

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.**

Wednesday, October 7, 1959.

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

**QUESTIONS.****TRAMWAYS TRUST OPERATING COSTS.**

Mrs. **STEELE**—I understand the Minister of Works has a reply to the question I asked on September 24 concerning the Municipal Tramways Trust.

The Hon. G. G. **PEARSON**—The following is a report from the General Manager of the Trust:—

Before embarking on its rehabilitation scheme, the Trust carefully considered the type of public service vehicle for Adelaide and came to the conclusion that on balance the underfloor-engined single-deck bus was the most economical and suitable. This view was supported by De Leuw, Cather and Co., American transport consultants, whose chief principal came to Adelaide to examine conditions on the spot before submitting his report. A further endorsement came from Mr. S. H. Bingham, an international transport expert who studied our report and Mr. De Leuw's views thereon.

Acting on the result of its own researches, and fortified by the advice of experts, the Trust proceeded to replace its tram system with diesel buses. Because of the economic life then remaining therein, the Trust decided to retain the Glenelg Tramway and the trolleybus service, and to make a review of the situation at a later date under the then existing circumstances. The Trust no longer extracts separate complete statements of revenue and costs for the trolleybuses and diesel buses operating on the same route as such statements would serve no useful purpose and would in fact be quite misleading. When a comparison between two or more types of vehicles is required, a special economic study is made which places the respective positions on a comparable basis, which otherwise could not be achieved. One of the advantages of diesel bus operation is the ability to extend services with a minimum of capital expenditure: practically every route converted to diesel buses has in fact been extended. This is in contradistinction to an extension of a trolleybus route where the cost of erecting overhead equipment alone is £10,000 per mile and, if a further converter station is required, then the capital expenditure is considerably increased.

**ELECTRICITY SUPPLY FOR INMAN VALLEY.**

Mr. **JENKINS**—I have been told that the plans and costing of the proposed extension of electricity from Victor Harbour to Inman Valley have been prepared, but that the allocation of funds has not yet been made. Some of my constituents who are fairly big poten-

tial users of electricity wish to know when this supply is likely to be available, as they may be able to avoid purchasing new equipment. Will the Premier ascertain when the extension is likely to be commenced?

The Hon. Sir **THOMAS PLAYFORD**—I will have a report prepared and, I hope, make it available next week.

**PORT PIRIE HARBOUR BEACONS.**

Mr. **McKEE**—As a result of heavy buffeting by the strong winds and high seas, No. 1 beacon and No. 5 beacon in the channel at Port Pirie have recently collapsed. Can the Minister of Works say what progress has been made regarding their replacement?

The Hon. G. G. **PEARSON**—This matter has not been brought to my notice, but I presume it is being dealt with by the Harbors Board in the usual way. I will call for a report from the board and give the honourable member the precise information he desires.

**VETERINARY OFFICER FOR MINNIPA.**

Mr. **BOCKELBERG**—Will the Minister of Agriculture favourably consider the stationing of a veterinary officer at the Government Research Centre at Minnipa?

The Hon. D. N. **BROOKMAN**—Yes, but because of the particularly serious shortage of veterinary officers there is little likelihood of one being made available in the near future. The department has enough work for and would like to employ several more veterinary officers.

**MEDICAL EXAMINATION OF SCHOOLGIRLS.**

Mr. **HUTCHENS**—It was recently reported to me that medical officers making an examination of girls in primary schools, particularly of the senior girls, who are in various stages of development, requested these girls to strip to the waist and examined them in view of all the other students of a similar age. As this is embarrassing to the girls and creates some concern among the parents, will the Premier take up the matter with the Minister of Health to see if something can be done to overcome the girls' embarrassment?

The Hon. Sir **THOMAS PLAYFORD**—I think that is a very reasonable request, and I will see whether something can be done.

**MOTOR VEHICLES DEPARTMENT.**

Mr. **CUMBE**—Some time ago the Premier announced that the Motor Vehicles Department would quit its present premises at the Exhibition Building to enable the University to make use of that land, and go to premises in the

Railway Station building now occupied by the Taxation Department when it in due course moves to the new Advertiser Building. Can the Premier indicate when it is likely that the Motor Vehicles Department will be transferred, and, when it is, will he make a statement giving adequate publicity of the fact to obviate any inconvenience to the public?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Negotiations between the Railways Commissioner and the Registrar of Motor Vehicles have been completed and this morning I approved the terms of occupancy by the Motor Vehicles Department of part of the Railway Building. However, one or two things must be done before the department can change its location and the Architect-in-Chief is preparing plans, which relate primarily to slight alterations to the partitioning of the accommodation. It will also be necessary to provide a lift for clients of the Motor Vehicles Department, and parking space because at times it is necessary for vehicles to be inspected prior to registration. Under those circumstances it will be some months at least before the department shifts. I will see that adequate notice is given to the public. The Railway Building in many respects may be more convenient than the present building, particularly for the large number of people who travel by rail.

#### INCREASE IN RAIL FARES.

Mr. RYAN—Yesterday, in reply to a question from the member for Semaphore about increased rail fares from October 1, the Minister of Works read a report from the Railways Commissioner, the relevant portion of which was as follows:—

It is inevitable that when a variation in suburban fares is made, the percentage increases will not be constant throughout the whole of the stations but it is interesting to note that the average increase in the daily return fare to stations without alternative transport is 11 per cent compared with an average increase of 13 per cent at those stations which are services with alternative transport.

As an example of the increases that have applied I referred to the fare from Kilkenny to Adelaide which had been increased from 1s. 4d. to 1s. 6d.—an increase of 12½ per cent—as compared with the fare from Kilkenny to Port Adelaide, a similar distance, which had been increased from 1s. 6d. to 2s.—an increase of 33½ per cent. The fare from Woodville Park to Adelaide was increased from 1s. 4d. to 1s. 6d.—also an increase of 12½ per cent—but from West Croydon to Port Ade-

laide, approximately the same distance, the increase was from 1s. 6d. to 2s.—33½ per cent. Will the Minister ascertain from the Minister of Railways why there is a general discrepancy between the fares away from the city and those into the city? In other words, people travelling away from the city are penalized as compared with those going to the city, even though they travel the same distance.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Yesterday, when I replied to the member for Semaphore, I told the member for Port Adelaide that if any matters were outstanding after that information had been conveyed to him I would seek a report from my colleague, the Minister of Railways, and I will do so.

#### COOLTONG PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. KING—Has the Minister of Education reached a decision on the desirability of establishing a school at Cooltong, and, if so, when is it likely to be built?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—The need for a new primary school at Cooltong is recognized and the Architect-in-Chief has been requested to prepare the necessary plans, but owing to the more urgent need for schools, particularly secondary schools, in other localities this school was not included in the 1959-60 programme. It will be considered for inclusion in the 1960-61 programme when that is being prepared.

#### PORT AUGUSTA TO WOOMERA ROAD.

Mr. LOVEDAY—Yesterday I asked the Premier a question regarding the Port Augusta to Woomera road and his reply was that the Commonwealth provided the State with specific funds for the work in addition to those provided under the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act. He outlined the expenditure for 1957-58, 1958-59 and 1959-60, stating that £40,000 would be available for 1959-60. In view of the fact that in 1957-58 £24,000 was provided and only £16,000 spent, can the Premier give an assurance that the maximum amount of £40,000 available for 1959-60 will all be spent in that year, particularly in view of the bad condition of the road?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I am afraid I cannot give that assurance. If the honourable member looks at the reply I gave yesterday he will see that these are not the normal funds provided to the State by the Commonwealth but specific funds for that road and that the expenditure of those funds is under the direction of the Commonwealth.

Mr. Loveday—The reply states that they are not subject to direction by the Commonwealth.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The first part of the reply dealt with the ordinary funds, which are not subject to direction by the Commonwealth, but the special fund is subject to such direction and obviously we must spend it as the Commonwealth determines. I will check the point if the honourable member desires it. I assure him that we will do our utmost to expend the total amount of the funds under our direction.

#### ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES NEAR AERODROME.

Mr. HALL—Recently an electricity supply was extended to the Mallala area but under regulations relating to aerodromes the supply to a consumer residing within half a mile of the aerodrome had to be placed underground at a cost of about £1,000 to the Electricity Trust. The consumer now requires an additional service to his shearing shed. He was promised that service in the past but the trust has now notified him that it will cost £90 as compared with £15 for overhead wiring. The trust has been very helpful and has borne the additional cost of supplying the service to the house, but as the aerodrome is a defence measure the consumer is wondering whether the Commonwealth can be induced to pay the additional cost involved in serving the shearing shed.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will examine this matter and discuss it with the Chairman of the Electricity Trust. I doubt whether we can get the Commonwealth interested but it may be possible for the trust to regard it as a special case because, after all, it is a costly business for a consumer, particularly as it arises from the policy of a Commonwealth department. Some time ago a somewhat similar position arose in respect of the aerodrome that it was proposed to construct at Port Augusta. The member for Stuart will remember that certain poles belonging to the Electricity Trust were adjacent to the area and one of the problems that arose was that the Commonwealth would have demanded the removal of those poles, at a substantial cost.

#### STANDARDIZATION OF RAILWAY GAUGES.

Mr. RICHES—Yesterday, in reply to a question by the Leader of the Opposition, the Premier gave an outline of correspondence he had received from the Commonwealth Minister about the broadening of the railway gauge in the Peterborough division. He dealt pri-

marily with the line between Port Pirie and Broken Hill. Some time ago the Premier made a statement about the connection between Port Pirie and Adelaide having a standard gauge. It seems to me that the city should be linked with the standard gauge system before or concurrently with the Broken Hill line. Have any further discussions taken place with the Commonwealth on linking the standard gauge system with Adelaide and, if so, what stage have they reached?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yesterday I informed the Leader that I had only briefly examined the document from the Commonwealth Railways Commissioner and I did not want him to take the outline I was giving as being necessarily either very accurate or very comprehensive. Subject to those remarks, I do not believe the document mentioned the Adelaide to Port Pirie line. If it did, it was only a passing reference and did not deal with it at all exhaustively. As far as I know, at present the Commonwealth Government is attending primarily and almost solely to the question of the Port Pirie and Broken Hill line. When the negotiations, which I now visualize will probably be much more rapid than previously, take place around the conference table, it will be possible for us to bring up the honourable member's point, which I agree is very important, for consideration. I am not sure that I take it quite as far as he does: I do not know whether I accept it as being more important than the Broken Hill to Port Pirie line. However, I shall be prepared to discuss it with the Minister when negotiations commence.

#### LAMEROO AREA SCHOOL.

Mr. NANKIVELL—I understand that tenders have been called for the paving of the area surrounding the classrooms of the Lameroo area school. Can the Minister of Education say whether any tenders have been accepted and, if so, when this work will be commenced?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—The question of tenders is in the hands of the Architect-in-Chief, whose department comes within the supervision of my colleague, the Minister of Works. I will have the necessary information obtained and let the honourable member have it as soon as possible.

#### MURRAY BRIDGE AMBULANCE DELAY.

Mr. BYWATERS—Has the Premier a reply to a question I asked some time ago about the reason for the delay of the ambulance from Murray Bridge at the Royal Adelaide Hospital?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—When the honourable member raised the question I said that the cause of the delay may have been connected with the stretchers used by Murray Bridge not being standard stretchers, but I find that other factors are associated with it. So that the honourable member will be able to clear the matter up with the authorities at Murray Bridge, I will read the report, which states:—

In answer to the question asked by Mr. Bywaters, M.P., regarding the delay caused to the Murray Bridge ambulance at Royal Adelaide Hospital, the following reply is submitted. The patient concerned was seen by a medical officer within a few minutes of his arrival at Royal Adelaide Hospital, and a diagnosis of a fractured thigh bone was made. In the case of injuries of this nature, it is standard procedure that a patient shall not be removed from the ambulance stretcher until an X-ray examination is made. To avoid delays to ambulances through waiting for the return of stretchers in such cases, a supply of standard stretchers is kept in Casualty Department to enable an ambulance to be re-equipped immediately provided it is fitted for standard stretchers. The Murray Bridge ambulance is not fitted with this type of stretcher and therefore an exchange could not be made. The ambulance stretcher was eventually released to the ambulance driver after the patient had been X-rayed. Further delay was then occasioned by the fact that the nurse who accompanied the patient from Murray Bridge had been instructed by her hospital to remain with the patient until he was admitted. The nurse remained with the patient until he was admitted to a ward. It is strongly recommended that in order to avoid delay in cases of this nature all ambulances be equipped for standard stretchers.

#### INFANTILE SCURVY.

Mr. QUIRKE—Has the Premier a reply to a question I asked last month concerning the incidence of scurvy in this State?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Director-General of Public Health, Dr. Woodruff, reports:—

It is true that in recent years some instances of lack of vitamin C in infants have been observed in Adelaide. The affected children respond rapidly to the administration of orange juice or some other reliable source of vitamin C. This is a problem in infant feeding, and it is engaging the attention of the Mothers and Babies Health Association. The constant aim of the association is to teach mothers the modern methods of infant feeding. These are simpler, more flexible and easier to follow than the systems which were popular some 10 or 15 years ago.

The honourable member will see that it is something readily available for cure by a very simple method of supplying vitamin C, which is contained in orange juice. I hope that is the information the honourable member desires.

#### MAYAN WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. HAMBOUR—About two years ago, when I asked a question regarding the supply of water to constituents of mine living between Riverton and Tarlee in an area known as Mayan, I was given to understand that a supply would not be available until the Warren-Nuriootpa main had been completed. Can the Minister of Works say whether that is correct, and, if so, about when will the department be able to consider a service to the people of that area?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I cannot answer that question without further reference. I will seek the information from the Engineer-in-Chief and advise the honourable member.

#### FARE REFUNDS TO PENSIONERS.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Has the Premier a reply to a question I asked a few weeks ago concerning the treatment of pensioner claimants for fare refunds at the Royal Adelaide Hospital?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Administrator of the hospital had the question directed to him and he has now furnished me with the following report:—

I have discussed with the clerks concerned the question of courteous treatment of pensioner claimants of fares. These officers are quite aware of the fact that pensioners attending the hospital are usually sick and because of age often find difficulty in understanding requirements to qualify for repayment of fares. Mr. Walsh, M.P., has made a very general statement, but if he could supply some specific instance, or instances, of discourtesy I should be most pleased to make further inquiries. The necessity for pensioners to produce a pension authority or other evidence is a frequent cause of difficulty but every effort is made to meet the audit requirements without inconvenience to the patient concerned.

The latter part of that question will probably be cleared up as a matter of ordinary procedure because, as the honourable member knows, the Tramways Trust is now, in connection with the concessions given to pensioners, making available to them a general authority card. If the honourable member has specific cases and lets me have them, I will follow them up.

#### ELECTRICITY TRUST'S BANKERS.

Mr. RALSTON—Recently the Premier assured the House that, as far as he was concerned, the Bank of Adelaide would continue to be the bank for the Electricity Trust and to act as the agency where payment of consumer accounts would be made. Most businessmen would agree that that is not a good arrangement, especially as the State Bank could act for the trust for banking purposes. In

this morning's press it is reported that the Bank of Adelaide's shares rose by 6s. 3d. in the last two days, and strong rumours are current in banking circles of a take-over by an interstate banking concern. Can the Premier indicate the attitude of the Government and the trust should this eventuate?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—It is impossible to reply to such a hypothetical question. The Government has continued to use the Bank of Adelaide as the bank for the trust because of an assurance given to the House when the trust was established that as far as possible the Government would look after the interests of all people associated with the Adelaide Electric Supply Company, and that the employees and other people doing business with the company would not be adversely affected by the establishment of the trust. The Government has always been anxious to honour in full the assurances given to Parliament when the trust was established, and it is pleasing to me to say that never during the period of the trust's operations has any employee or anyone associated with the trust come to me claiming that there has been a departure in any way from the general policy.

What the honourable member is outlining is something entirely different. If someone took over the Bank of Adelaide, particularly if someone purchased it over the heads of the directors by making mass offers to individual shareholders, that would be a somewhat different matter and much consideration would be required before I could express a view. Subject to that, however, I know of no-one attempting to take over the Bank of Adelaide, so it is purely a hypothetical question that cannot be answered at this stage.

#### USE OF LAND ALONGSIDE HIGHWAYS.

Mr. LAUCKE—Land has been purchased by the Highways Department as part of a long-range policy to widen roads, but the land will not be used for road construction for some time ahead. Can the Minister representing the Minister of Roads state whether the Highways Department will consider permitting the owners of adjoining land to cultivate and grow fodder on these currently unused tracts? This would not only help alleviate the feed shortage, but would be helpful in controlling what could otherwise become a bush fire hazard.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I believe this matter is being considered by the Minister of Roads and that he is taking into account the reasons the honourable member has advanced

in asking his question. However, I shall be pleased to refer the matter to the Minister and to obtain his authoritative reply.

#### REGISTRATION OF CRECHES.

Mrs. STEELE—Has the Premier a reply to a question I asked some time ago relating to the registration of creches and child-minding centres?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I submitted the honourable member's question to the Minister of Health, who reports:—

I have already given a good deal of consideration to this question and have asked the Parliamentary Draftsman to confer with the chairman of the Children's Welfare & Public Relief Board and the Director-General of Public Health with a view to evolving the most efficient and appropriate system for supervising child-minding centres. Both departments are interested in the matter and I desire to avoid any duplication of activities.

As soon as those reports are available I will see that the honourable member is furnished with a copy.

#### BREAD PRICES IN ELIZABETH-SALISBURY AREA.

Mr. CLARK—Has the Premier a reply to my recent question regarding bread prices at Salisbury and Elizabeth?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes, the Prices Commissioner has given me the following information:—

Following on the query raised in the House by the member for Gawler concerning bread prices in the Salisbury-Elizabeth area, it is advised that investigation of the position in outer areas is nearing completion. As regards Salisbury-Elizabeth, problems associated with bread delivery still exist, and it appears unlikely that prices will be reduced to those operating in the main part of the metropolitan area. There are indications, however, that it may be possible to effect some reductions to consumers in the near future. Whilst on this subject, a number of statements emanating from outside sources have attributed bread prices at Salisbury and Elizabeth to be fixed at the level of general country prices. This is not correct. Since January 1956, bread prices for Salisbury-Elizabeth have been fixed at halfpenny per delivered 2 lb. loaf below the general country price structure.

