

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, October 21, 1959.

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

### PETITION: WINE INDUSTRY.

Mr. STOTT presented a petition signed by 31 electors of the district of Ridley and respectfully praying that the House should order an inquiry into the wine industry of South Australia.

Received.

### QUESTIONS.

#### WAR SERVICE LAND SETTLEMENT.

Mr. QUIRKE—The following is an extract from today's *Advertiser* under the heading "Land Plan was Frustrated" and refers to a speech made by Dr. Forbes, M.H.R., in the House of Representatives:—

Dr. Forbes, speaking during the second reading debate on a Bill for raising £7m. loan moneys for the plan in 1959-60, said disputes about the relative responsibilities under the plan had frequently been used by both Commonwealth and States as an excuse for doing nothing.

"I do not think the scheme has been as successful as it might have been at any rate in South Australia," Dr. Forbes said.

"Argument has taken place there over the decision of the Commonwealth to end the scheme from June 30 last, in the sense that it would not consider new propositions after that date.

"The Premier of South Australia saw fit to say at an R.S.L. conference that he was disappointed at the decision, and implied that it was to blame for the failure of hundreds of eligible exservicemen to receive land in South Australia.

"It should be borne in mind that the scheme had been proceeding for 15 years, that South Australia has consistently failed to spend the money available under War Service Land Settlement, and that for the past four or five years the properties offered by the State to the Commonwealth had diminished to a mere trickle."

On the other hand, the State Government could argue that it had consistently offered land to the Commonwealth which the Commonwealth had rejected. If this had been accepted, there probably would have been more than enough to settle all available applicants . . .

The Minister for Primary Industry (Mr. Adermann), who had introduced the Bill, denied any intention of ending the scheme. The Government however, was discontinuing the extra subsidy to States because it had not been used. The unexpended balance would be included in the £7m. vote.

I should like the Premier to comment on the article, particularly regarding those men who are classed as eligible and who, as we under-

stand, have been told to dissolve all desires of getting land owing to the cessation of the scheme.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have not seen Dr. Forbes' statement but I think the proper thing for the Government to do is to prepare a report to the House in connection with this. I will see that that report is prepared, and I hope it will be available tomorrow.

Mr. STOTT—In his speech Dr. Forbes said:—

It should be borne in mind that the scheme had been proceeding for 15 years, that South Australia has consistently failed to spend the money available under War Service Land Settlement, and that for the past four or five years the properties offered by the State to the Commonwealth had diminished to a mere trickle.

In his reply the Minister for Primary Industry said that the unexpended balance would be included in the £7,000,000 vote. Can the Minister of Lands tell me whether the land at Bookpurnong and Lyrup, which was recommended by his officers as being suitable for land settlement, was included in the "trickle" referred to by Dr. Forbes, and how much money was unexpended by South Australia under the War Service Land Settlement Scheme? Would the amount have been sufficient to bring that area under the War Service Land Settlement Scheme?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—It would not have been sufficient to develop the Lyrup area as an irrigation settlement. My one comment regarding Dr. Forbes' remarks is that since I have been in the House I think it is about the best 2s. bet each way that I have ever heard. As the Premier said, the Government is giving full consideration to the matter raised.

#### DROUGHT AID.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Last week I asked whether the Commonwealth Government would assist this State in view of the drought. I have subsequently discussed this matter with Senator Laught and Dr. Forbes, and both said that they would raise the matter. However, Dr. Forbes asked yesterday in the House of Representatives whether in 1957-58 a supplementary grant of £5,000,000 was made to New South Wales and Queensland because of droughts in those States, whether this established a precedent, and whether the Government would consider assisting South Australia, which was suffering from the worst drought in its history. Mr. Holt replied

that the question could not be answered simply, and said that, while a special grant had been made to New South Wales and Queensland at the time of drought, and some unemployment resulted from drought, the deficit situation in the two States had also come into the picture. He asked Dr. Forbes to place this question on the notice paper. Will the Premier take up this matter with the Federal Government and follow it through with a view to obtaining some assistance for this State similar to that given to other States?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I know the circumstances in which the grant was made to New South Wales and Queensland. At a meeting of the Loan Council the Commonwealth Government made £5,000,000 available but before it distributed it between the States it set aside £1,000,000 each for New South Wales and Queensland as a special State grant. The severity of the drought and its duration are not known yet, nor do we know what is involved, but I assure the honourable member that this matter will be examined by the State Government in due course.

#### EXPORTS OF PYRITIC RESIDUES.

Mr. McKEE—In the *Advertiser* of October 16, under the heading "Trial Shipments," the following article appeared.

Canberra—Trial shipments of Australian pyritic residues have been sent to Japan for tests to determine whether they contain sufficient iron to make extraction an economic proposition. It is understood that more than 200 tons from Victoria, South Australia and Western Australia were shipped in August. Of the 200 tons shipped in August, about 10 tons was sent from South Australia. The Japanese are believed to require a minimum iron ore content of 57 per cent to make bulk imports of the residues worthwhile. Results of the tests are not yet known, but it is reported that a content of 57 per cent iron ore is quite practicable. The Japanese interest in extracting the iron ore from Australian pyritic residues has been prompted by the acute internal shortage of iron ore which Japanese manufacturers are finding difficult to overcome. For some time the Japanese have been trying to import iron ore from Australia. Recently they tried to obtain it from Western Australia but, despite the Western Australian Government's representations, the Commonwealth would not approve the export licence. South Australia is by far the largest producer of sulphuric acid and these pyritic residues,

which are now discarded as useless, are available in large quantities, with up to 50,000 tons being free for export each year. The commodity value of the residue is believed to be less than 20s. a ton, but the export of it would return considerable revenue to the State. Has the attention of the Minister been drawn to a report from Canberra that the Japanese are interested in importing pyritic residue for the purpose of extracting iron ore? Has the Minister any information on the subject and is it likely this will provide some industry for South Australia because this State possesses a large sulphuric acid industry? In view of the possible income which sulphuric acid manufacturers could receive from the sale of pyritic residues, is it likely to have any bearing on the bounty paid by the Commonwealth to acid manufacturers who use indigenous materials?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I saw the press article referred to by the honourable member. True, at present a fairly large quantity of residue is located alongside the acid plant at Birkenhead. It would be feasible to use it for iron production, but it all boils down to a question of whether the freight charges would warrant its being exported and also whether the Commonwealth Government would grant export licences. The residues belong not to the State Government but to the mining companies operating the mine; it is a private matter. No representation, as far as I know, has been made to the South Australian Government in connection with the matter.

#### NEW NORWOOD HIGH SCHOOL.

Mrs. STEELE—The honourable member for Norwood and I have asked questions concerning the building of the new Norwood high school. I have several times recently visited the site and have noted with pleasure the progress being made in the erection of the prefabricated section. However, I have realized with disappointment that there is as yet no sign of the commencement of the solid building to house toilets, shelter accommodation and administration block. Can the Minister of Education say (1) whether tenders have been called; (2) when they close; and (3) whether it is still expected that the school will be completed by the beginning of the next school year?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—The pre-fabricated classrooms for the Norwood high school are being constructed by the building division of the Architect-in-Chief's Department. They are partly erected and will be completed in time for the beginning of the 1960 school

year. Tenders for the construction of the brick spine which contains toilets, shelter accommodation and administration block were called on September 25 and closed on October 7. A contract was let on October 14. I still hope that the school will be ready for occupation at the beginning of the 1960 school year. If not, temporary alternative accommodation will be provided for the intending students at the Norwood boys' technical high school and at the Campbelltown high school.

This is only one of eight schools consisting of four high schools and four technical high schools which are substantially in the same position—Norwood, Taperoo, Willunga and Plympton high schools; and Elizabeth boys' and girls' technical high schools, Strathmont girls' and Angle Park boys' technical high schools.

The preparation of the working drawings and specifications was entrusted by the Architect-in-Chief to an outside firm. As soon as working drawings and specifications were received, they were checked and tenders called as soon as possible thereafter. In a number of cases, tenders were called within two weeks of the plans being received. In each case the pre-fabricated buildings in course of construction by the building division of the Architect-in-Chief's Department will be finished in time. Contracts have already been let or will be let in the very near future to outside contractors for the construction of the brick spine. If any of these schools are not ready for occupation at the beginning of the 1960 school year, temporary alternative accommodation will be provided at nearby completed departmental schools.

#### WAR SERVICE SETTLEMENT VALUATIONS.

Mr. STOTT—On October 7, in reply to a question by the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) regarding revaluations for war service land settlement schemes, the Premier said:—

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.

Clause 6 (7) of the schedule to the War Service Land Settlement Agreement Act states:—

In making the valuations, the officers shall have regard to the need for the proceeds of the holding (based on conservative estimates over

a long-term period of prices and yields for products) being sufficient to provide a reasonable living for the settler after meeting such financial commitments as would be incurred by a settler possessing no capital.

In view of the Premier's quite nebulous statements that mean nothing to the settlers, does he now believe that his statement in reply to Mr. Quirke's question complies with that provision in the War Service Land Settlement Agreement Act?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have made inquiries into this matter and some investigations of particular cases. When the word "reasonable" is placed in an agreement it is liable to have all manner of meanings applied to it. One person's interpretation of it may differ from another person's. Taking it by and large, the cases I have investigated do, I believe, conform to the spirit as well as to the word of the agreement and there is no reason, in point of fact, why that should not be. The officers concerned are competent and have no desire to do the unfair thing by a returned soldier settler. In fact, I am sure they desire the success of the scheme. It is not correct to suggest that they would not be inclined to give a fair deal. Quite apart from the valuations that have been arrived at, an agreement has been reached which enables the settler to state his case about any valuations if he desires to appeal.

