minister of Lands that the clay put on the banks be covered with sand and I was pleased when the engineer in charge of the construction work agreed with the suggestion. When it rains the clay becomes boggy. I have seen places up-river where sand has been mixed with the clay and it has resulted in a solid construction.

Out of every calamity comes some good. Unbeknown to us before, there are large clay deposits in several areas near Murray Bridge and observations in connection with them have been made by two retired persons. They took some of the clay from the different localities and had it tested by burning in the brick kilns at Littlehampton. The clay made excellent bricks, although they were only roughly made because of hand moulding, but it was proved that the bricks had good standing capabilities. I was asked to take up with the Minister of Mines the matter of experiments being carried out on the possibilities of these clay deposits. Through the Director of Mines the Minister was pleased to assist and tests are now being made. I hope

success will come for as time passes the pugholes and the brick kilns in the metropolitan area will become fewer because of the lack of suitable land. In any case land prices will be so high that proprietors of brick kilns will have to transfer to where other clay deposits are available.

I want now to refer to several matters associated with the metropolitan area. There is a hazard on North Terrace when a pedestrian tries to cross the roadway near the railway station at busy times. I know that a policeman is on duty at peak periods to control the traffic, but there are long periods when no officer is there. An excellent opportunity is provided for a subway to be built under the roadway. Recently Bank Street was widened. On the corner of that street and North Terrace there is an open area containing a deep hole which could be used for the beginning of a subway under North Terrace, so as to provide safety for people going to and coming from the railway station. We should plan now for the future. It has been said that the metropolitan area will contain about 1,000,000 people within the next 10 years and if that eventuates the traffic hazard on North Terrace will be so much greater. This deep hole gives us the opportunity to construct a subway. Last night the traffic on North Terrace was so great that I had to wait some time before I could safely cross. Elderly people are afraid to cross.

Another thing I notice when I come to the city is the way the traffic lights are ignored by motorists. I pointed this out last year. The other day I saw a motor car cross the intersection of King William and Rundie Streets whilst the red light was on. There seems to be few police officers about to control the position; in fact there appear to be fewer in King William Street than there were some years ago. Greater efforts should be made to prevent motorists from crossing intersections when the amber light is showing. When a motorist does this he has to cross at a high speed, which creates a danger. A few prosecutions would stop this practice. I therefore ask the Government to take up this matter with the Police Commissioner so that something will be done to protect pedestrians.

I now wish to make one or two references to the Workers' Educational Association, a body that has been held in high regard over the years, and which provides facilities for adult education for people in the lower income brackets. Unfortunately not everyone has availed himself of the facilities available, but

in the future, as it has in the past, this organization will fulfil the needs of adult education. Last year, with the advent of a new adult education principal, there was a change of plans, and instead of the W.E.A. collecting fees from a number of classes, these are now collected by the university. It has been pointed out to me that the income of the association had decreased considerably because of this. When this change came about I was a member of the council of that body, and I opposed the change because I thought it was against its best interests. However, the change came about, and the W.E.A. is in an embarrassing financial position. Last year class fees amounting to £3,120 were collected, but this year only £450 was received. The W.E.A. is still conducting classes of its own apart from the university, which is where the £450 came from.

Mr. Corcoran—What does it cost to join the classes?

Mr. BYWATERS—It varies, although it is a nominal fee well within the ability of anyone to pay. Whereas the total income last year was £6,120, this year it decreased to £3,875. Of course, I realize that when the university took over the fees it also assumed some of the responsibilities, so that expenditure by the W.E.A. decreased from £6,120 last year to £5,263 this year; however, the excess of expenditure over income is £1,388. Last year the Minister of Education raised the grant to £2,200, which was very acceptable, but it is felt that it will be necessary to raise it this year to £3,600 because, although the income of the association has decreased, it must still retain its staff and pay other expenses. As the Premier opened the new W.E.A. building and made £500 available towards it, I know he is interested in the work the association is doing. This building will be an asset, and I know it is appreciated, but I urge once more that the grant be raised to £3,600 to enable the association to meet its commitments.

Mr. Riches—Is the association continuing its activities in the country?

Mr. BYWATERS—Yes, where required. It realizes that adult education councils from the Education Department are fulfilling a great need in the country, and I am pleased that a full-time principal has been appointed in Murray Bridge, but there are places not served by these centres that the W.E.A. will serve if required.

Mr. Riches—Is the principal present in Murray Bridge all the time?

Mr. BYWATERS—He has just been appointed. Of course, Murray Bridge is only the centre for a large area, and his district will take in such places as Victor Harbour and Mannum down as far as the Victorian border.

Mr. Riches—Who will be in charge of his classes while he is away?

Mr. BYWATERS—The principal does not take classes; he is an administrator, and the teachers will carry on in his absence. I believe the same thing occurred in Gawler, where there has been a principal for many years. Mount Gambier now has a full-time principal, and from what I have been told, that centre has progressed very well indeed. Although Murray Bridge has had a full-time principal only for the last few weeks, I feel that centre will also be very successful. As I believe working hours will be decreased, which will mean increased leisure, there will be a big need for adult education facilities.

Recently, complaints have been made to me by several people in dire straits who have been told by letter that their incomes from the Public Relief Department have been or will be decreased. As many of them have been on a limited budget, they have been placed in an awkward financial position because the department has adopted a policy of re-assessing the amounts they are entitled to receive. Like the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn), I know many who were previously in a difficult position, but are now far worse off because of this policy. I do not know the reason for the change. I have asked one or two officers of the department, but they have not been able to tell me, so I appeal to the Government to do something to help these people who are receiving only a few pounds a week and are in real need of assistance. One lady I know who has herself and a son to keep receives only about £5 1s. 6d. a week. The son is approaching the high school age and she would like him to attend, but unfortunately he may have to go to work and miss his higher education because she cannot afford to keep him on her limited income.

Recently the Treasurer was good enough to visit Mypolonga to open the new packing shed and he was informed of the future needs of the district. Mypolonga was declared a

Government town in 1915. The people of this area, through their perseverance and hard work, have made a good living off a small acreage. Most of the orchardists employ one man on an area of 18 acres. There are not many places where two families could get a living off such an area. Many of the orchardists have sons leaving school who are desirous to have an orchard of their own, but their fathers are faced with the position of having to put off their employee in order to find employment for their son.

Mr. Corcoran—Have they the area to provide an orchard for their sons?

Mr. BYWATERS—They have plenty of land adjacent to the present irrigation scheme. Most of the orchards are below the channel because they are flood-irrigated, but today most of them are installing spray irrigation. They would be able to undertake that system on the higher land above the channel. They are within about one mile of the Murray. Without water the high land is practically valueless, although it is similar to country now under orchard. They have been told that the present scheme is unable to provide water for increased plantings, so something may have to be done to increase the quantity of water for irrigation.

In view of what the settlers have done with about 1,000 acres over the last 30 years, I am sure that another 1,000 acres could be developed in the not distant future, provided that the necessary facilities were provided. It is essential that we keep our young men on the land. The Treasurer realizes that these people have been ideal settlers. Here we have private enterprise co-operating with Government enterprise. It has proved that it is possible for socialization and private enterprise to live together and so promote the welfare of the State. Labor's policy has been carried out here where State enterprise, coupled with private enterprise and co-operative effort has made it possible for this settlement to be developed and thus assist the welfare of the State. I support the first line.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.37 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, September 25, at 2 p.m.