#### BUSH FIRES.

Mr. KING—Has the Minister of Agriculture any statement to make regarding the report of the Bushfire Research Committee?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—The Bushfire Research Committee has not yet made a report on its work, but it has been asked to go ahead and promulgate some of the information that will be of use to people in this

State before the bushfire danger period begins. The committee feels that it is rather important to do some of this work, which is of an extensive nature, before the danger period: that is why it is inaugurating what is known as a "clean-up week." I have arranged for each member of this House to have a copy of a letter that has been written to the chairmen of district councils. The letter, which members will see, is addressed to the leaders of local councils, and mayors of corporations will also receive the letter. These leaders of local government have been asked to assist us in this clean-up week. I thought that because of the interest members showed in affairs in their districts they would be pleased to see these letters, and also the notes which accompanied them. The research committee will at a later date make a report upon its investigations, which will be far more comprehensive in that on this occasion the committee is concentrating on seeing that all possible unnecessary inflammable material around buildings is cleaned up before the danger period starts. The committee feels that many other precautions are essential, and at the same time not difficult to carry out, and these will be mentioned by the committee in due course. However, they are not the points they wish to stress at the moment, as they are concentrating on clean-up week.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Yesterday I referred to the question of fires arising from the non-provision of receptacles for cigarettes, matches and the like on public transport using roads in the Adelaide hills. The Minister of Agriculture in his reply said that he would obtain a copy of a report, and he was good enough to do so, for which I thank him. However, I have read the report, but I find no reference to the aspect to which I referred. Although I requested yesterday that the Minister consider referring the question to Cabinet with a view to making the provision of receptacles compulsory on the public transport I mentioned, I would now ask that he refer it to the committee that has been set up by his department, and to which he referred in his report.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I will do that. However, I think there is some misunderstanding, and that the honourable member is probably reading the literature on clean-up week, which was not sent to him by way of a reply to his question. As a matter of fact, I have not yet received the report which he requested, but I am endeavouring to obtain it.

Mr. LAUCKE—The Bush Fires Act, which is intricate and cumbersome, is difficult to follow because of numerous alterations and additions to it over the years. Will the Minister of Agriculture consider having this Act rewritten and consolidated?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I agree that the Bush Fires Act is cumbersome and difficult to follow because of the numerous amendments that have been made to it; and others will be made in the future. Many amendments are made in this House and I do not criticize Parliament for making them, and at some time or other every member has expressed opinions on certain aspects of the Act. In addition, organizations interested in bush fire control suggest amendments that are considered by the Bush Fires Advisory Committee and, if practicable, are recommended for incorporation in amending Bills. This is a subject on which views are rarely static and opinions may vary with weather conditions and with localities. The Government is concerned at the difficulty of interpreting the Act and Sir Edgar Bean has been approached to examine it in the same way as he is examining the Road Traffic Act. He has kindly consented to do so, but his report will not be available this year. However, when it is ready it will be studied with the object of simplifying the Act and making it more effectual.

#### CROYDON GIRLS TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Has the Treasurer a reply to the question I raised during the Loan Estimates debate concerning a new science block at the Croydon girls technical high school?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The report received from the Minister of Education is as follows:—

I have discussed the attached extract from the *Hansard* report relating to the query raised by the member for the district, Mr. Hutchens, concerning an amount for a science block at the Croydon girls technical high school. The new school in the course of erection contains science accommodation and in addition further science accommodation is available in the existing wooden buildings. It is not envisaged that a separate science block be erected at the Croydon girls technical high school, as the science accommodation referred to above is sufficient to meet the needs of the school.

#### INNAMINCKA OIL EXPLORATION.

Mr. COUMBE—In reply to my question of September 16 regarding oil drilling exploration work in the Innamincka district, the Premier

gave the House certain information and indicated that he would seek a report giving further information. Has the Premier a further reply?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have a further reply to the one I gave the honourable member, a reply that has been discussed and agreed with by the resident manager of Delhi Australian Petroleum Ltd. I regret that as the House did not meet last week the report is, in consequence, older than otherwise would have been the case. It is as follows:—

The Innamincka No. 1 well reached a depth of 10,601ft. on September 16. The well is sited on a structural dome apparent from surface features, and confirmed in depth by seismic surveys carried out on behalf of the operating companies by the Department of Mines. The well initially traversed approximately 6,500ft. of Mesozoic sediments and revealed minor oil showings at several points. At 7,010ft. it passed into tight shales and sandy shales. These are thought to be Middle Palaeozoic in age but as they are almost completely unfossiliferous, the age still requires confirmation. The well is drilling ahead. It can be said that the well has confirmed the geological section indicated by the seismic surveys and that it is now drilling in sediments which may be equivalent in age to those outcropping at the margin of the Artesian Basin, some 300 miles to the south-east. The occurrence of minor showings of oil in the Mesozoic sediment and the possible existence of Cambro-Ordovician source beds at depth underlying the present section provide an adequate incentive for continued exploratory activity. The Government is convinced that the area justifies the maximum possible effort by all concerned and for its part has authorized the Department of Mines to mount a full-scale geological and geophysical investigation of the Great Artesian Basin in South Australia commencing in the new year.

#### ABORIGINAL CHILDREN AT COOBER PEDY.

Mr. LOVEDAY—Has the Minister of Education a further report on the qualifications required by aboriginal children who might attend the Coober Pedy school?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—No, I have not received any report following on the visit of Mr. Whitburn to Coober Pedy, but as soon as I receive it I will let the honourable member know.

#### PINNAROO-CANNAWIGARA ROAD.

Mr. NANKIVELL—On August 19, in reply to my question concerning the Pinnaroo-Cannawigara Road, the Minister of Works said that £30,000 was to be allocated for work on this road during 1959-60. Will the Minister

now ascertain for me whether any decision has been reached on how and where this money will be spent?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I will seek a report from my colleague, the Minister of Roads, and let the honourable member have it.

#### GEPPS CROSS HOSTEL.

Mr. QUIRKE—Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on September 28 regarding the Gepps Cross Hostel and the painting thereof?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The chairman of the Housing Trust has reported as follows:—

The Housing Trust during the past two years has carried out an extensive painting programme at the Gepps Cross Hostel, and all the woodwork and some of the roofs of the buildings have been painted. It is proposed to paint further roofs during this financial year, but, as the total expenditure in any year of maintaining the hostel is approximately equal to the rents received, it is impracticable to paint all the roofs in one financial year. The buildings were designed and erected by the Commonwealth and, in their design, no concessions were made to aesthetic considerations. However, whilst the appearance of the buildings may be short of what could be desired, the trust is endeavouring to carry out such maintenance as is necessary to prevent deterioration.

#### MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATIONS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—On page 161 of the Auditor-General's report, under the heading "Motor Vehicles Department," reference was made to the refund of registration fees paid by interstate hauliers, amounting to £109. Can the Premier say whether the Government has further considered the possibility of making refunds of local registration fees when people, through sickness, are not able to use their vehicles for three months or more? Can he indicate, also, whether the Government has arranged for motor traders—used car dealers—to obtain registrations and number plates when the Department is closed, possibly through local police stations?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—As members know, Sir Edgar Bean has promised to consolidate our Road Traffic Act and he has recommended that it be divided into two separate Acts, one dealing entirely with registration matters, and the other with the rules of the road and matters more immediately affected by traffic regulations. The first Bill will be available for presentation to the House probably by next Tuesday, subject to any alterations

Cabinet may decide to make. That Bill deals with the registration of vehicles and contains some big departures from present procedure which, in many ways, will be simplified. Provision is made for some alleviation of the second problem the honourable member mentioned. The first problem has been discussed and referred to Sir Edgar Bean and the Registrar of Motor Vehicles for examination. I am not sure what recommendation, if any, they have included in the Bill.

#### RAILWAY REFRESHMENT ROOMS.

Mrs. STEELE—I understand the Premier now has a reply to the question I asked some time ago about negotiations that were proceeding for the leasing of railway refreshment rooms.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—No finality has been reached on this matter. One or two problems have arisen and the investigation has been somewhat protracted, but the Minister of Railways has assured me that the matter is being actively considered and I will report to the honourable member in the near future.

Mr. RICHES—Questions have been asked from time to time regarding the leasing of railway refreshment rooms. I should like to know whether this question has been considered and whether it includes Port Pirie and other centres as well. What is the reason for the suggestion that they should be leased? As one who is a regular patron of these refreshment services, my impression is that they are of a good standard and are serving the public well. Can the Premier give an assurance that should any alteration be made the service will not deteriorate in quality and that prices will not be raised?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I informed the member for Burnside that the Minister of Railways and the Railways Commissioner were examining the position to see whether it would be advantageous for private firms to undertake the control and management of these refreshment rooms. This matter has been raised on a number of occasions, and I believe it was first raised in the House by the member for Light. He pointed out that these refreshment rooms were making a substantial loss, whereas he had a definite assurance that private enterprise would be prepared to take over the services and pay a reasonable fee to the Railways Commissioner for the rent of the premises.

Mr. RICHES—The passengers do the paying.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—These are the matters which the Commissioner and the Minister are looking into. Obviously, it would be undesirable to transfer these refreshment rooms to any other authority if it were to be done at the expense of passengers and the efficiency and standard of the service. I am assured by the member for Light that the authority he has in mind has a high reputation in the catering world and would be able to provide a service as adequate and as good as the present service. No decision has yet been reached on the matter.

#### COMMONWEALTH HOUSING.

Mr. RYAN—Recently I asked the Premier a question concerning the sale of Commonwealth-owned houses at Prospect, Ovingham and Woodville North, and he promised to confer with the Federal authorities. Has he anything to report?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have not had an opportunity of conferring with the Federal authorities, but I have written to the Prime Minister as follows:—

I am enclosing a copy of a *Hansard* report on the sale of Commonwealth-owned houses in this State. The main point in question is that the occupants have been notified by the Department of the Interior that the houses are for sale for cash. Pursuant to our agreed policies all moneys made available by the Commonwealth to the State under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement are reserved for financing of new homes as distinct from finance for exchange of ownership of existing homes. To keep in line with this policy the State also makes funds available for new homes only. Finance for the Commonwealth homes is, therefore, only available from institutions, many of which adopt the same policies as have been agreed upon by our Governments.

You will, I am sure, realize the difficulties being encountered by the occupants to obtain financial assistance to enable them to pay cash pursuant to the department's policy. These people would be greatly assisted if the Commonwealth could sell these homes on the basis of a small deposit, the balance of purchase money plus interest at 5½ per cent per annum to be paid on a long term basis by equal monthly instalments. A policy such as this would not involve your Government in any new expenditure as the cost of the houses has long since been met. I trust the Commonwealth will do something along the lines indicated to relieve the hardship which will otherwise be imposed on these people.

I will give the honourable member a copy of that letter so that he can take it up directly.



## GAWLER ADULT EDUCATION CENTRE.

Mr. CLARK—In the Loan Estimates debate recently I referred to the continued delay in regard to drainage at the Gawler Adult Education Centre. Has the Treasurer any further information on this matter?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The following is a report from the Minister of Works:—

Difficulties have been encountered with respect to drainage of this area. The use of bores for disposal of effluent is neither practicable nor desirable. The Engineer-in-Chief has investigated this problem and has advised that there is not room at the existing site for any acceptable form of sewage treatment. He has advised that if the existing site is to be used it would appear to be necessary for the liquid to be piped towards the river bank and there to be treated. The Engineer-in-Chief is at present making further investigations with a view to submitting a definite proposal.

## PRESERVATION OF GUM TREES.

Mr. RICHES—My question relates to the preservation of gum trees, the giants of the timber country in the Flinders Ranges, particularly in the Pichi Richi Pass and at Mambray Creek. As long ago as when Sir George Jenkins was Minister of Agriculture, this matter was raised and he said the best method of tackling this problem was to ask the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization to conduct a series of experiments, recognizing at that time that the preservation of these giant gums was just as important as the planting of new trees. The member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) has been good enough to hand me a copy of the C.S.I.R.O.'s *Rural Research* magazine, No. 29, which reports on tests conducted by that organization on a method of injection into trees for the eradication of mistletoe. One sentence states:—

The total cost, including labour, would probably work out in practice at about 6d. per tree.

The report goes on to say:—

It may be seen that reasonably good results have been obtained for seven of the eight species, and this suggests that the treatment may be suitable for destroying mistletoe on a wide range of eucalypt hosts. However, it is emphasized again that before large-scale work is undertaken in any untested area, or involving other species of eucalypt, pilot trials should first be carried out.

Will the Minister of Agriculture have this report investigated by his department with a view to having the method outlined here tested on the gums in Pichi Richi Pass or some other part of the Flinders Ranges?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I will give the honourable member a considered reply later.

## WHYALLA EXTENSION.

Mr. LOVEDAY—In the *Government Gazette* of September 24 appears a proclamation to the effect that there will be an extension of the area of the town of Whyalla by adding certain portions of the town adjacent to a recreational reserve and near the sea. They are in a very desirable position. In a later *Government Gazette* appears a notice to the effect that 34 allotments will be made available for purchase, and it also says that an application from the Broken Hill Proprietary Company for those allotments will receive favourable consideration from the Land Board. As this matter has not been referred to the Whyalla Town Commission and the commission has had no opportunity of expressing an opinion as to whether it is desirable that this land should be used for residences or for some other purpose, will the Minister of Lands see that no allotment is made until the Town Commission has had an opportunity of discussing this question and has been advised of all particulars?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I will look at the question raised by the honourable member and bring him a reply tomorrow. I suggest that in regard to a much larger area the Lands Department is awaiting a reply from the Whyalla Town Commission.

## LOXTON IRRIGATION SETTLEMENT.

Mr. QUIRKE—On September 2 I wrote to the Treasurer about the revaluation and appeals concerning the Loxton irrigation settlement. Has he a reply?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The reply is a very comprehensive report from the Director of Lands. I think that probably the best thing will be to have it incorporated in *Hansard* so that copies of it will be available. It is too long to read at this juncture. It deals with a very important public matter, the valuation of soldier settlements on irrigation areas. I ask permission to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

## RE A. S. HICKS—LOXTON.

It is presumed that the Member for Burra, in his letter of the 2nd instant addressed to the Honourable the Premier, refers to the case of A. S. Hicks, a War Service settler at Loxton who occupies Section 807, Loxton Irrigation Area.

During the settler's occupation of his holding—approximately four years—he was given all

possible advice and assistance by the Department but it was ultimately necessary to recommend the termination of his lease because of his incompetency and inability to manage the land with advantage to himself and to the satisfaction of the Department.

Although War Service Land Settlement has been carried out under an agreement between the Commonwealth and the State, the State administers the Scheme on behalf of the Commonwealth. Leases are issued by the State and the State Minister is the authority for dealing with matters under the lease.

The lessee has no right of appeal under the lease against the decisions of the Minister, but an authority may be set up, in accordance with the conditions of the War Service Land Settlement Agreement, to hear appeals relating to the rights and responsibilities of the lessees, as defined in the lease, and, if Mr. Hicks had lodged an appeal at this Office direct without going to the Commonwealth, it would have been dealt with in the same manner as has now been approved.

The agreement of the Commonwealth and the State to the setting up of this authority was advised to the R.S.S. & I.L.A. and is well known and understood by the Settlers' Association and it is difficult to believe that Mr. Hicks was not aware of the position.

The authority referred to will in each case comprise a Stipendiary Magistrate as Chairman, a representative of the Minister and a representative nominated by the settler. Those appointed to hear Mr. Hicks' appeal are—Mr. L. F. J. Johnston S.M., Mr. A. C. Gordon, representing the Minister of Irrigation, and Mr. J. Quirke representing Mr. Hicks.

It is noted that Mr. Hicks will have legal representation and I have, therefore, arranged with the Crown Solicitor for an Officer of his Department to represent the Minister of Irrigation.

Following the issue of the notice of cancellation of the lease, it was necessary for the department to arrange for the working of the property but Mr. Hicks has continued to occupy the house free of charge.

#### Valuations.

In connection with appeals by irrigation settlers against their valuations, the Land Board, in conjunction with Commonwealth Officers, will consider these appeals.

The properties will be inspected and the settler will be given every opportunity of presenting his case and no objection will be raised if he requires advice and assistance in doing so.

The Association has previously asked for details of how the valuations are arrived at and this request has been refused by both the State and the Commonwealth.

The valuation of rural land is not a precise science and, in the ultimate valuations, reflects the considered opinions of the valuers based on all available and relevant information rather than on any strict mathematical formula. The principles underlying valuation of War Service Land Settlement holdings are such that the valuations must, of necessity, rely to an even greater extent upon the considered opinions of those making such valuations.

The release of any details used by the valuers to assist them in arriving at the valuation would tend to make a somewhat difficult situation even more difficult and complex.

In the circumstances, the settlers' concern should not be how the values are arrived at, but rather whether or not they are fair and reasonable.

Notwithstanding the fact that there is no provision in the Act for appeals by settlers against valuations, it has been agreed by the Commonwealth and the State that an opportunity for re-consideration of the valuation should be allowed where a settler can furnish substantial evidence to show that the value placed on his holding is too high and that an anomaly exists in his particular case, and each settler is allowed 90 days in which to lodge his application for re-consideration.

The Commonwealth has agreed also, that each settler will be given a further and final opportunity to seek a review of his valuation within 30 days after the expiration of a ten (10) year period from the end of the "Assistance Period" on the grounds that the valuation was too high to allow a reasonable living, based on the average prices for produce during the period of ten (10) years. Any such application would have to be supported by factual and relevant information.

If, during the ten (10) year period, it becomes evident to the department that a settler is in difficulty due to circumstances over which he has no control, his case will be examined with a view to all possible steps being taken to ensure that he is given a proper opportunity to succeed, and that he receives the benefits from the scheme as intended when it was planned.

#### URANIUM PRODUCTION.

Mr. JENKINS—My question relates to the production of uranium in South Australia. I know that the Premier made a statement on this matter some weeks ago but the Canadian delegates to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference told me last week that there was no market for uranium in Canada and they were closing down their mines. Can the Premier say whether we are likely to produce uranium profitably in South Australia?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—At present the Government is working the mine under a long-term trade agreement which was entered into with the Combined Developmental Agency and which was for seven years, of which  $4\frac{1}{2}$  years have elapsed and  $2\frac{1}{2}$  years remain. Therefore, we are working under an agreement that has some time yet to go. Speaking on the general position, from inquiries I have made and discussion I have had with overseas authorities, it would appear to me that during the period from 1961 to perhaps 1970 uranium will be in over-supply on the world's markets. There appears to be

a very great contraction of its use for military purposes and up to the present the supply for civil purposes has not been sufficiently advanced to take up the very large present world production. World production of uranium today is about 40,000 tons a year, so that there will be, in my opinion, a difficult period between 1961 and 1970.