#### JUVENILE COURT IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. COUMBE—Annual reports concerning the Juvenile Court and the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department recently published indicate certain trends in crime in this State. Among other things, suggestions have been made regarding Juvenile Court improvements. The Attorney-General is reported to have said that the Government is contemplating certain improvements to that court. Can the Premier now indicate what improvements the Government proposes to make to the Juvenile Court?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—This does not come within my department and I ask the honourable member to put the question on notice.

#### WHYALLA WATER RATING.

Mr. LOVEDAY—Several times this session I have drawn the attention of the Minister of Works to the situation that has arisen in Whyalla as a result of the imposition of water rating as opposed to the old method of payment on consumption of water and have also

drawn attention to the fact that this change-over to water rating must, necessarily, lead to a greater use of water through the determination of some people who will say that because they have to pay for the water they will use all they are entitled to under their rebate. In view of that, will the Minister of Works reconsider reverting to the old method of paying for water on a consumption basis, because that would certainly lead to much greater economy in the use of water?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The water rating system that has now been decided for Whyalla is the same as has applied throughout the State for many years. If the honourable member examines the matter he will see that it is the only system of rating that could produce a reasonable result. In order to supply a service to a consumer a great amount of capital cost is involved and I emphasize that the Government could not possibly enter into a proposition to supply a costly service regardless of the quantity of water used. It could not do so unless there was some guarantee of a return. The use of water does not guarantee a return and for that reason alone it is necessary to have a basic rating in order to provide a water supply for the whole State. In addition, there are other important considerations. For instance, in the highly-priced city areas or in the more expensive areas in Whyalla a property may use only a limited quantity of water, yet such a property has the advantage of a large main running past it, and water is available at all times should it be required, and in particular in times of fire or an emergency. It would be impossible for insurance rates to remain at anything like present levels if it were not for the fact that adequate supplies of water were available for fire fighting requirements. This matter has been examined on a number of occasions. Frequently I have been interviewed, personally and by telephone, on this subject, and invariably the request has come from people who are small users of water. The people who are large users are well satisfied with the system as it stands. On reflection the honourable member will see that no other system could result in the Government's being able to provide water for the whole State. It could not provide water for 95 per cent of the total population if it were not for the system at present operating. Whyalla is now in line with every other part of the State where water is supplied by the Government and, in my opinion and the opinion of the Government, no other

system could be more equitable, taking an overall view of the matter, and making possible further extensions as and when required.

#### CANNING INDUSTRY.

Mr. DUNNAGE—The following report from London appeared in this morning's *Advertiser* under the heading "Canning Crisis":—

The position of the canning industry in South Africa is causing serious concern, says the *Financial Times*. It was estimated that the industry this year had sold £2m. worth of goods less than it expected on the British market and it still had £45m. worth of deciduous fruit and pineapples in stock.

When Mr. Heaslip and I were in Queensland a few weeks ago we had the pleasure of examining a pineapple canning industry there. Their place was packed with canned pineapples that they could not sell. The manager told us at that time that even if they got the pineapples for nothing they still could not compete with South Africa on the British market. This must have some detrimental effect on the fruitcanning industry in South Australia. As we have so many soldiers on the land in the river areas depending on the canning industry, can the Premier comment on the method of disposal in England? How are we selling our fruits overseas? Are we having any problems and have we any build-ups of fruit that we cannot get rid off?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The canning industry in South Australia is in somewhat the same position as that in Queensland with regard to pineapples. There have been excessive build-ups of stock, particularly of a grade of fruit not suitable for export. During the period immediately after the war, it was the practice of some canneries in South Australia to can large quantities of fruit not of export quality but of a good serviceable quality from the point of view of the local market. Its sale was limited because it could not be exported. Those canneries have had difficulty and experienced losses, and have still considerable stocks.

The Government has appointed a committee which is at present inquiring into this industry to see if any tangible assistance can be given and what should be done to enable the industry to carry on because, as the honourable member has said, not only is the industry affected and the employment of many hundreds of people in the factories in jeopardy, but also behind that the livelihood of the primary producers is involved. One bright spot is that the cannery which was established last year in the Upper Murray and which

concentrated on high quality export fruit is, I believe, in its first year of operations—although its intake was not to its full capacity because it started fairly late—at least breaking even, or possibly has made a profit; something that was not considered possible at the time the factory was opened. If we concentrate on high quality production and effective management, I still believe this industry can be placed upon a sound footing. The experiment undertaken at Berri last year clearly shows what effective management and high quality production can achieve.

#### ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES NEAR AERODROME.

Mr. HALL—Has the Premier an answer to my question about the cost of an electricity supply near Mallala?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Assistant Manager of the Electricity Trust has supplied me with the following report:—

We cannot answer for the Commonwealth in this matter, although our experience has been that they would make no contribution in the circumstances. As far as the Electricity Trust is concerned, the position is that we have provided a power supply to the property by means of an underground cable without additional cost to the consumer. The additional supply to the shearing shed must be put underground and the trust is prepared to supply 20ft. of this free in accordance with its normal practice. Even if the service could be provided by overhead mains, the trust would normally make a charge. The power supply is available on the property and the owner could, if he wished, arrange for the extension himself. In normal circumstances a shearing shed uses only about £10 worth of power per annum, and the trust could not contribute anything further than 20ft. of underground cable for this supply.

#### EYRE PENINSULA RAILWAY WORK.

Mr. BOCKELBERG—A considerable time ago approval was given for alteration and repairs to the railway ramps at Kielpa and Wirrulla and the trucking yards at Wirrulla, but up to the present no move has been made. As many sheep are being sent away by train, I should like the Minister of Works to inquire from the Minister of Railways when this work will be done.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Normally, work of this nature is dependent to a large extent upon the availability of a gang of tradesmen who can go to the various localities to do the work, and it is possible that so far the Superintendent at Port Lincoln has been unable to make a gang available. These works are listed for attention when gangs are working in those

areas. I realize that there is very great pressure on these facilities this year, and I will refer the question to the Minister of Railways for his attention.

#### SOUTH-WESTERN DRAINAGE SCHEME.

Mr. SHANNON—I am very disappointed to read criticism of the south-western suburbs drainage plan by certain councils in the area. Following upon the tendering of evidence to the Public Works Standing Committee by all the councils concerned, I conveyed to them a statement of the amount of their annual commitments. Apart from the receipt of messages, no approach has been made by any council to appear again before the committee. Certain rumours are current in a number of quarters, following upon the statements made public in the press by certain of these councils, that the Government might drop the proposed Bill to implement the plan, which I would regret. I should like to know whether it is a fact that the Government is even considering or re-considering its decision on this matter, in view of the fact that it has to find half of the finance involved. It is a very important matter. What is happening to the proposed Bill to implement the plan?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Following upon the tabling of the committee's report the Government asked my colleague, the Minister of Local Government, to confer with the Parliamentary Draftsman with a view to the preparation of a Bill for introduction into this House this session. The report presented reflects great credit on the work of the committee and of those departmental officers who were called before it to give evidence. They gave an enormous amount of time and research and some anxious thought to their evidence with a view to presenting a report which would, in the opinion of all concerned, be considered equitable and just by all the parties involved. Since instructions were given to have a Bill prepared the Government has, and I believe most honourable members probably have, received correspondence from one corporation which says, in effect, that it objects to the scheme on the ground of its contribution to it. I believe the correspondence sets out that this council's total contribution would be about £566,000, which of course, is a lot of money; but it must be remembered that this is the calculated total of the amortized cost of the scheme, and would be spread over a period of 53 years. The Government is carefully examining the objections and in the meantime a Bill is being prepared.

## COUNTRY ELECTRICITY EXTENSIONS.

Mr. HALL—The Electricity Trust has planned single-wire extensions throughout the country and it was anticipating connection to the system by a certain date. However, the people concerned have been informed that the trust's finances have been severely cut for this purpose and are bewildered as to what to do. Some have wired their houses and bought appliances and now they believe that the programme has been put back perhaps for a year or more. Can the Premier give any information on the expected delays in the matter so that the people will realize that we are not breaking faith with them?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The general reason why the Electricity Trust has had to re-arrange its programme is that heavy expenditure is involved in plant and equipment for the second power station at Port Augusta. As members will appreciate, before the trust can extend electricity supplies it must extend the power station to increase the quantity of electricity, and this year much expenditure is to come in that is immediately necessary on this power station. Although overall the trust has provided more money than usual this year, it is finding it difficult to continue with its expansion programme in the country to the extent it hoped. I know that other members may be in some difficulties in this matter, so if any member wants any information or desires any project to be proceeded with, and if he will give me notice on paper, I will discuss it with the Chairman of the trust to see whether anything can be done to assist.

## COVERING OF AQUEDUCT.

Mr. LAUCKE—Concern has been expressed to me by residents of Highbury at the dangerous situation arising, particularly to children, at the open concrete channel or aqueduct that carries Murray water into the Hope Valley reservoir. When land surrounding that aqueduct is subdivided and homes are built in the vicinity the problem will be further aggravated. Will the Minister of Works consider having this aqueduct sealed with a concrete decking? Local residents strongly prefer sealing to the erection of a safety fence, as the fence would not ensure the same degree of safety, would not blend in with the natural beauty of the surroundings, and would necessitate the purchase of extra land.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Without consultation, I am unable to decide whether or not the honourable member's proposal is

reasonable, but I will have the matter examined. The honourable member will appreciate that the cost of decking would be substantial and would not be justified in the absence of any extremely compelling reasons. However, I will discuss the matter with the Engineer-in-Chief, see what is involved, and will let the honourable member know the department's decision.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE: Mr. JENNINGS.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh) moved—

That one month's leave of absence be granted to the honourable member for Enfield (Mr. J. J. Jennings) on account of ill-health.

Motion carried.

## METROPOLITAN MILK SUPPLIES.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart)—I move—

That in the opinion of this House a Select Committee of members of both Houses should be appointed to inquire into the operations of the Metropolitan Milk Board and to recommend to Parliament any steps which in the opinion of the Committee should be taken to:—

- (a) ensure fair prices for production and for services rendered by treatment plants, wholesale distributors and retail vendors;
- (b) improve services to consumers;
- (c) make any necessary adjustments in the zoning of deliveries; and
- (d) prevent the creation of cartels or business associations from operating unfairly to the detriment of the public or established operators.

Before asking the House to carry the motion or going into detailed reasons for moving it, I feel that some explanation on why the motion appears in my name and the basis on which we seek a discussion is appropriate. I am not suddenly holding myself out as an expert on the milk industry and the service it gives to the community, nor do I intend to tell the board how to carry out its functions, nor have I suddenly taken it on myself to represent metropolitan districts. I find it difficult enough in all conscience adequately to represent my own. The Parliamentary Labor Party in South Australia, in order to give the widest possible representation to all sections of the community, and finding it impossible for individual members to become conversant with every matter brought before it and, in particular, in its endeavour to give a hearing to all sections of the community, has appointed committees to deal in a purely exploratory and advisory capacity with matters brought under its notice.

One of those committees is the Rural Committee, of which for the time being I am chairman.

Many matters have been referred to us, and Ministers will know that from time to time these have been taken up with the appropriate Minister or directly with the department. In other cases we have referred inquiries to the member for the district, irrespective of political Party affiliation. We have never made a political football out of any requests put to us, nor have we sought any political advantage or publicity, and I assure the House that in asking its concurrence in this motion the same standards apply. We submit this motion in a spirit of constructive representation; we have not set out to make a series of accusations—it is not that kind of motion, but we ask for an inquiry into practices that disturb us—practices which we believe Parliament would not condone, and did not intend should apply when the present control was set up.

I repeat that in our judgment the Milk Board has dealt most satisfactorily with many of the problems it was commissioned to handle, and we give it credit for that, but there are happenings that cannot be countenanced and about which the board refuses to act or to give satisfactory explanations, and we believe that after 13 years of operation its activities should be reviewed in the interests of the community and all concerned in the industry.

I emphasize that we are asking Parliament to make the inquiry or to set up a committee for this purpose. We have not made an inquiry or come here with all the answers; nor do we pretend to have all the answers. We are not suggesting that we are competent to make the inquiry and, even if we did, we would not have the authority to do so. We think the inquiry should be made on a much broader basis than we could hope to adopt, and we hope that bringing it before the House will provide a constructive basis for inquiry as well as complaints. On this basis I submit the motion, which calls first of all for a committee to inquire into the operation of the Metropolitan Milk Board and, as I will show later, the operation of some business associations operating under the board to the detriment of other sections of the industry.

The milk industry with all its ramifications is one of the most important to the community. I do not suppose there could be a more important service than that which brings the daily milk supply into the household. I ask for

this inquiry because, in the course of a few weeks, representations have been received from producers who want to sell milk in the metropolitan area but who are now refused; representations have been received from producers who are supplying the metropolitan area and are seeking a price increase; complaints have been made by vendors regarding zoning and the request for the payment of a substantial sum to an association under a threat that unless this payment is made the Milk Board will not issue licences. Complaints have been received that, in order to establish claims for future rounds, free milk is given in some cases to householders in new districts for up to a month. Documentary evidence has been offered which shows that the Farmers Union has offered to pay a wholesale milk distributor whose business has been taken over merely by a decision not to supply him with more than one-quarter of his milk requirements. He was offered 3d. a gallon royalty for doing nothing.

The board has full knowledge of this but refuses to do anything about it. It has been alleged that the board is allowing cartels and business associations to become established and that, since they operated, the number of wholesale milk distributors has been reduced from 16 to three apart from treatment plants. I am not sure whether it has not now been reduced from 16 to two. In addition a statement in the Auditor-General's report should receive our attention. As a result of all this the course we are following today has been taken because there does not appear to be any other appeal against the decisions of the board and attempts to obtain a hearing have not been successful.

We contend that in a democracy there is always an appeal open to an aggrieved person—an appeal to this House. Cases have been submitted which we have been told have been supported by representation and correspondence in turn by the Hon. Sir Frank Perry and the Hon. S. C. Bevan in another place and by the members for Mitcham, Unley and Norwood and by the Leader of the Opposition and others in this House. In each case the board has hedged in its replies and the members have not been able to obtain satisfaction. A classic example of the board's evasive attitude was given in this House a fortnight ago in the replies given to a series of questions placed on notice under my name. Those questions were asked for the purpose of seeking information and for no other reason, but the

board did not see fit to give the information asked for.

I am now moving this motion that a committee competent to obtain this information and report back to this House should be set up. I intend to deal with replies given to me a fortnight ago. I ask the House to urge the Government to institute an inquiry by a Select Committee of members of both Houses because members of both Houses have already displayed their interest in the problem placed before them and I believe they are still interested. I think that a full inquiry on the highest level is warranted and I ask members not to quibble about the actual framing of the resolution. By that I ask them not to vote against it on the ground that some other form of inquiry will be preferable or for any similar reason. If members would like to improve the wording or the reference I invite amendments, but I want an inquiry by a competent committee before which all sections of the community can appear and state their case. I hope that the move for an inquiry will not be resisted because, if after investigation the operations of the board and its impact on the industry were found to be in the public interest, it would be a source of satisfaction to everyone, but on the other hand, if it were found that there were wrongs to be set right or improvements to be made, a report should be made on those matters.

The board was constituted in 1946 and was given very wide powers, apparently without any right of appeal except that the board in some measure—although we are not quite sure to what extent—is answerable to Parliament. It has been alleged that the board is unduly influenced in some of its decisions. One case relates to the Farmers Union and, in the matter of supplies from treatment plants, monopolies and cartels have been created with the full knowledge of the board. I am not alleging at this stage that this is either a good or bad thing, but some people's businesses have been affected and some have been completely wiped out. A case that is strong enough to warrant a full investigation has been presented. These conditions are serious and this House should take them seriously.

The board has tended to regard them lightly and has refused to stand up to its obligations when decisions are necessary to effect improvements in the industry. Invariably it has shown a fear of making a decision that would be against the interests of the larger undertakings engaged in the industry. When the men who have been aggrieved have attempted

to pin the board down they have been told to have the matter settled by litigation, but that is not a fair attitude for the board to adopt, for its attitude should be to prevent litigation and to reach an understanding.

The committee to which I have already referred—the Rural committee of the Parliamentary Labor Party—did consider the advisability of submitting an amendment to the Act but felt that, because so many aspects of the administration were causing discontent, a full inquiry was warranted and any amendment would come better if recommended by a committee set up by Parliament than it would from any private member. This matter should be free from politics and it should be founded on a much more thorough investigation than it is competent for the Labor Party committee to make. I have been told, by some who have approached me, that they have a very high regard for the interest shown in their problem by the former Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Pearson) and they had a feeling that he instituted investigations which seem to have been side-tracked or short circuited. On the other hand, many producers who have been to me have expressed confidence in the board. I feel that in all honesty I must say that, but the producers have asked us to put a case to this House for inquiry and the case I have been asked to state on their behalf is in relation to prices. I understand that this application for an increase in price is being considered by the board now. I understand that the board has been asked for an increase of 4d. a gallon. Some producers who have approached us have said that in view of the drought conditions now obtaining it is questionable whether even that will be sufficient. There should be a full investigation into the various methods of assisting the producers before any increase in the price to consumers is agreed upon. Everybody has sympathy for the milk producer, who seems to be right at the end of the scheme of things and too often must take what is given, but in acknowledging his claims it is essential, in his interests as well as in the interests of the consumer, that the price to the consumer should not be forced any higher than is necessary, because increased prices inevitably mean reduced consumption.

Another matter that might be considered is referred to in the Auditor-General's report. His comments on the accumulated funds of the board are:—

The steep increase in the accumulated funds of the board over the past two years (from



£8,602 to £22,897) indicates that the increase of  $\frac{3}{16}$ d. (from  $\frac{1}{16}$ d. to  $\frac{5}{16}$ d.) in treatment levies, which operated from May 12, 1957, was more than required to meet the annual commitments of the board. An increase of  $\frac{1}{4}$ d., yielding £4,287 in 1958 and £4,441 in 1959, would have been more than adequate and given surpluses of £4,035 and £1,532, respectively, in those years.

Producers have also suggested that at present they are facing an unprecedentedly dry year and are being hard put to maintain production as well as to maintain their stock. This must have occasioned an extraordinary expenditure that must reflect in their costs of production. It has been suggested that an increase in the price of milk may not be the complete answer. The producer who is able to produce the most milk will undoubtedly get the greatest measure of relief: this will be the producer who will be the least embarrassed and in the least need of help because his conditions are the most favourable. The producer who is the hardest hit and in the greatest need is the man who will be unable to produce the milk to give him the measure of relief he needs. The most equitable way of giving aid may be to use production of a normal year as the basis of giving help. The possibility of meeting this situation by a drought relief grant from the Commonwealth to be distributed on this basis might also be considered. I do not know to what extent the Milk Board can make representations to the Commonwealth or to what extent it can speak for the industry, but an inquiry such as is envisaged in this resolution could explore these avenues. It might also explore the possibility of the board using some of its accumulated surpluses in an advertising campaign to popularize milk sales. It may be necessary to amend the Act in order to permit that to be done.