On the other hand, I believe the long-term position of uranium to be extremely good. Every year, almost continuously, the cost of uranium produced power is getting lower and lower and more competitive with power from the traditional sources—oil, coal, and even water. So that the long-term requirements of uranium in the world I believe to be great; so the position will be quite good. On the other hand, the cost of production in South Australia at present is unusually high indeed by world standards and it will be necessary for us to get our costs down very materially if we are to compete in world markets.

#### LOSS OF RAILWAY FREIGHT.

Mr. LOVEDAY—Has the Premier a reply to my question of September 23 concerning the loss of railway freight to Melbourne?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have been supplied with the following reply from the Railways Commissioner, through my colleague the Minister of Railways:—

Isolated cases have been brought under notice of unreasonably high charges being quoted for delivery to and from rail in Melbourne. Generally, the charges are reasonable, although slightly higher than the equivalent charges in Adelaide. The Victorian Railways have a standing contract with a private carrier for the delivery of goods booked for door-to-door handling, and this arrangement serves to exercise control over general delivery rates in Melbourne in a similar manner to the control exercised through our own road motor organization in Adelaide. The operations of our contract carriers, who give door-to-door service, also counteract any tendency for delivery rates in Melbourne to be raised to unreasonably high levels.

#### ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES AND REPRESENTATION.

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 new boundaries for electoral districts for the House of Assembly to give substantial effects to the principle of one vote one value; and

- (b) to report on the advisability of increasing the number of members of the House of Assembly.

(Continued from September 23. Page 845.)

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield)—I support the motion and assure the House at the outset that I shall be what honourable members opposite consider refreshingly brief. I shall not speak at length for several reasons, not the least of which is that we have had almost ever since I have been a member, and for many years before that, Bills and motions of a similar character to this motion of the Leader of the Opposition, but we have never yet heard any good arguments against them. We have heard the same old arguments every year. Let me be fair and say that indeed we have heard the same arguments for them, too, but these arguments were good arguments and have never been refuted, and therefore it makes it difficult for us to think up new arguments. I should like to mention the attitude adopted by the Premier on these matters when they were introduced by the Opposition during the brief time I have been a member. The first move by the Leader of the Opposition during that period was in 1953, and in answering the arguments the Premier began his speech this way: "A cursory glance at the Bill shows . . .", and then he went on to prove to the House that he need not have begun his remarks in that way because it was obvious that he had given only a cursory glance to it. On September 8, 1954, on the same issue, the Premier began his speech in opposition to our measure in almost exactly the same way and said, "I have not had an opportunity to very closely examine the Leader of the Opposition's remarks on this Bill." Once again he went on to make it very obvious that he had not had the opportunity or did not bother to examine the Bill. On October 19, 1954, the Premier introduced his Bill to establish a commission to report on the revision of electoral boundaries, and on that occasion he said:—

The facts are wellknown and have been recently discussed in Parliament. It suffices to say that the Government recognizes that the growth of population in recent years and the change in the distribution of population have created anomalous differences in the sizes of certain electorates.

And he then continued:—"There is admittedly good cause for making changes." Might I intrude my remark here that if admittedly there were good reasons for making a change then, the disproportionate growth in electorates

since is also a good cause for making another change now. The Premier went on:—

It ought however to be made clear at the outset that it is not the Government's policy to make radical changes in the electoral system. In particular the Government believes that the existing ratio between metropolitan and country representatives should be maintained.

It was quite clear that even though the Premier was prepared, in appointing this commission, to fiddle around a little bit with electoral boundaries he was not prepared to alter the primary structure of two country representatives to one metropolitan representative in this House. Following on the terms of reference to this commission to inquire into the matter and to bring down recommendations there was one of the bitterest—indeed the most bitter—debate I have ever heard in this House. The measure was opposed tooth and nail by every member on this side of the House and yet, of course, it went through. We took the view that the Premier's proposal could only perpetuate the system we have been opposed to for so many years. However, we have been told ever since that the Labor Party agreed to the new boundaries. The Premier and other members on the Government side have pointed out that the only member to call for a division on the Bill that implemented the commissioners' report was the late Sir George Jenkins, but he did it out of consideration for his old electorate of Newcastle rather than for the constitutional amendment the measure contained. We have been told time and time again that members on this side of the House sat here and agreed to it but as we pointed out time and time again we opposed the terms of reference to the commission in one of the most bitter debates I have ever heard in this House. However, when the report came down we agreed that the commission had done its job according to the terms of reference and that it could not have done any more, but the Leader of the Opposition in speaking to the Bill made it quite clear that we did not agree with the terms of reference; on the other hand we agreed that the commission had done all it possibly could according to its terms of reference and therefore the Opposition would not oppose the Bill.

After that, in 1958—that is not long afterwards—the Leader of the Opposition moved for the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into new boundaries for electoral districts to give substantial effect to the principle of one-vote one-value. That shows, I think—it was made quite clear by the Leader of the

Opposition then and by all members on this side of the House who supported him—that we were not at all satisfied with the alterations made to the boundaries by the commission appointed by Parliament. The Premier opposed the motion on that occasion without seeking an adjournment. He just got up and opposed it immediately, which shows, according to the term he frequently uses, that he only had a cursory glance at the matter. This year the Premier in opposing this motion starts off strangely enough in the same way. He said:—

I have not had much time to examine this motion, consequently I cannot quote statistics and other things I should like to cite.

There we are right from 1953—and no doubt similar remarks were made before that, but right from 1953 up to this year, every time an important constitutional measure like this comes up in the House, the Premier gets up and says, "I have only had a cursory glance at it" or "I have not had time to look at it." One would think that matters of such grave importance would take a little more of the Premier's time. He should, out of courtesy to the House, have more than a cursory glance at issues of this nature so that he could give a more constructive lead to those on the other side of the House who blindly follow him.

I said that the Premier in opposing measures like this usually said he had not had time to study the Bill or the motion properly but it is obvious that he has not the inclination to do so because he does not want to be convinced. I think his speeches have shown only too clearly that on a matter like this we might have more reason to believe what he says than we might have in other instances because his speeches show only too clearly that he has had only a cursory glance at the matter. Take, for example, what he said this year:—

This motion would completely nullify any possibility of decentralization. It would aggravate the forces that at present are so potent in causing people to flood to the metropolitan area.

In other words, what the Premier is saying is that the present system is the safeguard of the country. How has it worked out? The Premier said:—

Can any metropolitan member say that from the point of view of providing utilities, public services, hospitals, schools, his district is less favourably treated than any country area? If any amenity is to be provided it is always provided in the metropolitan area first and later it may be extended to the country.

He went on to say that Adelaide is virtually 100 per cent seweraged and that the Government was trying to extend sewerage in the country. What about all the supporters on the other side of the House who are there to look after the interests of the country people? Apparently they have not been doing their job very well.

Mr. Hambour—We live in clean districts. Not everybody wants sewers. You look after your own district.

Mr. JENNINGS—At least that statement explains a lot of other things. The Premier then went on to say that power and water supplies had been almost completely established in the metropolitan area and that the Government was trying to extend them to all country areas. He said just a few moments before that twice the number of members are needed in the country areas to safeguard their interests, and a few minutes later he said that even though there were only 13 metropolitan members to 26 country members the metropolitan area gets everything first. How does it all work out? I am afraid I cannot understand the Premier on this, and I do not think that in this instance that is due to lack of perception on my part.

Mr. Loveday—The first shall be last!

Mr. JENNINGS—That is right. If Parliament were elected on a proper, democratic basis we could all consider South Australia as a whole and not be in the position into which we are sometimes put of having to consider country areas against metropolitan areas and so creating an artificial barrier between the people of this State. Under those circumstances, too, we should allow the electors a free opportunity to accept or reject the Government—an opportunity they certainly have not now. The Premier supports the present system because, under it, South Australia gets the Government he wants. This reminds me somewhat of the reported statement in yesterday's *News* attributed to the Premier of Victoria (Mr. Bolte), a very great friend and colleague of our Premier. Part of the quotation was read yesterday by the member for Semaphore when dealing with a different aspect, but I should like to read it again:—

Victoria's Liberal and Country Party had no plans to abolish the Legislative Council, the Premier, Mr. Bolte, said today. Its policy was to support the bicameral system of Government. A recent public opinion poll survey indicated that most people in Victoria and New South Wales favoured abolition of the Legislative Council. Of Victorians interviewed, 51 per cent supported a "one-house" Parliament.

I am sure not nearly that percentage would support the one-man Parliament we have here. The article continues:—

Mr. Bolte said he himself strongly supported a two-house Parliament. Investors had confidence in Victoria's political stability because it was safeguarded and guaranteed by the Legislative Council, he said. Even if the Socialists—

Should I whisper that word?

Mr. Hambour—You please yourself: it is your tag.

Mr. JENNINGS—The honourable member has never known me to be ashamed of it.

Even if the Socialists controlled the Lower House, it will be 'impossible' with a bicameral system, for them to put their policy into effect.

Mr. Clark—That is what it is for, isn't it?

Mr. JENNINGS—Precisely. It is a matter of "Never mind what the people think about it, we will establish some system so that, irrespective of what the people themselves want, we will see they do not get it. We know better than they do what is good for them." It is the same old story of "Dear elector, don't worry yourself about your destiny. Uncle Tom and Uncle Henry, who is his great mate of Victoria, or Uncle Adolf and Uncle Benito, will look after you better than you can yourself." I think the so-called democrats on the other side ought to know that the reason why a big part of the globe is over-run by Communism is that the former Governments in those countries said they knew what was best for the people and did everything possible to frustrate their genuine democratic aspirations. The Czars of Imperial Russia must take their share of blame for it, and so must the "Czardines" of Victoria and South Australia.

Mr. Hambour—Your memory is short. How did Chifley lose possession of the Treasury benches?

Mr. JENNINGS—We do not object to being voted out by the majority of the people. During this debate we have heard the same old arguments from members opposite. We have heard about the numerically small electorates in the far north of Western Australia, but this matter has been explained on innumerable occasions by members on this side, who have pointed out that there are three zones in Western Australia and that, though in the sparsely settled areas in the north the numerical strength of the electorates is relatively very small, the area is zoned so that there is a fair chance of getting an

accurate reflection of opinion in the whole area.

Mr. Clark—Don't forget that the Western Australian system was started to provide the same results as we have here.

Mr. JENNINGS—Precisely, but it did not work out because a few mines started in those areas and the population increased. We also heard the story about the Senate; that is a regular argument that we can depend on the Premier to use. He said that 10 members are elected to the Senate from each State irrespective of population. Surely we have mentioned often enough to make it clear that we do not subscribe to the method of election to the Senate? Indeed, we do not subscribe to the existence of the Senate at all. Our policy is for the abolition of the Senate just as it is for the abolition of the Legislative Council in South Australia. Even so, the Senate election takes in a big cross-section—indeed, it takes in the whole State—so there is a much better chance to get a proper reflection of the vote of the whole State than if the State were drawn up into all sorts of artificial boundaries.

I am a little disappointed that we have not yet heard mention of the House of Lords, which was often mentioned in previous debates by the previous member for Burnside (Mr. Geoffrey Clarke). We were once told that the Attlee Government had been guilty of an affront to democracy by stacking the House of Lords with Labor peers. I do not know whether the present member for Burnside will carry on the tradition established by her predecessor in taking part in these debates but, if she does, I sincerely hope she will have a better story in opposing Bills such as this than quoting what happened in the House of Lords.

I do not think any case has been put forward by the Government members who have spoken. I listened to the member for Torrens and some of the other members, but as I read their speeches last year I do not think there is much use in referring to them again, because they certainly have not varied. The member for Gouger, however, spoke on this matter for the first time, this being the first occasion he has had an opportunity to do so, and said:—

The members for Onkaparinga and Torrens have refuted the figures presented by the Opposition to support this motion, and have presented their case so well that there is little more for me to say.

I think that was a very good start and a very good end for the member for Gouger, but, unfortunately, even though there was little more to be said, he went on and said precisely nothing. That was the beginning of his speech.

Mr. Clark—What was the end like?

Mr JENNINGS—Fortunately, in the middle there was much pencil tapping in front of his microphone, and that was some relief to us because we were unable to understand what he was saying. Nevertheless, at the end he said:—

I urge the House to reject the motion, and to think more of the people and less of the politicians.

If anything is likely to encourage people to think less of politicians, it is a speech like the one made by the member for Gouger. I need only say this: the real opposition, and the only opposition, members of the Government have to this motion is one that they dare not voice, and that is their fear of a fair vote. They realize that if they agree to a democratic motion such as this they will no longer be on the Government side of the House. But irrespective of whether or not Government members support it, the Opposition sincerely believes and has good reason to believe from what has happened recently that although Government members, for the sake of their seats, cling to this undemocratic electoral system, the Opposition will triumph soon.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh)—I rise with all the enthusiasm that I possess to support the motion. In spite of some insinuations that the Labor Party lacks enthusiasm regarding the measures that they have the privilege to discuss on private members' day, it is rather significant that one Opposition member must follow another in this debate: that is evidence that members opposite are so completely and thoroughly ashamed of the present electoral system that they refrain from talking for fear they will be drawn into an admission of the fact.

The Opposition has moved many motions of this kind. I repeat what the member for Enfield said during the course of his remarks: the Opposition has never subscribed to an electoral system of the kind that operates in South Australia today. The Opposition has made that clear time and time again. It believes that the only reason Government members are sitting tight-lipped, as stated by the member for Enfield, is that they fear a fair vote in this State.

It might be refreshing for members to have another look at the motion before the House. It is in two parts, the first of which seeks the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the electoral boundaries of the House of Assembly and to give substantial effect to the principle of one-vote one-value. If that is not democracy, I have yet to learn what democracy is, and to deny the people of this country, or any other country, equality of opportunity is to deny them a democratic way of Government. You, Mr. Speaker, referred yesterday to a delegation that we have been honoured to meet in South Australia—the delegation that is attending the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference. Some of those delegates inquired about the electoral system in South Australia and I know that while they were in Western Australia they were told something of the electoral system that operates in this State. Some of those delegates from countries that have recently been granted self-government were amazed, in fact shocked, at the system operating in South Australia.

Last year when a similar motion was before the House it was argued that there was insufficient time for members to discuss it. Strangely enough, although there seems to be plenty of time this session, the members who complained, and whose Party complained that there was not sufficient time last year are not using the time that has been made available to them on this occasion. When the Premier was speaking on this motion he drew some imaginary lines, as he is so capable of doing, and suggested that they were the proposals in the motion. I point out that the Leader of the Opposition, on behalf of the Opposition, did not lay down any boundaries at all, nor is it the intention of the motion to lay down any specific boundaries; it merely asks that a Royal Commission be appointed to consider the best boundaries to provide a democratic system in South Australia. That is all the Opposition seeks.

The present system was instituted back in the 1930's, when enrolments in the metropolitan area totalled 211,963—about 58 per cent of the State's enrolment. At that time the Party which I have the honour to represent believed that the system was wrong and undemocratic, and I am certain that everybody at that time who believed in democracy was shocked that such a system should operate in this State. However, for the reasons that have been mentioned this afternoon by the member for Enfield and repeated by myself, it has been retained. The system has considerably

worsened in the intervening period; it is still claimed by the honourable gentlemen opposite to be the ideal system, yet it ignores the requirements of a democratic State.

The metropolitan enrolment today is 312,705, or nearly 63 per cent of the entire enrolment of the State. Therefore, the position has considerably worsened. In the metropolitan area 13 members represent almost 63 per cent of the population whilst 26 country members represent the remaining 37 per cent. Figures have been quoted to prove that for many years in election contests the Labor Party has gained the majority of votes, but still remains in opposition. The member for Gouger, Mr. Hall, claims that the Labor Party has no policy, but the election figures reveal conclusively that the people regard the Liberal Party as having a policy of expediency, whereas the Labor Party has a plan and the people want the Labor Party to govern. In 1953 the Labor Party polled 167,000 votes and the L.C.L. 119,000, a majority of 48,000 for Labor; in 1956 the Labor Party polled 129,000 as compared with the Liberal Party's 100,000, a majority of 29,000 for Labor; and at this year's election the Labor Party polled 185,000 and the Liberal Party 136,000, a majority of 49,000 for Labor. The Federal election figures for South Australia also reveal that the people support Labor's policy. The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) said that some seats were not contested and that therefore the Labor Party had no right to claim a majority. I am probably the only member in this House at present who has been returned four times without a contest. That situation is wrong. Boundaries should be so designed that every member would go to the people and give an account of his stewardship and the people should have the right to re-elect him or reject him and his policy.

The motion also suggests increasing the number of members of this House. In the 1920's, when the State population was less than half the present figure, there were 46 members here. It is not long since Parliament, at the Government's suggestion, unanimously agreed that there was need for additional Ministers because of the public demands on them. If there is increased work for Ministers there is increased work for members. The member for Gouger, in his futile opposition to the motion, advanced a forcible argument for an increase of members. He said:—

I have two small pamphlets in my possession. One is entitled *Local Government*. That is government as close to the people as it can get

and although some mistakes are made in its operation, it is a desirable feature by which services are freely given by community leaders. If closeness to the people is an argument for the retention of local government, surely it is an argument for increased Parliamentary membership to enable members to be more readily available to their constituents. In respect of the member for Gawler, the member for Gouger said:—

He also made the despicable insinuation that this Government refuses to develop the country areas because of its political interests.

That is grossly unfair to the member for Gawler. He did not insinuate it: he stated it most frankly. Is there anything despicable about being frank? I suggest that Mr. Hall exercise caution in using that word, lest it boomerang. In discussing this motion the Premier said:—

Can any metropolitan member say that from the point of view of providing utilities, public services, hospitals and schools, his district is less favourably treated than any country area? If any amenity is to be provided it is always provided in the metropolitan area first and later it may be extended to the country.

That supports the contentions of the member for Gawler. Much has been said about decentralization during this debate and the Premier claimed that, if carried, this motion would be the death knell of decentralization. The present electoral system has a retarding effect on decentralization. The Government administers its affairs so as to deny development in country areas. It promotes industry in sure Labor electorates in order to provide for its own political security. In 1957, in an attempt to prove that the Playford Government was interested in decentralization, the Premier quoted every town in South Australia where the Housing Trust had built one or more homes. He showed that during the Government's term of office a total of 7,830 homes had been built. I checked them and found, to my satisfaction, that 5,127 of the total of 7,830 homes built during that period were built in non-Government districts. I challenge the opposition—although I know they will not accept the challenge—to name one industry that has been established during the reign of the Playford Government in a Liberal-held district other than because of natural causes.