Another producer has suggested that payment for all milk, whether it is turned into butterfat or not, could be fixed on a graduated scale, if necessary according to quality, but paid on the whole milk basis rather than on a Babcock test. These suggestions are not ours, but those of persons who have approached us. The chief cause for discontent relates to the zoning of deliveries. Since an article appeared in last Friday's *Advertiser* we have been literally inundated with representations, written approaches and personal interviews by vendors from various parts of the city who are dissatisfied with the present zoning arrangements. They are particularly unhappy with an agreement they are required to sign relating to operations in new zones and con-

cerning any additional business that may come their way even on old established rounds. I have copies of the agreements they are required to sign in both instances. The aim of the Milk Vendors' Association, which is responsible for the drawing up of agreements, is commendable, but some of the clauses would give vendors room for grave concern, particularly if all their ramifications were not understood. They demand from the vendors absolute trust in the association, but for some reason or other the association does not possess the trust that is necessary if this agreement is to give satisfaction.

As I understand the situation, milk rounds in the metropolitan area are valued at about £40 a gallon and applicants for licences in the new areas are required to enter into an agreement with the association under which the goodwill of any new business they build up becomes the property of the association for it to dispose of at will. The applicant must pay £20 a gallon on milk supplied on his round in these new areas and, although the licence is granted by the Milk Board in the name of the vendor and to the vendor, by agreement with the association he signs the goodwill over and it becomes the property of the association. The association nominates the vendor and could, I suppose, under the terms of the agreement, have complete power to recommend to the board that the licence be terminated. There is no appeal and the vendor has no redress. I doubt whether these provisions would ever be invoked in their complete form, but young men, who rang me as late as this morning, have told me that they are so concerned about these provisions that they have been unable to sleep. I thought that was far-fetched until I met them, but they have real concern and they do not all come from one area. We are not saying that it is a good or bad thing, but we do say that it was not envisaged by Parliament when the Milk Board was set up. The association works under the board's authority. It is a power which, if properly handled, could operate to the advantage of the vendor. It seems to have an element of co-operative effort in it. I understand that the idea behind it is that the board should licence only nominees of the association and that they should act in new areas in a caretaking capacity. Although the licences are issued in their names the goodwill is signed over to the association. After 12 months' operation the vendor can have a certain amount of free milk but he must pay the £20 in respect of the rest

and the money he pays for it is divided amongst the other vendors who cannot expand their business. He also has an option to purchase the round he has built up under similar conditions.

Another vendor situated closer to Adelaide approached us. He had a long-established round and told us that because of population moving out, and houses being turned into motor garages and business premises, his round had been reduced by 30 gallons. A round is valued at £40 a gallon, so it represented a substantial loss to him. As I understand the agreement, vendors in developing areas make up for such losses, but this man assured us that he had received nothing, although he is a member of the association. He moved out into another area and endeavoured to establish a round but was told to go back to the old round or he would receive no supplies of milk. Then there was the case of a man on the borderline who had a round for several years in an area that was not completely built on when he purchased it. Since then population has increased and now he has a monopoly. His round has increased by 60 gallons, and at £40 a gallon that represents a large sum of money. He is not required to pay anything to the fund, although other members of the association are required to do so. Under the agreement they declare their business in October each year and if his business in October of the following year shows an increase on that in October of the previous year he has to pay into the association.

It is an involved matter and in order that the best should be done for all concerned a thorough investigation is necessary, something much more thorough than we have been able to give it. I do not suggest that we have all the answers. There is much discontent and it is time for an investigation, and I cannot think of a better investigation than by a Select Committee of members of both Houses of Parliament. It could report to Parliament without a protracted inquiry and could make recommendations for the advancement of the industry. The motion says that the Select Committee could inquire into the possibilities of improving services to consumers. In the north in the last fortnight we have introduced a completely new system of milk delivery. Now containers are used instead of bottles. Milk vendors say that there has been an immediate increase in the demand, an increase beyond their wildest expectations. The consumers are getting a thoroughly satisfactory supply. This is a point that could be inves-

tigated by a Select Committee. The motion also refers to the uneasiness about the Milk Board's squeezing out businessmen, who have given a lifetime to building up wholesale delivery services. Through no fault of their own, or lack of energy or enterprise, and no failure on the part of their business, they have been squeezed out and they do not seem to have any redress. This is a matter which we should consider seriously.

I want now to refer to a case that was mentioned when we sought information by way of a question in this House about a fortnight ago. I refer to the case of Mr. Cox: The story, as told to me, is that Mr. Cox had been a wholesale milk deliverer for about 35 years. He had built up a business with much goodwill because of his efficient service, but when petrol rationing and zoning came during the war all milk distributors were asked to declare their rounds and come to an agreement regarding zoning in order to cut out duplication. He was allotted a zone and operated in it to the satisfaction of all concerned. In 1953 he entered into a contract with Schofield & Sons. In some parts of the round they were both delivering in the one street. Mr. Cox thought that this did not make sense, so he arranged for Schofield to deliver milk to his customers and he agreed to pay Schofield for cartage. Everybody seemed happy and the arrangement continued until 1955, when Schofield sold the round to the Farmers Union. In buying it the Farmers Union took over Schofield's obligations under the agreement.

Mr. Millhouse—Was it signed and executed?

Mr. RICHES—Yes, the agreement between Cox and Schofield. It provided that it could be terminated by notice being given by either party.

Mr. Millhouse—You are sure it was signed by both parties?

Mr. RICHES—Yes. Also talked about between Cox and the Farmers Union was an agreement that was promised but was never signed; but the agreement between Cox and Schofield was signed. The Farmers Union operated under that agreement for three years, Cox believing all the time that the Farmers Union was actually carting for him to the customers in his round and he was paying the Farmers Union for that service.

However, after three years of operation, the Farmers Union merely served notice on Cox, under one term of the agreement, that this agreement would terminate. During the course of the negotiations that then took place,

in which Cox sought legal advice, the Farmers Union offered him 8d. a gallon for all the milk—representing, I believe, some 800 gallons—that he would have been delivering: a royalty for all time, a payment to Cox to sit down and do nothing, clearly acknowledging that it had an obligation to Cox under this agreement.

Cox did not accept that. He did not want to be idle and collect money for services he was not rendering. His reply to the Farmers Union was that, if it was not prepared to continue under the agreement that had been operating, under which it was doing the actual carting for him, he would take over and supply the customers himself, as was originally done. When he sought to do that, the Farmers Union just stopped supplies—refused to supply him. He sought supplies from other sources, but there is this cartel, gentleman's agreement, or whatever else you like to call it, and supplies completely dried up: there is no supply except as directed by the board.

Then Cox approached the board and asked it to give an order for supplies. The board did not tell him that it had no power to do that, or that it was not in the best interests of the industry to do it. It said, "Show us proof that your customers will still deal with you; show us some evidence that your customers require a service with you operating it, and we will consider it." Mr. Cox went to his customers and obtained from them signatures which he placed before the board, which asked him to appear before it as well.

When he appeared before the board a representative of the Farmers Union was there, and the Farmers Union called the tune. The board subsequently told Mr. Cox in a letter of a line and a half that it was not prepared to do anything about it. No reason or explanation was given until the matter was subsequently taken up through the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) to the Minister of Agriculture, and that was the first reply that this man had received about his application to the board. If we are making an accusation it is that the Farmers Union has been calling the tune and the board has been dancing to it. I do not want this to be construed as an attack on the Farmers Union because, to be perfectly fair, it would appear from information at our disposal that the Farmers Union has dealt with the producers as well as any organization in the industry has. As a matter of fact, its bonuses to the producers compare with any. I know it has been suggested that in many cases that has been forced

by the operations of other producers forming themselves into something like a co-operative. Be that as it may, the fact remains that the Farmers Union has been and still is giving good service and satisfaction to the producer. But I am convinced that in this particular case it has just come in, forced a man out of business and taken over to itself a business worth a lot of money, considering that a milk round is valued at £40 a gallon and it has just taken off him 800 gallons of milk supply.

If that were the only case we would judge that there might be something wrong with the wholesale distributor, but the case of another wholesale distributor from Blackwood is almost on a par with that. The company there is not the Farmers Union, but a man has been forced out of business. I have had an opportunity of looking at his file and think his case was strongly and fairly put by the Minister of the day, who took it to the board direct. He asked the board to say whether it was prepared to make an order on some wholesaler other than the one that had refused to supply Read, the man in question. This firm can give a supply but is not prepared to make any adjustment in price for the service he renders; it is not prepared to allow any margin for anything he does in the way of handling the milk; he has to do that without cost. There is no more ridiculous set-up, surely, in the metropolitan area. In reply to the Minister, the board acknowledged the service that this man was giving in the Blackwood area and the desirability of a wholesalers' milk depot. It acknowledged that the method of distribution without a depot was not satisfactory, and that a depot was desirable.

When it came to answering questions that I placed on notice a fortnight ago, the board changed its tune and said, as a reason for not fixing a price for services rendered by the wholesale distributors, that these were not necessary in the industry. We went to look at how the milk was handled and distributed. We are convinced that, if these depots were not there, some other depots would have to be established and, if these people were not rendering the service, somebody else would have to, just as the board itself said in the case at Blackwood that the depot was a necessary adjunct to the supply.

Mr. Jenkins—How are they getting on now it has been discontinued?

Mr. RICHES—They come down to Edwards-town and get a supply. The consumers are getting a supply but the wholesale man is

pushed out of business. The Milk Board has acknowledged that some service is given free of charge and that it would not be adequate except for the good offices of the wholesale vendor. The board has this to say:—

The board is aware of the present conditions under which the wholesale milk is left for some vendors in the Blackwood area. This method of delivery is common practice throughout the metropolitan area and the board agrees that it is most unsatisfactory. It is doubtful if this board, under existing legislation, can remedy the position.

That is one reason why we think that on the evidence of the board itself it may be necessary for new legislation to give it power to remedy this position. The board then continues:—

In an attempt to place delivery to retail vendors on an improved basis the board met representatives of the Metropolitan County Board in conference in June 1952. It was suggested to the Metropolitan County Board that it should require that vendors of milk should either have refrigerated premises or take delivery of their milk from a licensed factory or depot.

The provision of this refrigerated service is one of the prime services that the wholesale man renders and for which service the board refuses to fix any remuneration. The board should, under the powers available to it, fix the value of the services rendered by the wholesale distributors, instead of expressing the opinion on the one hand and that they are not necessary to the industry and on the other admitting that they do render a very essential service. If this were done, much of the dissatisfaction in this respect would be met. In the light of that, it is most interesting to note how the board dealt with questions submitted to it a fortnight ago. It could have been completely honest in giving answers to the questions. I do not know whether it thought I was launching an attack on it, but if it did it was wrong in its assumption. All that was being sought was information.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—Are you accusing the board of dishonesty?

Mr. RICHES—Yes, in some of its replies. The first question I asked was:—

Are milk vendors in the metropolitan area directed by the Metropolitan Milk Board to obtain their supplies from wholesale treatment plants nominated by the board?

And the answer was “No.” I say that is not an honest answer. Members who have been approached by the vendors know that there is a very strong direction. I mentioned Mr. Cox. We saw his depot, and there is a

vendor almost next door, and it would be much more convenient for all concerned if he were able to get his supplies from the cool store, which is only a stone’s throw away. He is not allowed to do that. I also asked the board:—

Is Mr. Cox the holder of a wholesale milk delivery licence?

And the board replied:—

The Milk Board does not issue wholesale milk delivery licences.

The board knows that Mr. Cox has been operating as a wholesale milk delivery man for the last 30 odd years. The board was also asked:—

Has Mr. Cox applied to the Metropolitan Milk Board for an order on the S.A. Farmers Union to grant him a supply?

And the answer was “Yes.” The board was then asked:—

Did Mr. Cox have a round of approximately 1,000 gallons a day in 1958?

And the reply was:—

Mr. Cox told the board he was selling 131 gallons retail and 820 gallons wholesale daily.

The next question was:—

Is it a fact that in order to avoid unnecessary expense and duplication of deliveries an arrangement was entered into between Cox and the Farmers Union under which the Farmers Union undertook some of the cartage to Cox’s customers at his expense?

And the board replied:—

No. He may have entered into an arrangement with Messrs. J. Schofield and Sons, but details are not known.

That is the kind of answer we have been getting. The board had Mr. Cox before it and he requested it make an order for the Farmers Union to supply him with milk, the same as Schofields did. Frankly, the answers received to the questions were not the answers that I expected. I thought that the best way to get information on the matter and to check up was to ask the Minister questions. I have not known Mr. Cox and I am not pushing his barrow or anyone else’s barrow. I wanted to check up on the story he told because it rang true, but I still wanted to be certain. When I read that the member for Mitcham and the previous Minister of Agriculture had written to the board, saw that the member for Norwood had taken up the cudgels, and learned that Sir Frank Perry had approached the board on these matters I thought to myself, “Here is a case that merits some consideration.” However, I was still not satisfied and so we set out a series of questions to get information from the board direct. On our checking the

replies to those questions we were satisfied that it did not give an honest answer in hardly any case.

Mr. Shannon—Do you suggest that the board was dishonest?

Mr. RICHES—I said straight out and I say again that the answers to these questions were not honest.

Mr. Shannon—You are saying that the board is dishonest. That is a serious statement.

Mr. RICHES—And I am proposing to substantiate it. The next question to the board was:—

Has the Farmers Union now compulsorily taken over the supply to most of Cox's customers with the knowledge of the board?

And the board's answer was:—

There is a dispute between Mr. Cox and S.A. Farmers Co-op. Union as to the right to serve certain retail vendors.

The next question was:—

Has Mr. Cox been paid any compensation? To which the board replied that it was not known. With great respect, I say the board does know and knows that he has not been paid any compensation. The next question was:—

Has Mr. Cox been offered a "royalty" of 5d. a gallon on 800 gallons a day without handling the milk at all?

And the answer was:—

It is believed that negotiations took place between the legal representatives of S.A. Farmers Co-op. Union and Mr. Cox but the details of these discussions are a matter for the parties themselves.

I suggest that the board was set up to look into these things and to control the distribution of milk in the metropolitan area, and that it is a matter for the board if men who have been in the industry all their lives are being squeezed out. When the board was set up 16 wholesale men were delivering, but all except three and the treatment plants have been squeezed out. The next question was:—

Has Mr. Cox refused this offer?

The reply was:—

See No. 8 above.

The next question was:—

Did Mr. Cox serve notice of his intention to resume supply to his former customers?

The answer to this was:—

No notice has been served on the Milk Board.

I say that that is another wrong answer: I have copies of correspondence in which notices were served on the board, not only by Cox

himself, but supported by members of this House. The next question was:—

Is it a fact that letters from milk vendors were submitted to the board in support of this notice of intention?

The reply given was:—

Letters were submitted with the application for an order (see Question No. 3) but letters from the same vendors were subsequently submitted by S.A. Farmers Co-op. Union stating that the vendors desired to continue to obtain their supplies from S.A. Farmers Co-op. Union.

The board was not sure that it had had an application for an order earlier, if members remember. My comment on this is that the South Australian Farmers Co-operative Union sent representatives around to the customers asking them to sign a document stating that they were satisfied with the service the delivery men were making on its behalf and that they had no complaints. When many of those customers subsequently found what the nature of the document was, another letter was sent to the board making the position clear and reiterating their desire to continue in business with Mr. Cox.

Mr. Dunstan—The board says nothing about that.

Mr. RICHES—No, the board seems to be apologizing for the Farmers Union all the time. We were not attacking the Farmers Union or anybody else, but merely seeking information, yet the board placed itself on the defensive. This has been typical of the replies other members have received in correspondence. We have seen letters from the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) and other members, telling the people that they have done all they can, that they are very sorry, but that there does not seem to be anything more that can be done. There was a similar letter from Sir Frank Perry and from others who have taken up the cudgels. If they cannot do anything about it individually—and I do not suggest they can—I suggest Parliament, if these things are substantiated, should set up this Committee. If a wrong is established Parliament can do something about it, and I think the case has been presented sufficiently coherently and strongly to convince us that there is need for an investigation of the operations of the board. I will not go through the remainder of the questions, because I think I have dealt with enough to make the point that I set out to make: that the board is not willing to give straightforward answers to questions or to face up to

its obligations in this matter. I hope that as a result of this debate the board will reconsider its attitude.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—Are you in favour of additional middlemen?

Mr. RICHES—No, but nobody is asking for that. That is an expression of opinion by the board that has clouded the issue. Nobody believes in unnecessary middlemen. I have shown that the board itself acknowledges the need for the services that these men are rendering. We do not believe in monopoly, and there is no question about extra middlemen coming in and bumping up the price to the consumer. We want to preserve the just business entitlements of the men who have given a lifetime of service to build up their milk rounds, which have been of tremendous value to them, but which have been filched away to such an extent that they are not able to continue providing employment and are looking to forms of backyard manufacture to keep their businesses going.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—Will you read question and answer No. 19?

Mr. RICHES—There are two or three before that. Question 17 was:—

Has an application been made to the board to fix a price for services rendered by wholesale delivery men?

The answer was:—

Yes, but no details were given to the wholesale delivery men on whose behalf the request was made.

Does anyone think that that was a reasonable answer? All the way through, the board has been dealing with Cox, yet it does not know who was the wholesale delivery man about whom this question was put, although it was holding correspondence from members of this House and of another place, and from legal representatives. Question 18 was:—

If so, what was the price determined?

The board's reply was:—

No margin was fixed.

The next question was:—

If not, why has the board refused to fix a price?

The reply was:—

To recognize additional "middlemen" would add to price structure. Board considers three price margins only are necessary—producers, treatment plants, and retail vendors.

That answer was the most dishonest of all, because the board itself, in the letter over the signature of Mr. Seth Gale to the Minister of Agriculture, acknowledged the necessity for

this depot at Blackwood. The board knows that nobody at that time had suggested any alteration in the price structure, either to producers or to consumers but, in between those two prices, there should be a fixation of a price for services rendered by these wholesale distributors.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—That is not a matter for the board.

Mr. RICHES—It is a matter for the board. The Act clearly sets out that it has this power, although the board does not want to do it—I suggest because it does not want to offend the companies calling the tune to which it dances. The Minister knows the board has power under the Act to fix this price. I remind the House that for three years after the Farmers Union took over Schofield, and even before that when Schofield was operating, this margin was paid without any additional price to the consumer or alteration in price to the producer. It was part of the amount allowed to treatment plants for services rendered.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—What additional service is Mr. Cox supplying?