In order to drag a red herring across the intentions of the motion before the House, the Premier conveniently said that the Royal Commission when appointed would firstly have to consider dividing up the districts and then recommend an additional member, but that is far from the facts for the two things would

obviously be considered together and recommendations made accordingly. Up to this moment the argument has been so obviously ridiculous that even the member for Light (Mr. Hambour) has not supported it. All we desire is the appointment of a commission to establish in South Australia a democratic electoral system. I warn honourable members that, if this Parliament is not prepared to accept democracy, it cannot expect respect from the other nations of the British Commonwealth. We talk about equality of opportunity to reject a Government that is not wanted and to elect a Government that is wanted, but under our present electoral system we damn democracy and the hopes of the people. As the honourable member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) said, if this continues the people will rebel and lose faith in our political system, which will be a tragedy for us all. I ask the House to look beyond selfish interests and examine the problem from the point of view of our national advancement.

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray)—I support the motion and congratulate the Leader on bringing this matter before public notice again. It is the second time it has been debated in the short time I have been in this House. I supported a similar motion last time and gave my reasons for so doing. I support the motion as a country member. It has been said that country members on this side are not sincere when they say they want a fair go at the elections, but I say quite fearlessly that the country people want an equal distribution; they want something that is equitable, honest and fair play. It does not matter whether people live in the country or in the metropolitan area: they are all South Australians and Australians. The people of Australia are known for their fair play. The people have indicated previously that they favour fair play by voting as they did. The Senate figures at the last General Election showed that the people favoured three Labor senators from South Australia to go to the Federal House. The previous time it was just the reverse: the people of South Australia desired three Liberal and Country League Senators to go to Canberra.

Mr. Hambour—Is the honourable member now speaking for Murray or the Labor Party?

Mr. BYWATERS—On that occasion three years ago South Australians made it perfectly clear that they wanted three L.C.L. senators, and they got them. On the previous occasion they made it clear that they wanted three Labor senators, and they got them.



Because of the way the votes were regulated, they were able to do so. We find that at election after election in the State sphere the people of South Australia are not getting what they desire, because the State election followed the Federal election only a few months later and they would not have changed their minds in that time.

Last year I spoke in a similar debate on a motion, the wording of which was different from that of this motion. Last year's motion was knocked out because of the wording. We have given the Government the right of challenge again this year with slightly different wording. If the Government was prepared to bring down legislation here to appoint a commission and issued some sort of statement to the effect that our electoral system was to be reviewed, we would support it here regardless of the words of our motion provided the hands of the Royal Commission were not fettered. The Opposition is interested in just electoral reform. Whether or not the commission decided it should be one-vote one-value or that there was to be some other difference, we would accept the umpire's decision because we would realize that we were not bound by any specific undertaking as we were when this matter was introduced here a few years ago.

About a year ago I said that prior to my election by a narrow majority I had referred to this matter in my election speeches. The member for Light has said that no one questioned him about electoral reform at his meetings, which were attended by many Labor people. Of course, you get your own supporters at a meeting and a few people who are not convinced or who are opposed to your policy come along to ask questions to embarrass you. We appreciate that because it gives us an opportunity of putting our points of view. The member for Light on each occasion was not approached by any of his constituents on electoral reform. I believe him when he says that, but I held meetings in my electorate and I specifically mentioned electoral reform every time I spoke. At a meeting in the Murray Bridge town hall the Leader of the Opposition and I both referred to electoral reform and not one question was asked why, as a country member, I did not oppose it. I believe that the people in my electorate honestly believe in a fair and just electoral system. I have discussed this matter not only at meetings, but with groups of people, and have heard no opposition to the proposal. The member for Light's argument that the people are not interested could just as easily apply to members on the other side.

The Liberal and Country League voters in my electorate were not prepared to criticize me on the points I had raised, and I believe that the majority of electors in my district are satisfied to know that I am supporting a motion that would give some measure of equality in voting at elections.

When I was speaking on a similar matter on another occasion I had interjections from the member for Light and the member for Chaffey, and they were very much in the same strain. The member for Light wanted to know whether I was speaking for the electors of Murray and I replied that I believed that they were basically fair on that occasion. After I had finished my speech I was followed by the member for Chaffey, who made a contribution from his point of view. It is only natural that members on each side of the house should differ in their points of view. A person who holds four aces does not want a new deal, and I can understand honourable members opposite being satisfied with the present position. The member for Chaffey said something to the effect that I had stated I had an outright say for the people of my electorate. I admit that I was elected by only a narrow majority at my first election and he said that therefore I did not have a mandate from my electorate. I remind the honourable member that I had to defeat a sitting Liberal and Country League member and I was the only one who opposed him at that election, but no Liberal candidate was successful in defeating a sitting Labor member. It is hard to upset a sitting member.

Mr. Hambour—Did you advocate two country seats to one city seat?

Mr. BYWATERS—I said that I favoured electoral reform in accordance with my Party's policy. It was made an issue not only at that election, but I think in every Parliament for several years. I believe that the people know the Australian Labor Party's policy on electoral reform.

Mr. Hambour—It will be made an issue in Murray at the next elections.

Mr. BYWATERS—I think it could have been made an issue at the last elections. I believe that the people of Murray showed convincingly what they thought of the Labor Party's policy. My majority increased from a majority of 193 votes at my first election to 2,000 votes on the last occasion. The member for Light paid me a fine tribute in saying that it was a personal vote.

Mr. Hambour—A tribute to your work.

Mr. BYWATERS—I still intend to continue to do the same honest work as I have done in the past.

Mr. Hambour—I should not like you to think your majority was a tribute to this part of your policy.

Mr. BYWATERS—Perhaps it is only a small item in our policy, but because it is part of our policy, members on this side accept it. If we are honest in our approach, people know where we stand, and even if they do not always accept our view on this question perhaps they will accept the majority of our views at an election. Some members opposite, including the Premier, said that they would not like to see an alteration of the present set-up of two to one in favour of country people. I should like to think that country people were receiving a better deal because the country had a representation of two to one compared with the metropolitan area, but that is not the case. Only yesterday it was brought to the notice of the public that people in the country are not receiving the same advantages as those in the metropolitan area, despite the fact that there are fewer representatives from the metropolitan area as compared with the country. Attention has been drawn to the fact in other debates during this session and also on other occasions that water rates are higher in many country areas than they are in the metropolitan area, and that people close to the River Murray are paying higher water rates than those living in the metropolitan area; and electricity charges in the country are higher than those in the metropolitan area. Whereas the increase in railway fares in the metropolitan area was 12 per cent, it was 17 per cent in the country, and yet we are told that those living in the country areas are better served because they have a majority of two to one in the representation in this House. I cannot accept that.

Mr. Heaslip—They would have less representation in the House if we had one-vote one-value.

Mr. BYWATERS—I doubt whether they could get much less. Let the House give it a trial and see. If we had a Labor Party in power, as would be possible under the new set-up, the people in the country would, as on previous occasions, find that a Labor Government would be far more beneficial to them than ever a Liberal and Country League Government has been. That has been noticeable in the Federal sphere, and the people have had a much better deal, and I am sure that

would be the position if the Labor Party were in office in this State.

Mr. Ryan—That was proved when a Labor Government was in power in Canberra.

Mr. BYWATERS—That is true. When a Federal Labor Government was in power people in the country got a better deal. Before then farmers were receiving as little as 1s. 3d. a bushel for their wheat, but they received a guaranteed price of 4s. 0½d. under the Curtin Government, and they have never looked back since. It was not until guaranteed prices came in under a Labor Government that things looked up. That applied to fruitgrowers as well as to wheatgrowers. Under a Labor Government they were given stabilized prices and they have never looked back since. The Apple and Pear Board was not acceptable to this State although it was accepted in other States. I realize that all such boards do not always comprise persons who understand the position and sometimes there are things that are not acceptable to growers, but at least they were better off than they were under the merchant system of a few years ago. We will always find disgruntled people under any system.

Mr. Hambour—What have you to say about the Chifley Government which sold a bargain parcel to New Zealand?

Mr. BYWATERS—I am not going to talk about that. Recently during the debate there have been some interjections which have not been relevant to the matter under discussion. The member for Torrens, interjecting when the member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) was speaking, asked what Labor Party he was referring to, but I do not think that is relevant to this debate. The member for Onkaparinga said that the Federal Labor Party was doomed because of its policy, but that is not true. We have had upsets in our Party as has the Liberal Party in the past. However, there has been only one Labor Party and it has never had to change its name as have the Conservative people who sit opposite us. When they were in trouble all they did was to run away and change their name so that they could hoodwink the people. They did that because they were not prepared to face up to splits in their Party. All they have done is to change their name and the Labor Party has never done that. It has stuck to its guns and has always remained the Labor Party although other Parties have come into existence and used part of its name.

This matter has been well discussed and members on this side of the House have put

their case fairly and have tried to stick to the subject, but members on the other side have not done that: they have instead spoken about everything else going, although some members opposite have indicated that they favour portion of this proposal. The members for Onkaparinga and Torrens both said they supported increased numbers and whether or not we believe in the principle of one-vote one-value I do not think it will be many years before the Government will be defeated because of the weight of numbers and it will not be many years before the Government itself will have to bring down some legislation or some recommendation to appoint a commission to reassess electoral boundaries.

Mr. Shannon—As it did before.

Mr. BYWATERS—Yes, and it won't be long before the Government does it again and I hope that this time the Government will not fetter the commission, but will give it a free and unfettered mind to enable it to bring down something equitable.

Mr. Shannon—It could not have been too bad last time because you voted for it.

Mr. BYWATERS—I was not here at that time and therefore I did not vote for it. Soon there will be a need to introduce electoral reform and that will be brought about by the fact that so-called country areas such as Elizabeth, which will reach a population of 40,000, aided by a drift of population to the southern part of the metropolitan area, will make it necessary for a redistribution and a re-alignment of electoral boundaries. When that does come about I hope the population of South Australia will be given an opportunity to see that justice is done and that no suggestion of a gerrymander, whether it favours this side of the House or the other side, will operate. I support the motion.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood)—I, too, support the motion. I have spoken previously when this subject has been before the House and, as I do not wish to be repetitive, I shall be brief since there is another matter to come before the House this afternoon in private members' business. In view of what has come from honourable members opposite during this debate it is not surprising that members on this side should have been brief for the pitiful pronouncements that have come from members opposite are clear evidence of their unease when talking on this subject.

Let me deal with the three matters that honourable members opposite have seen fit to

advance as so-called arguments in relation to this matter. The first is the Premier's painful pronouncement that there is no such principle as one-vote one-value and that it cannot be found anywhere in the world. The Premier evidently did not go to the House of Representatives nor to the matters brought forward by certain expelled Liberals in Victoria in bringing into force a system of one-vote one-value there. Of course the Liberal Party did not like it, but the pronouncement of Mr. Hollway, former Liberal Premier of Victoria, should surely have led the Premier to think that perhaps some Liberals believed there was a principle of this kind.

I have spoken about what some young Liberals here had to say previously and I noted at the time that I said something about that matter. That was only last year. I read at some length what they had to say in their bitter denunciation of the Government. The Minister of Agriculture said that when the member for Mitcham returned to the House—he was unfortunately absent at that time—he would refute what I had to say. The honourable member for Mitcham has been strangely silent. I do not find that very surprising. The honourable member for Mitcham has been assiduous in charging members on these benches with quieting their consciences because of Party tactics. The honourable member was well-known before he entered this House for his denunciation of the present electoral system. I note in the constitution of the Liberal and Country League—I have always been interested in anything which the Liberal and Country League professes to put forth on its policy because it is usually extremely vague—there is only one thing about which they choose to be specific in their State platform. That is in paragraphs (e) and (f) concerning the maintenance of the Legislative Council, the present franchise, and the present ratio of representation between country and city. It is evident that the honourable member for Mitcham has been influenced by Party tactics upon this matter, as is evident by his vote on this issue. It is not necessary for me to go to the authorities that have been quoted time and time again in this House upon the basis for the principle of one-vote one-value. A man has the right to a vote on the basis of his humanity and nothing else; it is not what he knows or where he lives, but whether he is a person living within this country and having citizenship of this country that should be the only basis for a vote, and there should be no differentiation between one citizen and another. There should

be no derogation of that principle, and the Premier cannot deny it. The Premier said that members cannot find any such principle or authority anywhere in the world. When we quoted Sir Winston Churchill he was rather inclined to disregard him. He does not want instances quoted, because the present system is the only means by which he can keep in office, without regard for what the people of this State want.

Members opposite have said that it is not true that under present circumstances the majority of the people of this State vote for the Labor Party. The Premier has not used this argument, which is not surprising. Members opposite have said that as there are certain uncontested seats at State elections, some of which are sound Labor seats due to a concentration of industrial voters bringing about an enormous majority and, as the Liberal Party does not contest those seats, the majorities recorded in them are not a true reflection of the position throughout the State. The member for Torrens used this argument during the 1958 debate, and said one cannot possibly turn to those figures when there are so many uncontested seats and say "Well, there is a fair result. You can determine where the majority vote is simply by taking the figures of uncontested seats." In last year's debate the member for Torrens, perhaps unfortunately for him, said:—

At the last Senate elections three Liberal Senators were returned, and what fairer vote could there be than for the Senate?

He said it was obvious that a number of people voted for the Liberal Party for the simple reason that there was a Liberal Senate majority only a short time before, and that that showed how the people would vote, because they voted in one electorate only on that occasion. Unfortunately for him, that was the only occasion for a considerable time when there had been a Liberal majority vote in the Senate; on the previous occasion there had been a Labor majority. On that basis the Labor Party should be in office in this State now. There is a good deal of inaccuracy in the arguments of members opposite.

Mr. Sainsbury and Mr. Reid, of the Adelaide University, in examining the 1953 elections, used this method of analysis. I used that method in the last debate through the schedule that I obtained leave to incorporate in *Hansard*, and it is a sound method. Under this method one takes the seats in the State elections that were contested directly by the main political Parties. One then compares the results in

those seats with the results in those same seats at the Senate election held only a short time before. This shows the swing between the two, and then one applies that swing to the Senate result in the rest of the State. No one can say that is unfair statistically. I was at pains to show members how I arrived at those figures, so I put forward the schedule in full. The member for Chaffey did me the kindness of pointing out that in the calculations there was a transfer of votes in the district of Torrens that should not have taken place.

Mr. Jennings—It did not make any difference, though.

Mr. DUNSTAN—No, but I will show exactly what the difference was. In that case the difference was 2,000 votes, and this was the only wrong factor that could be shown in the calculations, which was an arithmetical fault on my part. If we make the correction that the member for Chaffey pointed out, that gives on the 1956 elections a majority, in the seats where the Labor Party directly opposed the Liberal Party at the State elections, of 51.9 per cent as against the vote in those same seats for Labor at the Senate elections of 48.3 per cent. In other words, there was a swing to Labor as between the Senate and the State vote of 3.6 per cent, and not 4.6 per cent as in the schedule I put forward. Consequently, the result is that the majority for Labor in the State is shown by the analysis to be 17,000, and nobody can say that this calculation is unfair. Indeed, it is the only fair way to arrive at an accurate result as to the support that the two Parties commanded in this State at that time. It is a better result in relation to the representation in this House than the result recorded in the 1953 election, as a similar analysis of the 1953 election showed that the Labor Party polled 55.7 per cent of votes, which was the highest percentage vote obtained by any Party in the Commonwealth within living memory. So much for this argument; it simply is not there and, indeed, I remind members that the Young Liberals in a pamphlet told their own Party that it was not true that the Liberal Party commanded the majority support in this State. However, they were evidently quietened by Party discipline. In the pamphlet they said:—

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.

The member for Mitcham did not vote in accordance with his previous statements when he entered this House. Members opposite have used the argument that when it came to a vote on the 1955 redistribution members on this side of the House supported having two country seats for every one metropolitan seat, and the member for Onkaparinga saw fit to refer to those arguments. He knows that is not true, as the vote was not between what was in the Bill and our system of one-vote one-value, but between that Bill and the existing system, which was even worse. The issue was between giving them less than three times the value of a city vote and the system that existed when I came into this House, when the member for Port Adelaide represented more voters than the Premier, the Minister of Works, the Minister of Lands, the Minister of Agriculture, and the Speaker combined. That was called democracy.

Mr. Fred Walsh—It still is.

Mr. DUNSTAN—The Government does not call it democracy. Interestingly enough, members opposite do not talk of democracy very much, and in view of what exists in this State that is hardly surprising. The Government does not believe in people's rule, but in rule by areas and by people who live in certain areas; it believes it proper that the people up at Norton Summit should have about four times the say of the people that live in my district, which, I point out, is a little smaller than some other metropolitan districts. If the electorate of Gumeracha were compared with the neighbouring electorate of Enfield, an even worse position obtains, because Enfield now has over 30,000 electors, whereas the Premier's district has not quite 7,000.

Mr. Hambour—You probably need more support than the Premier does.

Mr. DUNSTAN—I have got it, but unfortunately for the people who support me that does not count in here, because members opposite do not believe that it should be people who decide the Government of this State. We have the same position now obtaining in this State as obtained in England at the time of Sir Robert Walpole. We have heard much recently about the record of the Premier and that it has surpassed the record of Sir Robert Walpole. Sir, it has surpassed it in more ways than one. Sir Robert Walpole

was a Prime Minister of Great Britain who maintained himself in office with the support of the large moneyed interests, against the wishes of the majority of the people who lived in the country, on a system of rotten boroughs.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Joe Stalin had a longer record.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Sir Robert Walpole did not have jackboots, so perhaps he is a little nearer the Premier's record than Premier Stalin was. No Parliament in the history of Great Britain—and there have been many corrupt Parliaments—was as low in the esteem of the public, and deservedly so, as was the Parliament dominated by Sir Robert Walpole and his cronies, put there at the behest of moneyed interests against the wishes of most of the people of Great Britain. That Parliament maintained itself in office, not because the people wanted it, not because it was people's rule, but because Walpole and his cronies wished to be there for themselves and for that small class in the community that gave them monetary support.

That is the situation that exists in South Australia now, and it is not surprising that the Premier maintains himself in power in this State in the interests of the people who are on his benches, and of those who give him monetary support, by the method of rotten boroughs. Honourable members opposite should not talk too much about Sir Robert Walpole. The analogy—indeed, the simile—is too obvious for their comfort.

Mr. Fred Walsh—They have not talked too much on that matter at all.

Mr. DUNSTAN—That is not surprising. The less the public know about their attitude upon this subject, which defies morality, conscience and principle entirely, the better for them. However, I do not believe that the people of this State will continue to support, even by that marginal vote in rotten boroughs, a system which is rebounding more and more to the detriment of the people of this State, which is redistributing income from the lower to the higher, which gives them the worst social services of any State in the Commonwealth, which is not interested in the poor, the unfortunate, or the working people, which is government not of the people, by the people and for the people, but a government of Tom Playford, for Tom Playford's friends, and against the belief of the people of this State. I support the motion.