Mr. RICHES—I understand that he renders service in the same way as some of the treatment plants which deliver milk and in the depot which he operates. When Parliament set up the Milk Board, 16 semi-wholesalers were in business and Parliament did not envisage that they were going to be forced out of business. The Milk Board was not set up for that purpose. If these companies can effect a lower price to the consumer by alteration of the services there might be some argument for them, but they are not supplying milk more cheaply to the consumer. They are taking this rake-off for themselves and that is the basis of my complaint and one reason why I want an inquiry.

Mr. Shannon—I am not worried about the honourable member's complaint. I have never heard anything more futile in my life. He does not even know how many wholesalers there are in the industry. I am quite happy.

Mr. RICHES—I know the member for Onkarparinga is happy. This business of the relationship between the wholesale distributors is only one aspect on which I am asking for an inquiry, but in order to explain the situation, it has been necessary to deal with it a little longer than the other aspects. I ask the House not to overlook the complaints made by vendors because many more complaints have

been received from vendors than from any other section. They are seriously concerned and whether their concern is justified is for the committee to determine. I cannot believe that any association would exercise viciously its powers over the operations of the vendors under the terms of this agreement, but I can understand their uneasiness in operating under the agreements, especially when rumour is current of what is going to happen and what can happen to them.

I have not been able to find any substance in the rumours except regarding the substantial accounts they have been required to pay. They may be designed to ultimately work out in the interests of the vendors, but this is a new arrangement and was not envisaged when the board was set up. There is no provision in the Act and there is no legal entitlement except in the agreement they sign, and it is a new departure when people have to sign away their goodwill before they are able to enter business at all.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—You are referring to rumours.

Mr. RICHES—These agreements are facts and I have them here. There is no question of rumour about them.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—What are the rumours you are referring to?

Mr. RICHES—I do not think I should state that here because it is causing uneasiness. The rumours concern licences in newly-declared areas, how they are to be allotted and the actions of the executives as to who is to be squeezed out and who will remain in business. Powers exist under the agreement to do that. I have not had any evidence that there is definite ground for those fears. Inquiries I have made of vendors have continually brought before me the fact that they fear that is the intention of the association, and it is a remarkable thing that vendors should come from Brighton, from Holden Hill and from various parts of the city all on the one day, unknown to each other but with the same fear. That is the situation as I find it, and I am bringing it to the House. The rural committee of the Labor Party is not a committee of experts and does not have the answers, but each member on the committee who has been approached believes that the great discontent warrants an inquiry by a Select Committee.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

## CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 14. Page 1078.)

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide)—I support the Bill and intend to give my reasons for supporting it. My first reason is that, like other members of this House, I accept the sixth commandment, "Thou shalt not kill." That was a principle I had for opposing capital punishment years before I became a member of the Labor Party, and I say that because one honourable member on the other side charged members on this side with voting on this matter in accordance with instructions. My second reason is that capital punishment is not a sufficient deterrent. Indeed, I go further and say that I doubt whether it is a sufficient penalty. My third reason is that there is always a chance that an innocent person may be executed, and my fourth reason is that capital punishment with a commutation by Executive Council means capital punishment for some persons and commutation for others. My fifth reason is that the State and society have some responsibility in this matter regarding the reasons for murders. My sixth reason is that by giving effect to capital punishment we are asking some citizens of our community to do something against their conscience. My seventh reason is the anxiety that must be caused to members of the Cabinet in considering whether or not a death sentence should be commuted.

In respect of my first reason, I believe that Government members have debated this matter fairly, honestly, sincerely and in accordance with their conscience, but I differ from their final conclusion to oppose the Bill and to continue this barbaric form of punishment. If we claim to believe in Christianity, we cannot believe only in some parts of it: we either accept it or we do not. At the conclusion of every speech by the Governor in opening Parliament he invokes Divine Blessing on the Parliament. The pillars of this Chamber are so decorated that every day we deliberate under the eyes of angels. In the first Parliament in Great Britain the Speaker sat in front of a statue of Christ. The whole foundation of Parliament is its acceptance of the principles of Christianity and we are charged with passing good laws in the interests of our people in accordance with those principles. By legislation Parliament has said to the people, "Thou shalt not kill," and Divine law imposes

the same restriction on members of Parliament. The member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke), in debating this Bill, said:—

I have no doubt that the greatest possible crime is the wilful taking of a God-given life. I agree with that and believe he was sincere in that assertion, but I disagree with his opposition to the Bill. Later he said:—

The State has God-given authority and responsibility to exercise and enforce this penalty, and I firmly believe that there should be no departure from an immutable law of God in this matter.

On what authority does he claim that the State has God-given authority to take life?

Mr. Laucke—I can give you a scriptural quotation.

Mr. LAWN—The honourable member did not give it when he debated this Bill.

Mr. Shannon—You said hanging was too good a punishment.

Mr. LAWN—The Farmers Union is not running this House at the moment and whilst I did say it was not a sufficient penalty I will discuss that presently. That has nothing to do with the right of any person to take life.

Mr. Shannon—It is a terrible thing to be able to remember.

Mr. LAWN—The honourable member can be facetious when he desires, and when he has no valid and logical argument the honourable member for Farmers Union always adopts the attitude of trying to treat matters before the House as a joke. This is a serious matter.

Mr. Shannon—Was it a joke?

The SPEAKER—Order!

Mr. LAWN—Government members have said that this is an important matter and is not a question of Party politics. I accept that. They said it is a matter on which each member should make up his own mind, but I do not think they have the right to do that. However, I will not argue that now, nor will I be side-tracked by the member for Onkaparinga. I also said that capital punishment was not a sufficient deterrent nor was it a sufficient penalty. Mr. Justice Barry of the Victorian Supreme Court, when speaking of capital punishment, said:—

It is clear that the mode of penalty cannot be demonstrated to have significant effect on the crime rate.

He claims that capital punishment is not a sufficient deterrent because the penalty has not had a significant effect on the crime rate. Who is the greater authority, a member of this House or a judge of a Supreme Court who has the duty of passing a death sentence?

Mr. Jenkins—Other justices hold the opposite view.

Mr. LAWN—And other authorities support his contention. I said that I doubted whether it was a sufficient penalty. Let us consider the case of a person who commits a murder. In the normal course of events he can be arrested, tried, found guilty and sentenced to death within four months. I believe the law prescribes that the penalty shall be carried out within a month from the date of sentence so that within five months of the date of the crime the murderer knows no more: he is passed on and is not here to suffer any anxiety for his crime. Some people say that he suffers hell during the five months, and I have no doubt that in some cases that is correct, but in one case gaol officials have said that the condemned man is thriving and putting on weight. During the waiting period the condemned man has special privileges. He does not have to do hard labour like other prisoners, and in comparison with their treatment he gets the very best. Time and again we have heard reports about the demeanour of a condemned person. We hear that he is sleeping and eating well, and happy with his gaolers. If a person can eat and sleep well he is not suffering much mental anguish. It is said that in most cases the condemned man walks to the gallows or electric chair without assistance, and does not have to be carried. Of course, if they are normal persons they must suffer some mental anxiety. After being arrested and found guilty of murder the man is out of his misery inside five or six months.

If a man is 27 years of age when the sentence is commuted to life imprisonment, and 67 when freed he has 40 years in which to commiserate with himself, and in that time he suffers much mental anguish. If he is a Christian he knows that he must eventually face his Maker, but for 40 years he is in a confined space doing hard labour. I do not advocate that a murderer whose sentence has been commuted to life imprisonment should be released within 12 to 15 years. I do not think that in that time he has suffered a sufficient penalty. It is not contrary to God's will to keep a man in prison for 20, 30 or 40 years. We have had instances of innocent persons being sentenced to death. There is always the chance that an innocent person may be executed. If a convicted person spends 10, 20 or 30 years in gaol before it is discovered that he is innocent we cannot undo his sufferings and those of his family during that time, but the man



still has his life and freedom. We can then attempt to provide him with something for the remainder of his life, but nothing can be done for a man once his life is taken. Mr. Shannon said that since 1950 there have been 100 reported murders in South Australia and 14 attempted murders. That is clear evidence that capital punishment is not a sufficient deterrent. Murders will continue to occur in South Australia and we have had one since the Stuart case. Mr. Shannon said that there had been 88 arrests for murders and attempted murders since 1950.

Mr. Jenkins—There have been five capital punishments.

Mr. LAWN—Yes. The honourable member realizes the weak argument advanced by Mr. Shannon. Eighty-eight people were arrested and tried for 114 murders and attempted murders, and only five were executed. Mr. Shannon did not say how many of the arrested people were found not guilty; therefore, his information does not amount to very much. One fact emerges from the figures given and it is that of the 88 persons arrested Executive Council decided to hang only five. Mr. Shannon charged people—he may have meant me, or other members on this side—with having accused the Government of developing a hanging State. I did not do that, and I do not think any of my colleagues did, but I believe something of the sort appeared in a newspaper in another State. The figures submitted by Mr. Shannon show that South Australia is not a hanging State. They show that there is a capital punishment for some people and commutation for others.

When a jury deals with a case it knows that if it finds the man guilty he will be sent to his death. There may have been instances where juries have found a man not guilty because they did not want to say “guilty” and be responsible for his death. If a person has sufficient money he can sometimes avoid a conviction for murder and I think we could give instances where it has happened in South Australia, and not over a lengthy period. The best of counsel is available to a wealthy man, but not available to the poor man. We saw the type of counsel that Stuart had at first. He did not have a Queen’s Counsel at his trial. The wealthy man can always get the best man available in the legal profession to defend him. If there is a chance to bribe the jury the wealthy man has the wherewithal to do it. We should not have

a state of affairs like this in South Australia. Mr. Justice Barry, to whom I have already referred, said:—

Commutation controverts the essential principle of certainty which is required to make punishment an effective deterrent, for it proclaims that the law does not always, but only sometimes, means what it says.