Mr. TAPPING secured the adjournment of the debate.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT  
AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 23. Page 859.)

Mr. CLARK (Gawler)—It is somewhat disconcerting at any time when trying to put your sequence of arguments before the House to have a break in your speech and have to continue on another occasion. On this occasion it has been rather worse, because my break has lasted a fortnight, and I therefore crave the indulgence of members for a few moments while I briefly recapitulate what I have tried to prove in my arguments.

I regard this as an entirely non-Party Bill. I think members sometimes find it a relief to speak in a debate in which we hope political bias is entirely absent. As I have heard my friend, the member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke) say, it is indeed a breath of fresh air sometimes to be able to speak in such a strain. I had therefore hoped when preparing to speak on this subject—and I had been encouraged in my hopes by the speeches made by members on both sides of the House—that this subject would be regarded without political feeling. However, my hopes were rudely dashed by the remarks of the member for Mitcham, who appeared to infer that because the abolition of capital punishment happened to be on the platform of the Labor Party it was, to put it bluntly, entirely damned.

I do not like that attitude at all. I am quite willing to admit that on the platforms of both the Liberal and Country League and the Party I represent there are some things on which both Parties could entirely agree. A few years ago the Minister of Agriculture and I came to a reciprocal arrangement and exchanged our platforms, and, possessing the platform of the Liberal and Country League, I had been emboldened to think and to hope that we could expect support from members on both sides of the House for such a measure as this, because clause (c) of the objects of the Liberal and Country League—and I make it perfectly clear that I am not reading this in any spirit of political controversy—states:—

To advocate sound, progressive and humanitarian legislation.

The word "humanitarian" led me to believe, rightly or wrongly, that many members on both sides, within the bounds of their printed platforms, would be glad to support this humanitarian legislation; and despite what has been said by the member for Mitcham I still hope that humanitarian feelings will prevail in this debate.

Mr. Heaslip—On whose side are you, on humanitarian grounds?

Mr. CLARK—I am with all men.

Mr. Heaslip—Are you with the innocent or the guilty?

Mr. CLARK—The innocent and the guilty are both members of the human race. I have attempted to stress the irrevocable nature of capital punishment, and the possibility of innocent persons suffering the death penalty must be disquieting to us all. I have cited numerous authentic instances of people who were executed but subsequently proven innocent. At the time of execution their guilt seemed perfectly clear, as we believe is the case in South Australia under our present legal system, but unfortunately that system is human and can err. Capital punishment has no value as a deterrent and its abolition has not led to a permanent increase in the murder rate in any country.

Two classes of people are condemned for capital offences: firstly, the clever murderer who does not anticipate the consequences of his crime because he thinks he is too smart to be caught and, secondly, the person who is motivated at the time of the murder by a fit of over-powering emotion or passion stronger than fear—the emotion of rage, lust, jealousy, hate, or the like. Passions of that nature drive completely from the mind of the person committing a crime the thought of the retribution that we hope will be salutary in preventing such offences. The fear of death is a real emotion—and only a fool would deny that—but it is a different thing before the crime is committed, when it is only potential and abstract, from what it is after the crime has been sheeted home and the person realizes that the consequences of it are inevitably coming upon him.

I referred to the many thousands of people who were executed for a multiplicity of crimes bearing the death penalty in earlier times, notably the Tudor period. Although they knew the crimes were punishable by death many reaped their richest harvest picking pockets while persons were being executed for the very crime they were committing. They committed crimes while the example of their punishment was before their eyes. Some members will say that what I have mentioned happened in the bad old days and that human nature has changed and we live in modern, enlightened times. We may be emboldened to so think because the death penalty has been abolished, either by law or by tradition, in 30 countries. When we recall that under the Mosaic law there were 33 capital offences we realize that

we have made some advancement, but it is interesting to consider some of the former methods of execution, and we recall them with disgust. They included burning at the stake, crucifixion, boiling in oil, self-execution, burying alive, shooting, breaking on the wheel, drawing and quartering, decapitation, impaling, crushing, poisoning, stoning, drowning and torturing. With a shudder we think of those methods as barbarous, but some of them still persist in countries that have not developed to the extent that we have. Our present methods are claimed to be quick and painless, but are they as quick and painless as we imagine, and have we, after all, changed very much? Are our present methods not planned, deliberate, mental and physical torture? Under the guise of protecting society do we not really execute State revenge?

Some members may say that I am getting emotional and sentimental. I may be accused of being a sentimentalist, but all reformers—most of them much greater men than I—have been so regarded. That great social reformer, Sir Samuel Romilly, when urging in the British Parliament the abolition of drawing and quartering, was told that he was “breaking down the bulwarks of the Constitution,” when he was trying to get abolished a punishment that we now regard with loathing. I may be accused of being sentimental and emotional. The same reproaches were cast at those who fought to get rid of slavery and child labour, and to free women and children from the mines and factories. We all agree today with the results of their emotion and sentiment. Let me say again that I believe that the whole process of waiting to be hanged—I know that people are not usually hanged unless for grievous offences that have caused terrible physical and mental pain—is mental torture, not only for the convicted man but also for the prison officials. There are numerous instances of prison officials being physically and mentally broken in the process of a man’s agonizing waiting for execution.

Mr. Shannon—That is one thing the victim does not have to suffer.

Mr. CLARK—Yes. A few weeks ago one of my colleagues (who shall be nameless) spoke to me about this in a friendly way. He said, “You stop and think of it like this: suppose a shocking crime such as rape or murder were committed on your little girl and you had the opportunity to get hold of the fellow who did it, what would you do?” I was forced to reply, “I am afraid in the

heat of the moment and because of my love for my child I would be forced to take action with my own hands, but I am certain I should regret it for ever after because I should be reverting to the law of the jungle.” People who wish to take revenge are more truly emotional than I.

Mr. Heaslip—But these are the laws of the land, not of the individual.

Mr. CLARK—We are seeking to amend the laws of the land, with which we cannot agree. This waiting for execution is a very real and terrible thing. If honourable members do not agree with me, some will say, “Yes, and he deserved every bit of it.” I do not believe anybody deserves it. Let me, at the risk of being regarded as a starry-eyed sentimentalist, quote a few words from a pamphlet by Victor Gollancz called *The Heart of the Matter*. This man, who was opposed to capital punishment, in this little pamphlet attempts to get into the mind of the man awaiting execution. He says:—

Imagine, then, that you are in the death-cell, with three weeks to wait. Everyone is very kind to you, specially kind: particularly the pair of wardens who are with you and watching you every hour of the day and night, for fear that you may find a way of taking the thing into your own hands and “cheating the gallows.” They chat with you, they offer to play cards with you, in the hope of “keeping your mind off it,” but all the time a little door in the side of your cell reminds you of what lies just beyond it. The doctor treats you like a king, for you must be well enough on the day to be killed: and the chaplain offers you spiritual consolation. Yes, they are exceedingly kind, and their very kindness—the very kindness of these people with a next year, a next month—their very kindness, and the reason for it, stabs you every minute and every second, with a realization of what you are. For you are a new kind of creation that no Creator but only human inhumanity could ever have created: you are not an animal or a man, but something dead while alive and something conscious during death of its deadness. And “trapped” there, kept “alive” there, even in a sort of way pampered there, you have to wait a self-conscious automaton, for the ending of that consciousness, day after day, hour after hour, minute after minute; but the moment ahead of you is not the sort of happy release that sick people, and even healthy people, sometimes find themselves welcoming, but a moment, your fear tells you, of unutterable horror. “What is it like being killed?” you keep asking yourself. Maybe you ask the warder, and he replies “A matter of seconds: no worse than having a tooth out.” But you don’t believe him. Death by hanging is perhaps instantaneous: but the contemplation of it isn’t.

You go to bed and perhaps to sleep, with what nightmares only God can know. You

wake up and maybe have forgotten: you wake up as a real man wakes up, with the joy or the burden, the ordinary happiness or the ordinary misery, of a new day before him. But if you have forgotten, you have forgotten only for a second: and the rushing, stabbing realisation of what you are is all the more dreadful for that momentary oblivion.

The hour grows nearer, and your mental agony increases. You cannot get away from it, this horror that is you: it lives in every breath you draw, in every word you speak, in every movement you make: it eats with you, drinks with you, goes to bed with you, gets up with you . . .

I think that is enough. Some may say, as I have already said, that that is starry-eyed sentiment. If it is—and it may be emotional—above all I submit that it is true; it is horrifyingly true, and I cannot accept that any human being—even a murderer, even if he has probably caused grievous physical and mental suffering to many—should be condemned to such a fate, to such mental suffering. I do not believe that the fear of death at some time in the future holds very great terrors for most of us, but I am certain that the thought of an immediate (though, unfortunately, not quite immediate) inevitable death getting closer every day does hold terrors for us all.

The supporters of capital punishment may say, "That is just what he should suffer," but I cannot believe that. Let me say again—because I know that some of my friends will, unfortunately, say this—that if I am a sentimentalist and an idealist I am proud to be in good company. I will accept the accusation gladly because I firmly believe that practically all of our humanitarian legislation has come from these sentimentalists, and usually against very heavy odds; it has taken years to obtain. So, naturally, I support this Bill in the firm belief that overall opinion throughout the civilized world favours the abolition of capital punishment. I believe sincerely that, if we pass this legislation in this year (1959), it will be remembered on our Statute Book long after many of the things about which we argue violently from a political point of view. I support the Bill.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert)—I rise to speak to this Bill because, having given the subject considerable thought, I feel I have an obligation, as has every honourable member who has seriously considered this subject, to express an opinion. I have listened with interest to the preceding speakers and will endeavour not to repeat unnecessarily the arguments they have already raised, for repetition seems to cloud the issue in a debate of this nature.

I should like to say at the outset that I am not unduly impressed by lists of figures, because figures can be found and manipulated to establish a case for or against almost any subject. To me, trends are far more interesting than actual figures. Nor do I propose to quote at length from the proceedings of the Royal Commission on Capital Punishment, because any report in which both sides of a case are heard and reported must obviously provide evidence for or against the argument, particularly if one wishes to quote hearings rather than findings. Similarly, one can find quotations in the Bible to support either argument if one so desires. Nevertheless, I believe that this question is more an ethical and moral issue than it is a legal one, and because this is so it resolves upon us who frame the Statutes to seriously consider these matters. It is neither the duty nor the obligation of the Judiciary. Their duty is to interpret our intentions and desires and to give rulings accordingly. It is not their duty to determine a right law from a wrong law; that is our duty. It might well be asked, Why do we obey the law? Does it spring from fear or does it spring from our respect for an orderly and law abiding society? It is my belief that because of centuries of justice and liberty Britishers have an inborn respect for the law. It is probably because of this that they always seek to defend the law and fear to alter it whether it is basically good or bad. And because legal practice is based upon precedent, the Judiciary themselves are reluctant to accept any change for fear of the consequences.

As to capital punishment, the basic argument advanced in its defence is that it is a deterrent. However, our forebears believed it was necessary not only as a deterrent for murder, but up until 1861 they also believed it necessary as a deterrent for upward of 200 lesser crimes. This belief has since been proved unfounded; but nevertheless, it is nearly 100 years since this punishment was finally restricted to only four crimes, namely, high treason, murder, piracy with violence and the destruction of public arsenals and dock yards. It is interesting to note, however, that, except for traitors during a war, there have been no executions since that date for any other crime than murder. In 100 years we have progressed immeasurably; we are now a well ordered, educated and enlightened community and I believe that our laws should provide for other than those few half-civilized members of society amongst us who may need the deterrent



of fear to keep them on the right side of the law. Nevertheless, despite our social advancement, we are still advancing the arguments of 150 years ago to support our contention that hanging is a deterrent for murder, when figures for a large number and diversity of countries which have long abolished hanging show that the removal of hanging as a punishment for murder has not been followed by a wave of crime nor has there been any evidence to support the contentions that as a result the police were subjected to extreme risks in carrying out their duties.

It is also most interesting to observe that the figures for murder follow a very similar pattern to those of other forms of crime, and it would appear to indicate that the incidence of crimes is more of an indicator of social conditions and social morality rather than a reflection upon the leniency of the punishment.

I think that I can say without fear of contradiction that we believe murder to be abhorrent, and to brand it as such we have retained the death penalty to place a certain social stigma upon it. I also believe that we are all agreed that the grief and suffering of the family of the victim is very real and very deadful, but we must also bear in mind that in placing a stigma upon a condemned man we are also placing a stigma upon the members of his family, who suffer just as much anguish and far more humiliation than the family of the victim. Is it just that these innocent people should have to suffer this stigma for another's guilt? It is also said that there is a wave of public sympathy for the accused and that the victim is forgotten, but is it sympathy or rather a matter of social respect that we wish to ensure that in exacting this irrevocable punishment justice is being done and that guilt is established beyond doubt? Let us not forget that death is very permanent both for the victim and the accused. Our law does not recognise degrees of murder. There is only one penalty—death. I believe that because of this, juries are sometimes reluctant to bring in a verdict of guilt, and seek a lesser verdict.

I believe that if the penalty is to act as a deterrent, it should be imposed without exceptions and without reprieves, otherwise it must surely lose its real deterrent value. There are unusual circumstances associated with the course of justice in the case of murder. The verdict of the judge and jury can be overruled by Executive Council in its exercise of the recommendation for the Royal prerogative of mercy. This is a most unenviable and unduly

responsible duty; and I feel that it places upon Ministers of the Government Party an unnecessary strain, and leaves them and their Party open to censure, as we have recently seen. Also, as the opposing Parties' policies are diametrically opposed on this issue, this leads to inconsistency, and whether a man is hanged or reprieved depends largely upon the Government in office at the time of the offence, and not upon the deed itself. This, to my lay mind, is most irregular. It is also doubtful whether hanging deters other than the vicious criminals who may shoot to avoid detention by removing the evidence. The premeditated murder is also meditated in an attempt to prevent detection—in an effort to find a way around the problem. The murderer thinks he is too clever, and will not be discovered. However, by far the greatest number of murders are committed in a rage or under severe provocation, and I doubt whether in such cases any consideration is given to the consequences until after the deed has been committed. It is also doubtful whether deterrence is strictly related to the threat of actual death in any case because, as I have pointed out, there is always the chance of reprieve. It is most interesting to recount that in 1932 the then British executioner was himself hanged for the murder of his wife and child. Apparently either hanging was no deterrent to him or it had induced a morbid fascination in him for Jaek Ketch. This morbid fascination and the sensationalism of certain sections of the press towards hanging should be greatly deplored. It is morally debasing to stimulate circulation under the cloak of justice. Sir, I am not convinced that hanging is the deterrent that it is claimed to be, but I am convinced that the fear of being detected is a very real deterrent.

If we are not to punish murderers by hanging, what is the alternative? In this regard I strongly disagree with the member for Norwood, who contends that the alternative is imprisonment for life. I do not believe that this would be at all effective as a deterrent as it is no greater punishment than that imposed for lesser crimes and gives hope of release through commutations within 12 years. This risk is one that any criminal is already prepared to accept as an occupational hazard, but always with the anticipation of being released to eventually resume his profession. I contend that such imprisonment should not be for life, but during Her Majesty's pleasure, for a minimum of 20 years. I have read many interesting views upon the matter of long

term imprisonment. Some people contend that it would be more humane to remove a condemned man from his misery than to incarcerate him indefinitely because they believe it would cause psychological deterioration worse than death. This contention, however, is not borne out by the evidence submitted to the Royal Commission on capital punishment by the British Home Office and Prisons Department. Others maintain that it is an undue expense for the State to maintain murderers in prison. This is not necessarily true, as they constitute only a small proportion of prisoners. Further, if cost to the State is to be considered, it might also be argued that we should not build bigger and better asylums to maintain the insane, as surely the same argument applies. Others say murderers should be removed as they constitute a public menace. This could have disturbing implications, because the number of murderers is small compared with the number of dangerous criminals and maniacs detained in gaols and institutions. This is a counterpart of Hitler's argument for exterminating certain races.

As a class, murderers are better behaved and give less trouble than the average prisoner and, upon release, are seldom reconvicted for any crime; in fact, figures given in the Royal Commission's report bear out that they are well behaved on their return to society. What are our intentions when we seek to exact punishment in any form? Do we seek revenge, or the removal of the guilty person from society until he has proved himself fit to return to society or otherwise? There are other reasons one might submit, but I believe that revenge is a barbaric custom that should not be condoned in any civilized society. I believe that criminals or murderers should be removed from society while they constitute a danger to the community and that they should be detained until it can be established that their release will not endanger society. I accept the principle that capital punishment by hanging could be abolished.

However, there are other offences covered by this Bill that I cannot agree to accept. For instance, if section 238 were repealed, it would no longer be a serious offence to enter a prison forcibly to rescue a convicted murderer. I cannot accept that, nor can I bring myself to consider treason in the same light as murder, as treason is a crime against the State and has a far more reaching significance than any crime against a person. I therefore oppose the Bill.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra)—I do not suppose any measure that has been before the House during my term here has given me such reason for thought as this Bill, and I have decided to support it. I heartily endorse most of the excellent speech made by the member for Albert and, to prevent repetition, I accept all that he has said, although I cannot arrive at the same conclusion. I accept all that he said as being true but, even so, I can come to only one conclusion. I agree that there are crimes which, for the safety of the State, merit capital punishment. Treason is one, and another was mentioned by the member for Albert, but if capital punishment were abolished it would be the duty of this House to apply adequate remedies in other directions.

We can abolish this primitive and savage act of revenge, which is what capital punishment is. It is in the minds of those who uphold it that, as a person has committed a crime of blood, therefore his blood must pay the toll. That is of ancient origin, but I think we have got past it. How would the people or the members who have opposed this Bill view the setting up for a public flogging of a triangle in North Terrace, with a circle of 25ft. radius drawn around it so that the spectators could stand outside the circle knowing that the best flagellator could not throw the victim's blood and flesh as far as that? That is one of the things that happened in this country, and there are permanent and indelible records of it. Would we do it here now? Would anyone now tolerate a spectacle like the first hanging in South Australia, when the executioner so muffed his task that he had to hang on to the legs of the condemned man until he died by slow strangulation? Could there be any public execution today? Would the people tolerate it? If they want to see the horror of it, let us have one and let them see it, and we would then see how long it would take to abolish capital punishment! All those dread methods of execution, which were in the main acts of revenge, are in the past. Would we tolerate the stoning of a woman for adultery, which is still done in the world today? I think we have gone so far beyond it that, if we can claim civilization, we can do away with the last vestige of these things, as they no longer apply in a community that claims to be fully civilized.

What is this thing? Is it blood for blood? Is it such a deterrent? The Premier quoted figures showing that because we have capital punishment acts of violence, such as manslaughter in some cases and murder in others,

are fewer here. They may be, but is that any reason why we should not abolish capital punishment? Is it to be construed to mean that immediately we take it away these offences will increase? I do not think that will apply in South Australia. However, if it is such a deterrent, what about the people who have already committed that crime? People committing murder do not for one moment think of the consequences, and on figures throughout the world I cannot see that hanging is such a deterrent.

Probably the reimposition of capital punishment in Ceylon will be mentioned later in this debate, but if we retain it because it has been reimposed in that country, it will be a reflection on our civilized state. It has been said that, because of the increase in murders in that country, the death penalty would have been reimposed in Ceylon, irrespective of the ghastly murder of the Prime Minister, but who are these people and what is their economic status? They are probably struggling upwards to achieve in economic status what we have achieved through the years. Are we to judge them on the same standard as ours? They exist on a mere daily pittance that keeps only body and soul together and gives them a life expectancy of perhaps only 28 years. Conditions exist where the very drive and force of keeping body and soul together sometimes forces these people to commit acts such as that. In case that should be brought up here, I point out that we cannot take that as evidence of why we should continue capital punishment, simply because Ceylon has reimposed it. I trust that it will not be brought up, because I could not accept it as having any parallel with our own case.

Mr. Jenkins—They were not the sort of people that murdered the Prime Minister of Ceylon.

Mr. QUIRKE—I thought that point would be brought up. One of Ceylon's representatives in Australia today stated, according to the press, that that particular murder was not the one that caused the reimposition of capital punishment. The member for Stirling may have seen that statement in the press. Of course, there are murders in every grade of society; there always have been, and there always will be, whether we have capital punishment or not. The member for Albert mentioned the act of hanging. I have one complete objection to hanging: that it perpetuates the idea that the sins of the fathers shall be visited upon the third and fourth generations,

and I do not believe for one moment that we should assist in perpetuating that belief.

Let us consider the school-going children of an executed man: who would like to be in their position? How would the mother feel when the children came home, having been taunted with the execution of their father, merciless and heartless as children are in these matters? We know that happens, and should we assist in such a thing? Right through their lives the children of these people bear that indelible mark that precludes them from ever taking their full status in society. We should not condemn them when we condemn their fathers. A murder of any type is seldom as deliberate as the act of the man who takes the life of the murderer. I believe that the State has the right to take life in the protection of its citizens; I believe that an individual has the right to take life to protect his own life, and I believe that the father of a family has the right to defend his family, even to the extent of taking life. Unlike the member for Gawler, if I were placed in that position I would kill without remorse. That is my attitude, but that does not mean that the circumstances are the same. The hangman—the common executioner—has to do that act; he has to do a far more deliberate act than the man whom he is executing, and that should not be forced upon anybody, willing as he may be. Curiously enough, plenty of people are prepared to act in that capacity.

We do not want to continue the idea of inflicting the sins of the father on the third and fourth generations. Somebody has said that this is not a political matter, and that it should be looked at as an individual matter. However, I maintain that we in South Australia cannot divorce this question from politics. Two men may be sentenced to death at intervals of a fortnight, and if the execution of one takes place on, say, Thursday and there is an election on Saturday, one man is hanged and the other is reprieved if the other Party gets into power. That is inevitable, and it is one of the things that should not be condoned. It appears from what has been said that most Government members believe in the retention of capital punishment, whereas the Labor Party, according to its platform, wants to abolish it. It could quite easily happen that one man will die a week before an election and the next man, whose crime may have been infinitely worse, will be reprieved.

Mr. Clark—It has actually happened.

Mr. QUIRKE—If it has, that makes the position worse. I do not like these things; I

will not have the visiting of that crime on the children, and I will not have the matter on a political basis. The member for Albert made probably the best speech that has been made in this debate. In fact, there were three very good speeches, one by the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday), one by the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse)—although he rather destroyed it by his first approach to the subject, for which I do not applaud him—and the third by the member for Albert. The latter was a magnificent speech, but in spite of the evidence he produced why capital punishment should be abolished he went on to say, because of something of lesser magnitude than anything he had mentioned, that he must vote against the Bill. Why could he not have a go? I would not expect him to amend the Bill, but I would expect him to stand up to what he said. I believe everything he said, and because I believe everything he said I look to Parliament to correct the things that need correction. Parliament can do that; that is what members of Parliament are here for. If we pass this Bill first and then adjust the necessary penalties to act in place of capital punishment, we can pass another measure through this House in possibly a week. However, as this measure is before the House, and because I feel as I do about it, I must vote for it even if I have to leave the penalties somewhat in the air until such time as Parliament has approved other penalties in lieu of capital punishment. For those reasons I wish to place on record my vote in favour of the abolition of capital punishment.

Mr. HALL (Gouger)—I have listened with much interest to the debate on this Bill, to which I am sure members on this side of the House and in all parts of the House have given much thought. I think we have been lost in a wave of emotion this afternoon, and that the members who have spoken have forgotten that the matter of capital punishment is a means to an end, and not an end in itself. All speakers who have supported this Bill have airily dismissed the angle of deterrence, without, I think, any reason to back that dismissal.

This Bill was well and ably explained by the member for Norwood, but I consider that his arguments were demolished by the member for Mitcham. The member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) said that capital punishment was causing a marked uneasiness amongst the normally complacent population. I say that it causes an uneasiness among potential murderers, and that is why we keep it on the Statute Book. I am not interested in capital

punishment as a punishment in itself, and if it could not stand up as a factor of deterrence I should have to support the Bill.

As the member for Burra said, there were several good speeches in this House, although I deplore the search of other countries contained in most of them. We have had trips around this world—to Britain, Scandinavia, Ceylon and New Zealand. We have spent very little time in Australia, particularly in South Australia, and, from what I can see, no-one has told the people what it really means to them in so many words. The two speeches I consider the most important were the one by the Premier, with his table of figures that he inserted in *Hansard*, and the one by the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday), with his table of figures similarly inserted in *Hansard*. It is quite obvious that these tables are complementary to each other, even though the member for Whyalla may not have intended that to be so.

Let us compare the Queensland and South Australian figures. From the Premier's table of illegal killings we find that the rate in Queensland for the last 10 years is 2.36 per 100,000 of the population compared with 1.44 in South Australia, so we have a much lower average of illegal killings. Some members have said that probably our crime rate is lower and that other factors must also be considered. In these circumstances it is interesting to refer to Mr. Loveday's table of criminal convictions per 100,000 of the population in all States. In Queensland the figure is 23.2 as compared with 36 in South Australia. I will admit that that is not a favourable comparison from South Australia's viewpoint, but it indicates that we have more major crimes *per capita* than Queensland, although we have only half the number of murders. The only deduction to be made from those figures is that capital punishment operates as a deterrent.

What does this mean to the people of this State? Some members say that numbers do not count, but they do if there are two killed in one State in a given period and four in another State. Those figures cannot be dismissed lightly. I am confident that if we abolish capital punishment and lose its deterrent effect we will have an increase in our murder rate. It would be most unusual for one State to have some peculiar social significance whereby its murder rate remains so far below the average of the other States: I contend that our murder rate must increase to some extent, and if it should rise to the

Queensland rate—and I do not think that it would immediately jump to that—we would have another eight illegal killings in South Australia annually. If it should rise by only .22 we would have another two illegal killings annually.

How many convicted murderers do we hang in this State annually? I have not the official figures, but I suggest the average would be less than one. To reprove less than one murderer a year how many innocent people would be condemned to death by violence by some undeterred murderer? These facts should be put to the people and not hidden beneath a wave of emotionalism. There is every reason to believe that our murder rate would rise to at least the lowest of the other States. The proponents of this Bill are saying to the people, "We are willing to sacrifice four or five innocent people to reprove an average of less than one murderer a year." I oppose the motion.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### LAND SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### STATUTES AMENDMENT (PUBLIC SALARIES) BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council with a suggested amendment.

#### EXCHANGE OF LAND (HUNDRED OF NOARLUNGA) BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

[*Sitting suspended from 5.49 to 7.30 p.m.*]

#### THE BUDGET.

In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from October 6. Page 925.)

Grand Total, £80,323,000.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens)—I rise to support the first line. This is a record Budget both in its scope and in its total amount. We have heard outlined in the Treasurer's Budget Speech the effects of the present bad season. It has been pointed out that our Railway and Harbors Board losses of revenue will be considerable. Expenditure on the pumping of water, especially through the Mannum pipeline, will be about £1,400,000 in a full year. Despite that, the deficit envisaged is not greater than £791,000. Taking all these things into consideration, I submit that this is a magnificent Budget, bearing in mind the effects of

this bad season and that last year the deficit was £1,027,000. That means that this year we have a smaller deficit. The Treasurer has done a very fine job and I should like to compliment him on introducing such a wonderful Budget in a bad year, probably one of the most difficult years this State has experienced for a decade.

I mention this so that honourable members can compare the effect of this bad season on our finances with what the position would have been a decade or so ago in a similar season. Bad as it is at the moment, I suggest that just before the war such a bad season would have had a ruinous effect not only on the economy of the State, but also on the producers themselves and the citizens at large. In those days we were principally a primary-producing State. All our economy at that time revolved upon our primary production. When the farmer was prosperous, everybody else was prosperous; when he had a bad season, most other people also suffered. But today the position has changed. Although many people, and indeed the State itself, will feel the effects of this bad season, its effect will not be nearly so disastrous as it would have been many years ago because we have today achieved a far better economy in our balance between primary and secondary production. We have for years now been expanding our manufacturing capacity. This is having a cushioning effect upon the result of this bad season, however disastrous it may be. So it is with some pride that we can look back upon our achievements in secondary industry developments over the past decade because it has no doubt affected the ordinary man in the street and made his position easier, and indirectly assisted the man on the land, who is the principal sufferer from a drought.

I want to consider the employment position in South Australia in the years to come because it is something that every honourable member of this House is intensely interested in and is most important to us all. We know that our present population is about 900,000 men, women and children, which is an increase of about 300,000 since the end of the war, representing about a three per cent net annual increase. We find that about half of this increase is coming from our natural increase from births, while the other half is coming from our intake of migrants. We also find that our post-war increase in the birth rate that occurred as a result of many soldiers returning from service is now catching up on us. We know that in 1944, 1945 and 1946 the birth rate

increased above the usual rate. Many of those children are now at school, and the trend is for them to stay at school longer than they used to, which is a good thing and should be encouraged. Within a year or so we shall find that over and above the normal three per cent increase coming on to the employment market there will be an extra percentage increase of these children resulting from the post-war birth rate increase also coming on to the market. So jobs must be found for all those children.

It will be a responsibility of the Government, of this Parliament, and of every person in the State to pull his weight in providing outlets and avenues for employment to absorb this extra work force that we shall have. It will mean that, so far as secondary industry is concerned at any rate, a considerable increase will have to take place. There will be some increase in primary production, but to take up this increase in population the big challenge will be to secondary industry because that is the obvious avenue where larger numbers can be absorbed. If we are going to expand our secondary industry we must of course in all due conscience examine our ability to expand our export market for both pastoral and manufactured goods. We must keep up our efficient production. We must also watch the efficiency of factory production because if we do not maintain our efficiency and keep our cost structure as low as we can, we face the prospect of being priced out of our export markets.

We not only have to produce more food to feed our increased population, but we have to produce more and more food to increase our export potential. Therefore, we have to see that our industries produce more and more consumer goods for the people, and also provide more products for our overseas trade. I name as one example the Holden car, which we are producing for the people of Australia, but we are also exporting it to many countries of the world, not only in the British Commonwealth of Nations, but to many countries not associated with the Commonwealth. This forms a very valuable export trade and assists in our export balance of trade.

I submit that this is one avenue that we can exploit further in future because it is only by expanding our economy in this way and absorbing our increased population that we can hope to improve our economic position in the years to come, and if Australia is to advance, and South Australia in particular, this is one way to do it.

It is an obligation upon members of this House and the general public to see that this type of programme is carried out. We must also, if we can, fill up many of our empty spaces. That is an essential. I am one who keenly believes in decentralization, and if we can encourage some of these industries to go to the country we can give more employment to more of the country towns. I hope that as a result of the exploration of mineral resources, especially oil, we may be able to fill up a few more of our empty spaces. As a natural corollary of the increases I have mentioned, we shall find that many of our children who will be leaving school in a year or so will, I hope, desire to get married. That means that more homes will be required, and the challenge there will be to the Housing Trust and to private builders to increase the rate of home building, even although today we are building a tremendous number of homes.

The challenge will be to build more homes and at the same time keep costs down within the economic limits of young couples when they get married. From my investigations I have discovered that many phases of the building industry are planning now to meet this challenge. For instance, cement producers are increasing their plant, and clay brick manufacturers are importing modern types of machinery and are installing more efficient methods so that there will be not only a tremendous increase of output, but also an improvement in quality and variety. Obviously, if more modern machinery is introduced and more efficient methods of production are adopted, the unit cost certainly should not rise.

Mr. Quirke—Can you tell me of one that has been reduced?

Mr. CUMBE—The price of the product certainly should not rise. Expansion methods in the timber trade are being put into operation so that greater throughputs will be achieved. We want this type of expansion, because the housing and building industry is one of our basic necessities. I suggest that one way in which new industries and new capital can be attracted to this State and existing factories expanded is for more use to be made of the facilities of the Department of Labour and Industry, which is under the administration of the Attorney-General. The Industries Assistance Branch has very competent engineers and officers, men who have given much assistance to industry. They have advised industries on handling methods and methods of expansion, and where new industries can be set up. I suggest that this department

should be expanded so that when an industry desires to establish here these officers will be able to advise on the State's resources and the locality most suited to their type of production. This would be a positive step towards expansion of our secondary industries. If this can be done in co-operation with the existing trade organizations here, it would be a positive step forward. Such expansion must inevitably lead to more and more employment.

As we look around the metropolitan area we find that the near-in land is rapidly disappearing. The Housing Trust is building large numbers of houses in various localities, but land nearest the city has been taken up first, and people have to travel further and further away to get land for a home; and before many years there will not be in the metropolitan area very many of those lots of land where the trust could economically build, as it is doing today, so it will have to go further afield. One effect of this remaining land being taken up will be the disappearance of much of our market garden land. I feel that is a tragedy, one which we should avert as long as we can, though I realize that eventually it might have to come. I know that the member for Barossa feels as keenly about this as I do. It means that, as in other parts of the world and of Australia, this primary producing land close to the city must be used for home building, and growers will have to move to another district. The result will be that the cost of their products must soar. I envisage that perhaps in 30 or 40 years the population in the metropolitan area will double, and it may be that we shall have houses all the way from Gawler or Virginia right through to Sellicks Beach on the western side of the ranges. That is not as fanciful as it might appear at first sight. I understand that the Town Planner is already looking in that direction, and that State officers are looking ahead regarding the facilities that will be necessary. The Town Planner has been working on an overall plan for a couple of years, and it should be submitted to Parliament as soon as possible so that those who are planning for the expansion of the metropolitan area will know where they are going. In his annual report the Auditor-General in his wisdom has this to say regarding the cost to the taxpayers of the function of Government, and I heartily agree with him:—

The "cost to the taxpayer" for 1958-59—  
(1) of all the functions of Government was £36,134,000, an increase of £2,921,000, or 9 per cent compared with 5 per cent the previous year.

He went on to say that the extent of the upward trend in the cost of all functions was indicated by the fact that since 1955 the cost had risen 24 per cent, or £7 14s. 4d. per head of the population, and that that increase when equated to the price level of 1955 to allow for the fall in the purchasing power of money since that date represented a real increase in levels of expenditure of £3 5s. 2d. per head (10.2 per cent).

More significantly, he goes on to say that social services, including education, health and hospitals, cost £21,540,000, which was £2,780,000, or 15 per cent, more than in 1957-58. I emphasize that these social services accounted for 60 per cent of the total cost of all Government functions. These are the figures referred to in the Estimates presented by the Treasurer and do not refer to anything under special Acts. I agree that adequate social services are extremely desirable and I do not think they should be curtailed; rather, they should be expanded, but when one realizes that they take about 60 per cent of the total cost of Government, one is brought up with a jolt. That means that only 40 per cent is left for other costs of Government, including administration and the expansion of the public resources of this State. I believe we are coming to the stage when we should carefully investigate the apportionment of expenditure. I agree with the total amount spent on social services, and I do not know how we will get over this, but the high percentage compared with what is spent on administration and development should give members food for thought.

We know that the Tramways Trust was reconstituted some years ago when it was showing large deficits that were increasing year after year. It then appeared that there was no possibility that an improvement would ever be effected. The board was reconstituted and advice was taken from some eminent authorities, including some overseas management consultants, from which was evolved what is now known as the 10-year plan, which was a plan that would re-establish the whole tramways system of Adelaide and suburbs within 10 years. Now that the whole of the tramways system, with the exception of the Adelaide-Glenelg line, has disappeared, the majority of rails have been taken up and the roadways reinstated, and almost all the overhead wiring has disappeared. No power is now generated by the Tramways Trust, which buys the small amount it requires from the Electricity Trust. It is extremely interesting to study the grants made by this Parliament

to the trust. The grant in 1952-53 was £700,000, which is a large sum; in 1953-54 it was £700,000; in 1954-55, £600,000; in 1955-56; £570,000; in 1956-57, £510,000; and in 1957-58, £490,000. It can thus be seen that after the first two years there was a slight improvement until, in 1958-59, only £440,000 was granted, and in the current financial year the grant has dropped amazingly to £190,500.

Mr. Ryan—Is it at the expense of the railways vote?

Mr. CUMBE—I am suggesting that through greater economy and better working efficiency within the trust and the use of an up-to-date system in place of the archaic tram system the trust has been able to reduce the grant to this amazingly low figure.

Mr. Ryan—Have you seen tonight's *News*?

Mr. CUMBE—Yes, and what I said still applies. Of all Government and quasi-Government departments, this department has shown the most amazing recovery. Years ago it was generally accepted that the trust was in a hopeless position, and the public more or less accepted the losses, but this amazing recovery has taken place and it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that within a year or two the trust will not require any grant from this Parliament, because this trend could continue with the modern plant at the trust's disposal. All members of this Parliament should take pride in this considerable achievement. We should have confidence in the trust and commend the board for the work it is doing. We also know that with the advent of diesel buses the trust has been able to extend its operations on routes where extension of tram services would not have been possible. In my district, and in that represented by the member for Enfield, buses are now travelling five miles and more beyond previous tram termini. This could not have occurred under the old system.