I do not think we should have a Statute that means what it says sometimes, and does not at other times. As I have said, a wealthy person has the money to buy the best of legal assistance; he may even be able to bribe the jury. Also, his wealth or position in society may ensure the commutation of his sentence. He could have friends in the Cabinet. What anxiety it must cause them if they have to determine whether or not a personal friend should have his sentence commuted!

My fifth reason for opposing capital punishment is that all men who do wrong are not wholly the product of society but some are. A boy or girl born in a slum area grows up with no training and very little home life. The three greatest institutions in a child’s life are the home, the school and the Sunday school or church, but many children are denied these essentials to education and character-building. They grow up with bad instead of good associations; they keep bad company. Subsequently, one of them commits a murder. One might justly ask, “Is he or she responsible for the murder?” No doubt the person is responsible; but I say that society too is responsible; we have some responsibility for that murder. For that reason many people say that they oppose the ultimate penalty, capital punishment for murder. They even say “He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone.” The responsibility for some murders is not wholly that of the individuals who commit them: some of it must be assumed by the State.

My sixth reason is that by ordaining capital punishment we require some people to do something against their conscience. No-one can deny that. We ask prison warders to prepare the scaffolding and the prisoner, and then we ask somebody to come in and perform the execution. I have visited the Adelaide Gaol and discussed this very point with those concerned with execution. They have told me what I am saying now, that they dislike it intensely; they would prefer to have nothing whatsoever to do with it.

Nobody knows who the executioner is. Why? If his act is in accordance with the divine law, if he is doing something in the interests

of the State, something that we should applaud, executing someone who has taken life in the community, why is it necessary to hush up or hide his identity? The law must be bad if it requires something to be done in secret. Parliament does not meet in secret. When we meet here the public gallery is open to members of the public. Our whole procedure is public and we do not rush through the passing of Bills. We consider them carefully to enable more and more people to know what is being done in Parliament so that, if they can fault anything or can show us some anomaly or that some harm may be done by the passing of a certain Bill, they have the opportunity of approaching their member of Parliament or a Minister to see if the matter can be put right; and yet we require the carrying out of one of our laws to be done in secret. That in itself proves there is something wrong with that law.

I come now to the seventh reason—the responsibility and anxiety that must be caused to our Cabinet Ministers. We disagree politically but I should hate to be a member of the Cabinet when a question of commutation or execution comes before them and they have to decide either for or against. We have the statement of a Home Secretary in Great Britain, who made no secret of the mental torture he suffered when he first had to consider the making of a recommendation to Cabinet, and I take it that the same happens here. One Minister has to refer the matter to Cabinet to say whether the sentence shall be carried out or whether it shall be commuted. Imagine the responsibility that we, by our present Statute, place upon the shoulders of our eight members of the Cabinet! It is wrong. If we believe in capital punishment there should not be capital punishment for some and commutation for others, leaving the responsibility of saying who shall die and who shall not to eight men; Parliament should accept that responsibility and say that hanging is the law of the land. Once a judge has passed sentence, following a verdict of guilty by the jury, we should not say to eight men, “It is your final responsibility to decide whether this person shall live or die.”

I will deal now with remarks made by other speakers. The Premier suggested that, if we lifted the death penalty, some of our citizens would just run amok with guns, shooting members of the police, just trigger-happy; that they would want to murder our police officers. Why did he pick on police officers? If he had

said, “People would run amok with guns shooting people here, there and everywhere,” one could understand that he might think that would happen, although he has no evidence of it. A country that has abolished or suspended capital punishment does not have its people running around with shot guns or revolvers shooting people here, there and everywhere. Much less do we find them shooting members of the police force. We know that the Premier has not a sense of responsibility except when it suits him, and that he has criticized heads of other Governments on their attitude towards capital punishment. Accepting the fact that we have had capital punishment, is it not logical to say that if a person has been seen committing a crime for which he could “swing,” he is likely to shoot the eyewitness to cover up the crime so that no evidence can be given against him? I do not think that such things weigh very much. Last week we listened to a very well considered address by the member for Albert, Mr. Nankivell. When he rose he said he had given considerable thought to the matter, and his remarks proved that. He spoke along the same lines as those I have spoken on this afternoon. He said that capital punishment was not a deterrent to murder and mentioned that 100 years ago there were about 200 offences for which capital punishment was the penalty in Great Britain. We know that that was so and that today the number has been reduced to four, including high treason and murder. He added that he thought that the question of capital punishment was more a moral issue than a legal one. I believe that to be so also. He proved that it was not a sufficient deterrent and said:—

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.

I agree wholeheartedly. I think Mr. Shannon said that South Australia has fewer crimes than any of the eastern States, and he attributed that to the fact that we have capital punishment and they have not. I emphasize that we have a much lower population, and that is the main reason. When our population reaches that of the eastern States we shall have just as many of the underworld here as they have. I believe that the citizens of South Australia have a respect for the law rather

than fear, and a respect for our police force. I also believe that they have greater respect for the police force than people in New South Wales have. If we encourage respect for the law and for the police force, rather than preach fear, then I believe we shall have less crime. Mr. Nankivell also said:—

Our law does not recognize 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 guilty and seek a lesser verdict.

I have already referred to the same matter. Many members on the Government side have agreed with the remarks of members on this side. Mr. Nankivell also had this to say:—

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.

That is something that I have argued this afternoon. The honourable member also said:—

I contend that such imprisonment should not be for life, but during Her Majesty's pleasure, for a minimum of 20 years.

He condemned the practice of releasing a condemned person after imprisonment for 12 to 15 years and said the period should be at least 20 years. I agree. Like the honourable member, I do not consider that a person who has received the death sentence should be released within 12 or 15 years. That is wrong, and I do not want to be a party to it. The honourable member also said:—

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.

The honourable member gave one of the most forceful and thoughtful speeches delivered during the debate, and his whole argument was in support of the Bill. He expressed much better than I could abhorrence to capital punishment, but finally undid all his argument in a few words by saying that because the Bill went further than abolishing capital punishment for murder by also abolishing capital punishment

for treason, he therefore opposed the Bill. I remind the honourable member that a little earlier he said that except during war-time no capital punishment had been imposed on any person for treason for 100 years. That position will not be altered by the Bill because, as I understand the position, treason is an offence under the Crimes Act, which is Commonwealth legislation and will not be affected by this Bill. Our Acts relate only to matters over which we have control, and we have no control over treason, so the honourable member has based his final decision on something that does not exist.

Mr. Loveday—Perhaps he will change his mind now.

Mr. LAWN—This debate has been generally on a high plane, except for one remark made against me by a member opposite, to which I will refer later. If it remains on that high plane the member for Albert must support the Bill, as his whole argument was against hanging. He decided not to support the Bill only because capital punishment would be abolished for every offence, but he admitted that there have been no hangings for treason in 100 years except during war-time, and perhaps he did not realize that treason was a Commonwealth offence, so the law governing it does not concern us.

The Premier in particular, and other members of his Cabinet, have condemned members for making irresponsible and untrue statements about other members. I also condemn that practice. I think I am as critical of other members as any member when the occasion arises, but I do not have to indulge in lies against other members by saying that they have made statements they have not made, particularly as our remarks are reported in *Hansard* and can be looked up with very little effort. The member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) is a solicitor, and would know that if he were arguing something before a court and the evidence given by any person was vital, he should produce that evidence. During the course of his remarks on this Bill, the honourable member said:—

Not one member of this House will soon forget the way the member for Adelaide blurted out the other day, "The man who committed that crime deserves to be hanged. Hanging is too good for him." We all saw the embarrassment that caused to members of his Party, but when he blurted that out he blurted out the truth, and I agree entirely with it.

I did not at any time make the statement the honourable member attributed to me. I have never said, "The man who committed that crime deserves to be hanged."

Mr. King—Everybody heard it.

Mr. LAWN—Nobody heard it. What I said is recorded in *Hansard* at page 663. I knew at the time I made this statement that I had cause to preface my remarks with certain words. I said:—

I want to make my attitude on this matter quite clear because certain members on the other side of the House have the habit of misrepresenting statements made by members on this side. In respect of what happened at Ceduna I would say that hanging is not severe enough punishment for the person who committed that crime.

The member for Light asked by way of interjection:—

What will you do with the "death penalty" Bill?

I then said:—

I am opposed to hanging, but I say that it is not enough, as hanging the person who committed that crime would be too good for him. I had in mind that that person is some 27 years of age and, in a normal set of circumstances, if the law had been carried out in the normal way, he would have been hanged long ago and out of all misery. However, I believe the person who committed that crime, whoever he may be, should spend the rest of his life in gaol. That is what I meant when I made that statement. I did not say, "The man who committed that crime deserves to be hanged." I made it quite clear in my statement and in reply to the member for Light that I opposed hanging.

Mr. Hambour—I excuse you.

Mr. LAWN—I am not asking the honourable member to excuse me. I have heard the Premier state what should not be said in this House, and members opposite say that all the ethics exist on that side of the House! I thought the member for Mitcham gave a considered speech. Early in his remarks he said:—

The views I express on this subject are those which I hold at present. I do not say for a moment that my views are unchangeable. I hope that, as a result of this debate, he will change his views, although perhaps not wholly in favour of the Bill. I will come to that later. The member for Mitcham went on to say:—

This is a matter upon which we have the responsibility of making up our minds, and I see no reason why we should abdicate that responsibility.