I wish now to refer to one or two matters concerning my electorate that I am pleased to see on the Estimates. They are both matters relating to the Hospitals Department. The first is the grant that will be made this year to the Adelaide Children's Hospital. We know that this hospital caters not only for the children living in Adelaide but for all children in this State, and it does a magnificent job. Many members are actively associated with the hospital or its auxiliaries, so most would know that a huge public appeal has been launched. Last year the grant made to the hospital was £496,000, and I am happy to see that it has been increased this year to £607,800. Part of

this will go towards the new wing and the expansion that will occur when the money comes in from the present huge appeal, which I am sure every member will support.

The other matter to which I wish to refer is the grant of £76,712 that will be made towards the rebuilding programme at the Calvary Hospital. I commend the Government for its policy of subsidizing these hospitals in the magnificent work they are doing. Without Government assistance this hospital could not carry out the work it is doing, and it is certainly cheaper for the Government to provide this assistance, for which I commend it. I have pleasure in supporting the Estimates. Despite the most difficult season we are experiencing, the Government and the Treasurer have done a magnificent job in bringing down this Budget.

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa)—I, too, have very much pleasure in supporting the adoption of the first line of these Estimates. In so doing I should firstly like to congratulate the Treasurer on the presentation of his twenty-first Budget. It is no mean achievement in itself to successively present Budgets over a period of 21 very important years in our State's history. It redounds to his credit, more so because of the development which has been evident throughout the State in those years in which the Treasurer has had the administration of the financial affairs of the State in his hands. I commend him for his unflagging efforts before the Grants Commission and at Loan Council meetings for the good of his State, and for having led this State to a position wherein we are now no longer among those who are regarded as mendicant States. It was a proud day for this State when we emerged from that position, and I have no doubt that this emergence has been due to the sound and purposeful direction of the finances of the State.

The present Budget is essentially one of review and planning for the future. It does us no harm to reflect at times on what has been achieved over recent years, having in mind that our State is one of the least endowed with natural resources of all the States of the Commonwealth, that 90 per cent of our land is arid, and that we have huge expanses to care for with water reticulation and such things. All these conditions are peculiar to this State and add very onerously to the provision of essential services. With that in our minds as background, we should note that 20 years ago we depended almost exclusively



on our primary economy. I feel that that economy will always remain the vitally important one in the overall economic life of this State, for it provides for us the overseas credit balances with which we can obtain those necessities for the development of the State and provides the essential machinery for important developmental projects.

The natural resources of this State have been developed with a drive, initiative and imagination which has led, in the primary section of our economy, to a total production of an average of 30,000,000 bushels of wheat per year, of barley in recent years 35,000,000 bushels, and oats 15,000,000 bushels. We can carry a population of 15,000,000 sheep and at the same time have a corresponding increase in the figures for secondary industry. That is indicated by the fact that employment in factories has increased since 1939 from 43,400 to 92,000, an increase of 112 per cent; the number of factories has increased from 2,067 to 4,063, an increase of 97 per cent; the wages in factories have increased from £8,000,000 to £78,000,000, an increase of 853 per cent; the value of factory production has risen from £14,000,000 in 1939 to £126,000,000 last year, an increase of 827 per cent. All this shows that this State has been very purposefully directed, and it reflects back to those in command of the general administration of the State.

We at present are going through one of the worst dries in the history of our State. Had this condition been with us 20 years ago we should, as the member for Torrens said, have felt the chill winds of adversity in the State economy by now, but the balance we have achieved between our primary and secondary industries has enabled us thus far this year to reach October without, as a State, having felt any great degree of economic stringency within the State. I feel that this balance of primary and secondary interests is very much to the good of our State, enabling us to increase our population as we are doing by 3 per cent each year and, through a good balance of sound secondary industry and our primary interests, we can look to the future to retain buoyancy in our finances to provide those services which we have provided so effectively and efficiently through the years. I refer to education, hospitalization, and social services generally.

There has been some criticism of the community effort working to match pound for pound of locally raised money for certain amenities. Assisted by the Government by

means of subsidy, we have a typical instance of the responsible approach by the citizens of this State which matches the responsibility and down-to-earth administration of the affairs at the Treasury level. The citizens of South Australia, I feel, are proud and happy to work with a common end in view. By means of local communities they can help themselves to a degree, and in helping in such a way they can qualify for a very generous subsidy from the Government. I have in mind, for instance, the swimming pools in country areas, the provision of which is giving to the dry inner parts of our State a facility for our children and our youth generally which is not enjoyed by all the States. This has been the brain child of the Government; it is something that I feel is of immense value to rural dwellers, and is one of those instances of where local communities, by acting for the good of the local folk, have the blessing of the Government and can achieve things such as swimming pools and hospitalization.

These committees, through local effort, can qualify, with £1 of locally produced money, for £1 or £2 of Government money. That could be criticized in some quarters, as it has been, but such criticism is unjust. This State has always been famed for its practical and down-to-earth approach to all things. We have a sound economy and a sound population, and I laud the Government which will further encourage that responsible spirit of citizens by giving them an interest in their own affairs, at the same time encouraging to the full the activities of those parties.

In the country the three major utilities of power, water, and means of communication, particularly roads, are always in our minds, and in this it is good to see that, of 12,000 new consumers of Electricity Trust power last years, 7,000 were in rural areas. We are bringing to the country, through the electric power generated from the brown coal at Leigh Creek, a necessity to industry and farming and an amenity to every other phase of living in the country. This is a facility which I can assure members, is very deeply appreciated.

Mr. Bywaters—A really good socialistic effort.

Mr. LAUCKE—It is an effort whereby the State provides a utility for the good of the whole community. It provides a basic utility and creates a framework within which individuals may live and work the better. This State activity is essentially a State responsibility and this Government has shown

its acceptance of that responsibility by the assiduity with which it has supplied power throughout the length and breadth of the State.

Mr. Bywaters—That shows that Socialism and private enterprise can work well together.

Mr. LAUCKE—Yes, and I feel they must work together, for Government and private enterprise are complementary to each other.

Mr. Bywaters—Certain things must be provided by the Government?

Mr. LAUCKE—Yes, they are basic to our way of living. Indeed we could not effectively live as a community without them. It is good to see that the Electricity Trust has increased its surplus by £307,000 to £469,000 this year and that the Leigh Creek coalfield, which is the source of the cheap power enjoyed in this State, has earned a surplus of £72,000 compared with £69,000 last year. Further, there is at present an accumulated surplus on the operations of the field of £48,000, which is indeed pleasing to see.

Water is always basic to a State such as South Australia because only 10 per cent of the area of this State enjoys an assured rainfall. The Mannum-Adelaide pipeline can deliver to the metropolitan area as well as to huge tracts of land north of Adelaide over 14,000,000,000 gallons a year, and the magnificent new reservoir at Williamstown on the South Para means that we now have a collective capacity of 24,000,000,000 gallons and increased use will be made of that reservoir when we have sufficient rains to fill it. Throughout this State are 8,250 miles of water mains, which would be sufficient to pipe water from Adelaide to San Francisco. This facility has enabled the reticulation of the water that has been the very lifeblood of this State, for the stock-carrying capacity of our land in many instances depends directly on the availability of this water. Indeed, in this year when dams are empty the presence of these lifelines across the State are a boon and a *sine qua non* of our ability to carry reasonable numbers of stock through a most adverse season.

The mineral resources of our State are often not given full due emphasis, but they are important to the economy of the State. After all, £24,000,000 is a large sum to be earned from mineral resources and I commend the Government for its keenness in exploiting so completely our mineral resources wherever possible. The income from our uranium deposits totals £10,000,000 and is the direct result of Government investigation,

research and imagination in using within our State resources that will have an important place in the scheme of things for years to come.

I am pleased to note that over the past four years the net cost of aboriginal welfare in this State has been increased from £12 10s. 7d. to £51 2s. 2d. per capita. Therein lies a story of the acceptance by the Government of the responsibility for our native population, and it is pleasing indeed to see that, although throughout the years this State has served its native population well, there is a growing acknowledgement of the rightful place that these people have. I commend the Government for this generous increase towards the welfare and well-being of our native people.

We in the fruitgrowing areas are greatly concerned with the danger that the fruit fly may take a hold in this State. I remind members that our citrus industry is in a favoured position because we have ready access to the New Zealand market because of our freedom from fruit fly. When we consider that such areas as the Barossa Valley, Adelaide Hills and other areas return a great income from the fruit industry, we realize that the money spent up to the present in ensuring freedom from the scourge of the fruit fly has been well spent and a mighty good insurance premium against calamity in this important industry. I hope that at no time will any person think that the money spent in this way has been mispent or has been an unnecessary outlay: this expenditure has been essential so that the fruitgrowing areas may be kept free of this killer of fruit industries. I have pleasure in supporting the Estimates.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra)—I take this opportunity to congratulate the Treasurer on the presentation of his 21st Budget. His is indeed a remarkable achievement, particularly when one considers the vicissitudes during the period from his first taking office in 1938, just before the great conflict of the Second World War, throughout that conflict, and during the post-war years. His is a remarkable record of 21 years' service. I join with all those who have congratulated the Treasurer, including his many friends outside this Chamber. Together with the achievement of the presentation of his 21st Budget, we also recognize the fact that we are now no longer a mendicant State. I have analysed things as they will continue henceforth and, quite frankly, all I can see is that the man who holds the whip has changed hands, and he has only changed it from his left

band to his right hand. I do not think there are any major virtues of the new as against the old order. I may be wrong but the presentation of figures in the Budget and the Auditor-General's report does not disclose any advantage. We peg our income to a base year and, according to our increase in population, we get some increase. There is probably some advantage in that, but it still leaves the major problems unsolved.

I intend to adopt a somewhat different attitude, familiar perhaps to those who have been in this Chamber for a considerable time, but not to those in Parliament for their first term. It is necessary for me to undertake this duty because I am convinced that the order as we know it today cannot possibly continue. That applies to whatever Government is in office. Whether it is a Government representative of the Liberal Party or of the Labor Party, the existing order of things must go, in the economic sphere at least, because it is impossible further to continue piling Pelion on Ossa as we are doing today.

The honourable member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) called it a "magnificent Budget." If a magnificent debt structure is a magnificent Budget, he has spoken truly because it is a magnificent debt structure—if there is any magnificence in that. I will prove, I hope, to the House just how huge is the Colossus under which we are operating today. I cannot show how we are going to get out of it quickly, but I will endeavour to show a possible way of resolving the difficulties that present themselves to any Treasurer in any part of Australia, Federal or State.

I speak now not on the lines of the Budget, but on the first line, and I take the Budget as a whole. There is plenty of time afterwards to speak on the various lines dealing for instance, with railways and the amount of money they and other organizations like the Tramways Trust receive. Those things are there, but there is not a department of the State today that is not starved for money. There is not a department in this State with projects in view that has not to say to itself, "Which is the most urgent?" to keep it within the ambit of financial possibility.

The honourable member for Torrens eulogized General Motors-Holdens. Do not take this as a criticism of General Motors-Holdens; it is just a factual statement. Let us see if honourable members agree with it. These figures are taken from their balance-sheet and they are as nearly accurate as they can be, except that I have lumped into one the number

of vehicles, be they cars, utilities or trucks. They make so many vehicles and they make so much profit, so I have just divided the figures up. They are not accurate for each item but they give the general outline.

Some people say that Holdens are exploiters in profit-making, and I think that can be generally admitted. Nobody, whatever his political affiliation, can deny that, because the figures prove that that is correct. But who gets the greatest rake-off from Holdens? Is it the American shareholders about whom we constantly hear or is it the Commonwealth Government? Listen to these figures. Holdens made a profit of £15,291,000 after meeting £3,340,000 depreciation and £11,088,000 for direct taxation. There are company tax, overseas shareholders' dividend tax, customs duties, and sales tax; the overall collection of taxes on 108,280 vehicles was £41,000,000. In other words, Holdens made a profit of £15,291,000, but that business contributed to the Federal Treasury £41,000,000. Without differentiating between the vehicles, £280 a vehicle was taken by the Commonwealth Government in tax from all sources. If we divide the number of vehicles into the profit, the result is £141 a vehicle. If we add the various forms of taxation to the profits, £280 and £141 total £421. I am not considering the agency and selling commission; I accept that as a possible fair charge but, after profit and tax are taken from the standard price of £885, the cost of a Holden vehicle is £464.

Who pays that? The man who buys the vehicle. Is it to be expected that a population such as ours should subsidize an industry to that extent? Those colossal figures just beggar description, but they are factual figures in the balance-sheet that is presented; they are published in the daily paper but it needs a little analysis to work them out. They are the figures. In other words, half the cost of that vehicle today is represented in taxation or charges that are collected consequential on the manufacture of that vehicle. On top of all that there is still a profit of £15,000,000, the biggest proportion of which goes to the American shareholder. The preference shareholders here in Australia receive only about £30,000 or more.

If anybody says that that industry is a major outstanding industry working for the benefit of Australia, I cannot agree with him. I give full marks to the magnificent effort that they made in building up that industry. The management and efficiency of the industry cannot be denied, but I say that to collect

£41,000,000 in taxation from that industry, which is a direct charge to the consumer, cannot be warranted. Who can substantiate such a charge? Also, if you take away that taxation, which is part and parcel of the Federal Budget, how are you going to replace that £41,000,000; where would it come from? Would it come from further income tax or from further concealed taxes? The people of this country pay all these taxes by mortgaging their income for three years. Is that balanced economy? It is the most fictitious and stupid thing one has ever read about.

Let us consider our South Australian economy. The only way we can expand is through our secondary industries, we are told. What value are they to us compared with our primary industries? With all the vast resources of capital invested in our secondary industries, what is the net result accruing to South Australia? The figures I shall now give are taken from Bulletin 3 of the 1959 *Factory Statistics*. The production value of manufactures in 1957-58 was £133,285,000; primary production for 1956-57 amounted to £153,764,000. With all the vast investment in our secondary industries and with all their magnitude, the value of their production is well below that of primary producers. As regards the building up of our overseas purchasing power, their output makes the output of secondary industries look insignificant. The total exports for 1958-59 amounted to £90,910,000. Of this total £87,720,000 was of primary origin and £3,190,000 was of secondary origin. The primary producers do this with a minimum of employment. Members should not think that I am writing down secondary industries. I know that it is absolutely essential to have the two types of industries—one is complementary to the other. The primary producers' best market is the home market. Our food, clothing and every bit of sustenance we get comes from the country. What we purchase from overseas to build up our secondary industries, namely, the raw materials, machinery, etc., is financed from primary production in their entirety.

Railway fares have been increased, but who carries the burden? A total of 60 per cent of the State's population is in the metropolitan area: they do not carry it, but the vast proportion of it is carried by the country people. The only railway income from people in the metropolitan area is from a few local trains. The country man pays both outward and inward freight and practically the total

income from the railways is of primary origin. That cannot be denied.

When we look at the Budget we must be realistic and find out where our income comes from and whence our export income is derived. Today our primary industries are bearing a terrific burden, and this in the worst year of our history—it far transcends what happened in 1914. Many people are doing much wishful thinking. I was pleased to hear the member for Gouger say that he did not think that if we got one and a half inches of rain we would have a bountiful crop. In the main our prospective crop has gone and we shall feel the impact next year. If we do not get summer rains our potential production will be reduced, and possibly our sheep population of 16,000,000 will be lowered 6,000,000 by direct losses. Our lighter country today is blowing and drifting, and no rain will hold it. This is a tragedy.

Let us have a look at the Budget. In 1958-59, State expenditure amounted to £69,000,000 and receipts to £68,000,000. Public debt charges were £16,075,000, State taxation £10,217,000 and excess debt charges over State taxation £5,858,000. In other words, our debt charges are £5,750,000 greater than our taxing income. Whereas taxation represents 14.73 per cent of consolidated revenue, the public debt charges represent 21.87 per cent. How do we reconcile that and where do we get the money? We know that we get some of it from the railways and water works. The State has increased the price of water and the Commonwealth has increased postal charges. The greatest feature of this Budget is that we can look forward to having a magnificent debt hanging around our necks. The cost to taxpayers of the functions of Government has increased by 52 per cent over a period of five years. Frankly, the Treasurer is a mightier man than appears on the surface. How he has managed I do not know. If honourable members on this side of the House are anxious to take over this legacy, may Providence guide them. In other words, undertakings financed from the Loan fund do not pay their way and as an extra boost to them there is a burden on consolidated revenue, which increased by 17 per cent from 1954-55 to 1958-59. I hope members can appreciate the astronomical climb that is now coming. The public debt of this State hanging around the necks of the people was £346,985,000 as at June 30, 1959, which is £377 per capita. The first present to every baby born today is a debt of £377! Do not tell me this will go down as the population

increases; it is keeping pace with and even out-distancing the population. Notwithstanding the population increase, there was an increase of £19 per capita over the year. I ask members to visualize that.

The public debt has increased by £123,757,000 in the last five years, and the interest in that same period has increased by £6,439,000, or 97.4 per cent. These figures have been taken from the Auditor-General's report and, as I received it only this morning, I have not had time to do a good job on it; I could have done much better if I had had another week. As is well known, there is a National Debt Sinking Fund into which we paid, in round figures, £3,538,000 last year bringing total payments since its inception to £38,329,000. The old sinking fund was merged into the National Debt Sinking Fund in 1923, since when we have paid only £38,000,000 into the fund, yet our public debt now stands at £346,000,000! When can we pay that off? Has anyone the vaguest idea, bearing in mind that it has taken us since 1923 to contribute only £38,000,000.

Mr. Hambour—Gradual inflation will reduce it in size.

Mr. QUIRKE—The whole of this borrowing is the greatest cause of inflation. The more borrowed the greater the inflation.

Mr. Hambour—That will dissolve the debt.

Mr. QUIRKE—It will not; it will add to it, and the interest will go on to it. The Premier took office on Guy Fawkes Day, 1938, and, from the inflammatory figures I have here, it was evidently a good day. The State debt was then £108,000,000, and it has risen in the 21 years to June 30 last to £346,000,000—an increase of £238,000,000, which is an average of £11,338,000 a year. The population in 1938 was 595,842 and it is now 907,992, so it has not increased by anywhere near the same extent as the public debt.

Mr. Heaslip—Do you think that money should not have been spent?

Mr. QUIRKE—I am not saying anything yet; I have only just started.

Mr. Heaslip—What is your suggestion?

Mr. QUIRKE—What is the idea of concealing it? You cannot apply a remedy unless you know what is doing.

Mr. Coumbe—What is your remedy?

Mr. QUIRKE—I will give it; do not worry about that. Although the per capita debt has increased from £182 to £377, we have paid off only £38,000,000.

Mr. Hambour—You will admit that on present values we owe less than we did 20 years ago?

Mr. QUIRKE—No, not quite. In any case, it does not matter whether it is inflated money or not: we still pay the same percentage.

Mr. Hambour—But the taxable income is in the same proportion.

Mr. QUIRKE—No, it is not. The member for Torrens asked for my remedy. There is an authoritative paper in England called *The Banker*. When H.M.A.S. *Sydney* was sunk there was much propaganda, and well-meant collections, to which people responded nobly, were launched. The greatest compliment you could pay to the magnificent battleship was that you should replace it, and everyone agreed to that. At the same time there was a project in England called "Bobs for Spitfires," and the propaganda was that if everyone did not contribute everything he could afford there would not be a Spitfire in England. They were destroyed in the gallant operation that defended and made England safe, and I pay a tribute to the men who died in them. It does not matter how many there were; they were destroyed in that heroic effort and had to be replaced, and the point was, "If you don't subscribe shillings for Spitfires, we can't have Spitfires." Of course, that was not correct, as was pointed out by the *Banker*, and as I quoted in the speech I made which appears at page 969 of *Hansard* for 1949, as follows:—

In recent weeks, a remarkable new institution has leapt into popularity, the "Spitfire" fund. All over the country groups of enthusiastic people are subscribing money to be applied in the purchase of a Spitfire, or occasionally some other specific piece of war equipment. The spirit behind this movement is wholly admirable; the contributions with which it has provided the exchequer already substantial. Yet, although these contributions are of genuine value to the nation, it is certain that the service they render is quite other than that which the vast majority of the sponsors and contributors suppose. From one point of view, indeed, the enthusiastic response to these funds reflects an almost universal ignorance of the true functions of money. Harmless and even beneficent enough in this context, these fallacious ideas—the total inability to distinguish between phenomena and their monetary counterpart—are in other directions leading to quite useless and futile activities or even actual damage

That is very interesting. Later on it continues as follows:—

If the money were not forthcoming in one of these ways it would have to be created. And this, the State, as the monetary authority,

can do perfectly well, at negligible cost and practically without limit.

It then goes on:—

But it requires to be recognized that it makes no difference to the finance of the war—much less the war effort—in what form companies hold funds which, on account of dividend limitation or reserve policy, would not be paid out to shareholders in any case. If they are held, for reasons of liquidity, on bank deposit, then the Government can create an equivalent amount of floating debt without inflationary consequences.

Mr. Hambour—They do it now.

Mr. QUIRKE—Of course they do. I will now quote something which comes nearer home to members in this House. I shall quote, from *Vital Speeches* of June of this year, extracts of a speech given by Robert B. Anderson, secretary of the United States Treasury, headed “There is no need for inflation.” What I shall quote will show members how misguided they are in thinking that there is no other process of financing the needs of this country than by this ever-increasing spiral of debt which brings with it the ever-increasing and perpetuating spiral of inflation.

Mr. Riches—But that money is available only to the Commonwealth.

Mr. QUIRKE—Of course it is, but where does our money come from?

Mr. Hambour—The member for Burra will admit that if they did what he suggests there would be a double issue of money available for a limited supply of goods.

Mr. QUIRKE—I will not admit anything of the sort; the honourable member is completely wrong, and if he will wait a little while I shall tell him why. The speech I referred to is as follows:—

The fact is that when the Government has to borrow from commercial banks, as is often the case in times of high business activity, such borrowing adds to the money supply by the amount of the borrowing and so increases inflationary pressures. Continued deficits are bound to add to monetary inflation.

What have we got but deficits the whole time?

It goes on:—

They are bound to have the same effect, over a period of time, as a resort to printing press money.

Later on it says:—

The fact that fiscal matters are little understood—even by some rather prominent and otherwise well-informed people—

Take your bow, gentlemen—

was brought home to me one day when a visitor in my office remarked: “You talk of the dangers of monetization of the debt, Mr. Secretary. You know I just don’t believe there is such a danger. Probably because I

don’t quite understand what monetization means.”

He has plenty of friends with an equal lack of knowledge. It goes on:—

I said this to my visitor: “Now suppose I wanted to write cheques of 100,000,000 dollars starting tomorrow morning, but the Treasury was out of money. If I called up a bank and said ‘Will you loan me 100,000,000 dollars at 3½ per cent for six months if I send you over a note to that effect?’ the banker would probably say ‘Yes, I will.’ Where would he get the hundred million with which to credit the account of the United States Treasury? Would he take it from the account of someone else? No, certainly not. He would merely create that much money, subject to reserve requirements”

Mr. Hambour—I am glad you mentioned that.

Mr. QUIRKE—Of course you must have that. That is the guarantee. The reserve requirements do not affect the general picture, but merely prevent the inflationary spiral.

Mr. Hambour—The reserve requirements don’t grow on mulberry trees.

Mr. QUIRKE—The reserve requirements are fixed from the Central Bank, and that is the basis of the whole monetary order. The speech continues:—

“He would merely create that much money, subject to reserve requirements, by crediting our account in that sum and accepting the Government’s note as an asset. When I had finished writing cheques for 100,000,000 dollars the operation would have added that sum to the money supply.”

Naturally it would, but it came out of the blue; it was not subject to production, and it was not earned from wool or manufactures or anything else, but was deliberately created. The 3½ per cent would be paid on money that was deliberately created in order to provide money that had no basis in actual fact, except that it was just as good as a purchasing power as if that amount had been printed in the form of notes. It goes on:—

“Now certainly that approaches the same degree of monetization as if I had called down to the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and said ‘Please print me up 100,000,000 dollars worth of greenbacks which I can pay out tomorrow.’”

That is precisely the same thing, the only point about it being that the printing of the notes is infinitely more dangerous.

Mr. Hambour—That has no backing, whereas the banker has a reserve.

Mr. QUIRKE—The banker does not consider his reserves in any way at all.

Mr. Hambour—You are arguing that the banker can give unlimited credit.

Mr. QUIRKE—I did not say anything of the sort; it is subject to the reserve bank.

Mr. Hambour—You said there was no backing.

The CHAIRMAN—Order!

Mr. QUIRKE—I will finally confound the member for Light.

Mr. Hambour—With the same result.

Mr. QUIRKE—It reminds me of someone who said grass cannot grow on a busy street, but someone else said that is because it cannot get through the concrete. I have another example that I want to put before the House taken from page 1089 of 1952 *Hansard*. At that time I obtained a copy of the Commonwealth Bank's monthly paper, *Currency*. It cannot be obtained down the street, as it circulates only amongst the top-ranking employees of the bank. I asked the bank for a copy, and I was given not the whole issue but two pages of two issues. It is most interesting and confirms what I have been saying, for it explains the point I have been leading up to. One copy was dated March, 1952, and the other April, 1952. *Currency* is not an economics textbook, but it carries the imprimatur of the Commonwealth Bank itself. This is an outline of training given to the bank's personnel:—

In a stable economy the role of the note issue is a passive one only, and changes in the volume of notes are symptoms of the operation of expansive or contractive forces affecting the economy rather than basic factors causing the expansion or contraction. The note issue is only part of the total money supplied, the greater part of which is represented by bank deposits. It is mainly through its control of bank lending which directly affects the volume of bank deposits that the central bank influences the volume of money available to the community. Bank lending operations are of particular economic significance, because they do not merely transfer existing purchasing power from one person or enterprise to another, as loans by individuals or other institutions do, but result in an actual increase in the total purchasing power. A bank is able to "create" credit because when the funds it lends are spent they return to it or to other banks in the form of new deposits. There you have the basic principle of banking—that every loan creates a deposit, and every repayment of a loan destroys a deposit.

Mr. Hambour—If you look at their balance-sheets your argument will be confounded.

Mr. QUIRKE—I have looked at their balance-sheets, but they do not confound my argument. What I have just quoted amounts to the Commonwealth Bank's instructions to its employees. It is of no use the honourable member, because he did not know this 40 years

ago as I did, thinking it is entirely wrong now. The weight of evidence is all against his argument.

Mr. Hambour—You are destroying the backing in the issue of credit.

Mr. QUIRKE—Nothing of the sort. There is no backing to bank credit except the asset of the man who borrows the money. The extract from *Currency* continues:—

If a bank lends more freely than its fellow banks it will find itself losing cash to other banks as the money lent by it is spent.

In other words, if a bank lends too freely and has not sufficient deposits it will lose its credit strength to other banks. Credit is not based on deposits but rather on the bank's liquidity. The article continues:—

If banks move roughly together and the central bank imposes no controls on the process of credit expansion, the ultimate limit to it is set only by the need of banks as a whole to keep enough liquid funds against their deposits.

I draw particular attention to the words "liquid funds against their deposits." Now I come to the principal point in this article:—

If, for example, banks consider a cash deposit ratio of 20 per cent adequate, an additional £10,000,000 of cash deposits would permit them to expand advances by up to about £40,000,000.

That £40,000,000 would be money taken completely out of the blue. There can be no argument about that. No banker today will argue against that because it is an established fact that has been admitted by the Commonwealth Bank, but it takes a long time for these things to sink into the minds of most people. Let us examine a simple transaction of the South Australian Savings Bank. Let us assume it subscribes £1,000,000 to a Commonwealth Loan, though I am strongly opposed to the Savings Bank subscribing even one penny to a Commonwealth Loan. I think the bank at present has about £50,000,000 or £60,000,000 invested in Commonwealth Loans. In what way does that reduce its deposits? Has it frozen individual deposits? Cannot any depositor go to the bank and draw out his money if he wants to? The bank has not lent the people's deposits to the Commonwealth, but something that is exactly the same in principle as the \$100,000,000 mentioned by the secretary of the United States Treasury. The people can still withdraw their deposits, but the £1,000,000 allocated back to the States by way of loan by the Commonwealth Government is new money. When it has been spent there is another £1,000,000 added to the spending power of the Australian public.

Let us assume that one honourable member subscribes £1,000 to a Commonwealth Loan. Then we have an entirely different set of circumstances operating, but with exactly the same result. In place of his £1,000 the honourable member gets negotiable scrip, but the Commonwealth Government can allocate that money to the State Governments, so it goes back to the people for further bank deposits. That form of finance is the greatest inflationary medium that we can have. We have pettifogging schemes of price control, but how can our price control operate effectively against a Colossus such as that?

Mr. Hambour—What you are trying to say is that we can get this money without having to pay colossal interest for it?

Mr. QUIRKE—Exactly.

Mr. Hambour—Communist countries have tried that and did not do any good.

Mr. QUIRKE—No country has ever tried it the way I am putting it forward. It is a different formula. I remember what they did in Germany after the first world war. That was deliberately designed to write down the value of property used as security for loans in Germany during that war; in other words, property was mortgaged for, say 5,000,000 marks, which would not buy a loaf of bread. They took over their property.

Mr. Hambour—Creating credit does not create wealth.

Mr. QUIRKE—Credit creation inside an economy such as ours monetizes production. That is the basis of it. I will tell the honourable member how to get wealthy quickly.

Mr. Hambour—I should like to know.

Mr. QUIRKE—I will not try it out myself. Let us assume that I was foolish enough to have a bet of £1,000 with a lucky man like the honourable member for Light. Of course, I should be bound to lose it. I go to the bank and, although I have assets totalling £10,000, I say, "I want £1,000." They look at me and I say, "I have assets worth £10,000." They stretch a point and grant me an overdraft of £1,000. I write a cheque and give it to the honourable member. They pay him the £1,000. He pays it into that bank or some other bank. My loan has become his deposit and that credit will purchase anything inside the purchasing capacity of £1,000. He grants me my revenge and he loses what he bet. He pays me back the £1,000. What happens to it? I pay £1,000 back into my bank account to square my debt. The £1,000 goes out of existence. That is

inescapable. Every loan becomes a deposit and every repayment of a loan destroys a deposit.

Why are we carrying on with this "magnificent Budget?" I do not blame the Treasurer for this. The States are the victims of this vicious system. To finance public works this way would reduce taxation, would reduce the price of motor-cars, and would bring down prices all round. It would not increase the amount of money in the country any more than it has increased it under the Loan system. In fact, inflation would be cut out under that system compared with the present-day position. Honourable members should study that plan and see where they can fault it. I have put it out before and said, "If anybody can show me where I am wrong in any one particular, I am prepared to admit it," but nobody has ever been able to do that. I have made a fairly close study of it. The fact remains that under this system we never shall get out of debt. Today the combined national debt of Australia is £4,000,000,000 in respect of which the taxpayer has £4,000,000 stripped off him to pay interest.

Mr. Hambour—That is less than the 1939 value.

Mr. QUIRKE—It doesn't matter. That is no longer a valid argument. If I go to the honourable member and want to buy something from his shop, and I offer him 4s. and say, "That should be worth £1; it was 10 or 15 years ago," he will throw me into outer darkness. A pound today buys a pound's worth of goods at today's prices. That is unalterable. To say that values today are not comparable is wrong. The year 1939 was 20 years ago. The man earning wages today is paid at today's rates. If he gets £16 or £18 a week, he can buy only what £16 or £18 will buy today; he is not concerned with what it would buy in 1939, neither should we be concerned about it, because we shall never go back there; so why worry? The money that we get today will purchase goods at today's prices. We must forget about the past.

Mr. Riches—The banks could finance the building of homes under that scheme?

Mr. QUIRKE—Yes, they could.

Mr. Hambour—Labor Governments have been in charge of the Treasury benches at Canberra, but they have not used it.

Mr. QUIRKE—It is on their policy. A man for whom I have the greatest respect—the late Mr. Ben Chifley—did not understand it any more than many others do. Honourable members may laugh at that but I can produce statements. There has been a build-up about



Ben Chifley—a sort of halo suggesting that he was a mighty financier.

Mr. Hambour—The honourable member is losing friends.

Mr. QUIRKE—I never care about that; I am being factual. If he had known about it he could have put it into operation, but he did not do it. He was on the Royal Commission that pointed out the very thing I am pointing out today; he acquiesced in those things and yet he never operated on the principle that was enunciated by the Royal Commission although he put his signature to it. I am not being at all defamatory.

Today, most people do not know about these things and anybody who speaks about finance is placed in the category of the very few men of major wisdom who know anything at all about finance, whereas in fact the principles underlying the finances of the Commonwealth of Australia in relation to the release of money for the general working of the Commonwealth are as simple as the alphabet. Complexity arises only with overseas exchange, when we have to trade with various countries to get our money back; but that is not at all related to internal finance. The fact remains that it can be done and will have to be done for this good and sufficient reason.

Mr. Hambour—It is done.

Mr. QUIRKE—It is not done. The only way it is done in the Commonwealth is in Treasury Bills. It is not done in any other way. The banks do it but they are a minor concern. The amount of money they advance in this way is negligible; they are so tied down by the Central Bank that they have had to launch out and take over the financial structures of hire-purchase systems; in other words, something more profitable than the banks. I do not say they use their depositors' funds in financing that. They have a good case against that. One bank runs the whole show; they do not use their depositors' funds. They do not use anyone's deposit; but all the money they use is created money. People are asked to subscribe, and they are paid 7, 8, or 9 per cent on their money, but the return is 16 or even 20 per cent. Who pays it? Those employed in industry, the housewives and those wanting washing machines, refrigerators, and so on. They have to buy on long terms and pay heavy charges to the colossus of finance to get the products of industry. The goods will not be paid for for three years. Going on as we are, that period will soon have to be extended to four years. There is no more inflationary

principle than the borrowing of money from inside Australia. The whole thing is based on complacency and ignorance.

The general public has no knowledge of finance, but only a few long-headed mystics sitting behind mahogany desks with glass tops who look wise, with the result that the people who come in contact with them say, "They must be mighty men, and how they understand all this I do not know." All they are doing is paying in or paying out or raising a loan. The whole security of this State and of Australia rests upon our changing this stupid system. Today the whole of what we call the free world is bound hand and foot with steel shackles to this system, which is holding us back and strangling us. There are two philosophies in the world today—the one we hold to and the one adopted by the dictatorial countries under the banner of Communism. We are being left behind in the race to an intolerable extent, because we base our capacity to do anything upon our capacity to get money. How much could the Highways Department spend next year on roads and bridges if it had the money, and how much could we spend on housing? I do not make the mistake of believing that we can go on building houses beyond our capacity to make raw materials and train tradesmen, and, if we do not recognize that, we shall never catch up with the position. Can we borrow the money from the Commonwealth Bank, which is making a profit of £15,000,000 a year, £11,000,000 of which is paid into Consolidated Revenue, which is another form of tax, with a fixed amount being paid into the Sinking Fund? Should the Commonwealth be able to make £15,000,000, and if it does cannot it pay it out and say, "This has been taken from the people, so let them use it." No, instead of that it goes into consolidated revenue. I should like honourable members to consider the grants we have received and the Loan funds allotted to us. In effect we are borrowing from the Commonwealth our own funds. Time and time again I have brought this matter before the House.

We should amalgamate the Savings Bank of South Australia and the State Bank, refuse to lend a penny to the Commonwealth, and instead invest the money in houses for the people. We should then get out of our difficulties with our own money, without borrowed money. When I have mentioned this before the Treasurer has said, "We could not do that because we must provide for those who want to get their money out of the bank." I

do not think he meant that. If all people in Australia who have a current account or a Savings Bank account wanted to draw their money, how much would they get? Only about 5 per cent of the total. If we considered the amount in the banks, and included notes as being money, in the aggregate it would never be more than £30,000,000, and the rest would be found in hip pockets, old socks up chimneys and in teapots and jugs being held for a rainy day. When we are told that we must keep the money in the Savings Banks to meet people's demands, there is nothing more fictitious, because the banks never have it; or even if they did they would lend it and still be drawing interest on the £60,000,000 they lent to the Commonwealth. How silly can we get!

I am asked to support the Budget. I pay a tribute to the Treasurer for what he has done. I do not know how he manages under the present system. His officers must be complete miracle workers. The Treasurer is a bigger man than this unfortunate Budget would indicate. He knows what he could do if he had the money and how much further South Aus-

tralia could expand. We could get roads built throughout the north-east and also in the south-east of the State, and we could get more hospitals and houses, etc. It is not because we have not the men, materials and skill, but because we have not the money. That is what they say, yet every penny is transmuted into bricks, mortar, buildings, railways, roads and everything else; and thus we have created assets for the creation of the credit which would enable us to do the job. I congratulate the Treasurer on his Budget, but the system on which it is based is rotten. It is a white ant-eaten prop which cannot last many more years, and if we persist in it the march of time will bring about our own dissolution. There are now many people who do not believe a word of the stupidities that are embodied in our economic system. I support the Budget.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.30 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, October 8, at 2 p.m.