I thought the honourable member made a reasonable statement to the House. He said he felt there should be degrees of murder. I believe the second reading of this Bill should be carried because, overall, the majority of members abhor hanging and would like to see some improvement to our law. If members are not prepared to pass the Bill in its entirety, I suggest we see whether we cannot improve the present law by amending the Bill in some way even if we have to find degrees. If the majority do not agree in Committee to the present Bill surely some way can be found to amend our present Statute. I support the Bill.

Mr. HAMBOUR (Light)—I have listened to members with much interest and I believe almost every possible investigation into this question has been embarked upon by different members. I do not doubt the sincerity of any member speaking on this Bill, but I want to clarify some remarks made by the member for Adelaide on the member for Albert's attitude. The member for Albert made a magnificent contribution to the debate. He told the House how he felt about this question and concluded by saying that he was not happy with complete abolition. Many members feel that the killer should be dealt with. With complete abolition a murderer in gaol can kill and fear no further penalty. That is the attitude of the member for Albert and I do not blame him for saying what he did and concluding as he did. Honourable members opposite have expressed their views and they are different. I excuse the honourable member for Adelaide, who said he didn't want to be excused, because words he used were used impetuously.

Mr. Lawn—I used the words shown in *Hansard*.

Mr. HAMBOUR—There is no question about what appears in *Hansard*; they are the words the honourable member used. I excuse him because in the heat of the moment we do not always say the things we mean. The member for Adelaide has quite clearly given his views this afternoon and I accept them. I am not concerned with details because all honourable members have raised various points, but they have to say either yes or no to this Bill.

I think the findings of the commissions, the opinions quoted, and the statistics given cover a wide range and they are probably the findings of experts in their field or statistics compiled by statisticians. Notwithstanding this I feel that this is a question each

honourable member has to decide in himself in his own home in a detached attitude. I started to read all the volumes quoted. I read the British Homicide Act but did not derive any satisfaction from that because it did not answer the question. I then sat at home and discussed this question with a few of my cronies and tried to get the human aspect on murder.

If a man kills someone near and dear to you what do you want to do? The human instinct is to retaliate but that cannot be done. The law should operate and, if we defeat that law, we take away the rights of the individual. If anyone killed anyone near and dear to me I would consider retaliation. I have asked many men what they would do if someone killed anyone near and dear to them and their immediate reaction was: "I would do away with him." I think we would all do that if it were in our own home or backyard. It is very easy to say what you would do when referring to something which is far away from you and which is of little concern to you. Possibly, of all the members in this House, the member for Eyre felt worse about the Ceduna tragedy than did any other member simply because he was familiar with the circumstances and it affected him more closely. The tragedy was more closely sheeted home to him than it would be to me in the district of Light hundreds of miles away. That aspect should not be overlooked, because it is most important.

We have also discussed what has happened in other countries and in other States, but that has no impact on my point of view. Ceylon abolished capital punishment and now that country is going to bring it back, but what has that to do with South Australia? That is a completely different set of circumstances. If we are going to do what other countries do we must remember that 10 years after the war generals who had acted under instructions were still being eliminated and that was done by the joint allies. If we consider other countries, should we not consider the action of the joint allies because those generals were undoubtedly men acting under orders. I do not desire to go any further away than my own self and my own surroundings to come to a conclusion in this matter.

Public opinion has been whipped up by the newspaper in front of the member for Chaffey at this moment. I do not know what views the editor of that paper holds; he may be opposed to capital punishment.

Mr. Dunstan—I do not think he is.

Mr. HAMBOUR—He may be opposed to the Government; he must be opposed to something or he would not be whipping up public opinion. He must have a point of view.

Mr. Dunstan—Very little—practically nothing—has appeared in the paper about capital punishment as such.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Let me continue.

Mr. Clark—I think you are talking on another issue.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Can anybody dissociate the two? I listened with interest to Professor Norval Morris on television and I thought he gave excellent answers to the questions because he qualified what he said by saying, "I am opposed to capital punishment." His answers were therefore clouded by his point of view. He was within his rights in saying what he did. He was put on the air to give an explanation and, if you say it is not trying to influence public opinion when you put a noted lecturer on television to give his views on capital punishment, I do not know what it is. However, that did not influence me. I respect the opinions of other people, and I certainly believe that members opposite were sincere in what they said. I feel strongly about this question and have made my decision. I hope I am right, although I may be wrong.

The member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) referred to the undesirable aspects of hanging. I am sure that all persons associated with the machinery involved in bringing about the end of a convicted murderer must go through a difficult period. I must admit that I did not completely understand what Mr. Shannon suggested was involved in the peaceful elimination of murderers, but if a means can be devised whereby the hangman and warders of the Adelaide Gaol can be relieved of their irksome duties it should be considered. I am not concerned with the murderer. If he suffers pain and anguish, it is part and parcel of his penalty.

Mr. Quirke—That would be a worse method than hanging, because a person knows when he is to be hanged, but he might not know when he is to be eliminated during his sleep.

Mr. HAMBOUR—In America a man has been under sentence of death for 11 years and a final decision as to his execution will be made on Friday. I firmly believe that the only murderer to be executed should be the killer—the man who kills deliberately. There is no room on earth for him because he will

only kill again and if we permit that as a State we are failing in our duty. Members of the Executive Council must go through a strenuous period in determining whether a convicted murderer shall be executed. The member for Onkaparinga said that only five men had been hanged in the last 10 years. That clearly indicates that the Executive is merciful. He named the persons that were hanged and related their crimes, which were surely sufficiently abhorrent to justify the extreme penalty.

Mr. Clark—All murder is abhorrent.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Certainly, but some murders are deliberate killings. Members opposite know that men who kill in a fit of anger, through impetuosity, or as the result of the eternal triangle are not hanged. If a man is emotionally upset or reveals some degree of irresponsibility he is not hanged. I believe our Executive commutes the sentences on all except the deliberate killers and by so doing obviates the necessity for prescribing degrees of murder. I am somewhat concerned that emotionalism and sentimentality should intrude into this debate and that, through the press, people should be emotionally aroused. I believe we are losing some of our God-given characteristics—the desire to fight and to be a little tough.

The Bible has been quoted and the Ten Commandments cited, but I do not wish to refer to them. I believe we are getting a little soft in our attitude to this question. If a man is bad and is a killer how can any member say, "Give him life?" What does "life" mean? Every member who has visited Yatala knows that the life of a well-behaved prisoner is no hardship. As a prisoner's behaviour improves his freedom becomes greater. The member for Onkaparinga referred to Block C. I examined that, and its dormitory and canteen conditions are as good as any in our colleges.

Mr. Clark—That is not for murderers.

Mr. HAMBOUR—A man from my district, in prison for life for murder, has the free run of the gaol. He is the best behaved prisoner there.

Mr. Clark—That was a very peculiar case.

Mr. HAMBOUR—That may be so, but they can only judge prisoners in gaol by their behaviour and the better they behave the more privileges they have extended to them. We applaud the fact that our gaol conditions have been improved.

Mr. Shannon—It is a very humane approach.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Yes, and I hope similar provisions can be extended to other institutions. However, we must think of the killers—men who will kill a warder to escape. There is possibly one roaming Australia at the moment and we will get others. Our population will increase and the bigger the city becomes the bigger the congregation of a bad element.

Mr. Shannon—The bigger the sediment.

Mr. HAMBOUR—That is a good description. If we eliminate capital punishment how will we deal with the worst offenders? We will imprison for life a man who commits an emotional murder—a murder arising from the eternal triangle—and we will give the same penalty to the man who kills without compunction. I believe the penalty should fit the crime. Where the crime is vile and the killer is callous the hangman's noose is for him. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. STOTT (Ridley)—We have had a full debate on the question of whether South Australia should have capital punishment or not. I agree with Mr. Hambour that after hearing the speeches and reading what the authorities say on the matter we must make up our own minds. Statistical evidence can be used to suit both sides of the argument. I approached this matter with an open mind and did not have a firm opinion one way or the other. I think that the present law should be altered, but I do not agree with the complete abolition of capital punishment. I have had no legal training in this matter and have to rely on my lay mind. I believe that there are various degrees of murder. I have read what English and Scottish people have to say about capital punishment and I am satisfied that the English law would meet the position in South Australia. The Bill abolishes capital punishment altogether, despite the degree of murder.

In Victoria a man murdered his wife because she did not have a good record and did not look after the children. That is different from a murder where a man apprehended by a policeman shoots him in cold blood. I cannot go all the way with Mr. Dunstan in his move. I prefer the law to be amended so that degrees of murder can be set out. When a person is convicted of murder there comes the question of whether he should be hanged or have the sentence commuted to life imprisonment, but that brings the matter within the political realm and I do not like that. We should not have the matter decided by a political Party decision. I do not think

Executive Council should have to determine whether a man should hang or have the sentence commuted.

A judge and jury hear a case step by step and then the judge tells the jury it must make up its mind beyond all reasonable doubt. If the jury finds the accused person guilty it believes that it has reached its decision beyond all reasonable doubt. The law says that when that position is reached and the man is sentenced to death the matter must go to Executive Council for a decision on whether the man should hang or have the sentence commuted. I believe that when a man is found guilty of murder the matter should not go to Executive Council. The present Government, in general, favours capital punishment, but if the Opposition were in charge of the Treasury benches the sentence would be commuted to life imprisonment. Once a jury has made its decision the matter should be referred to three judges of the Supreme Court to decide whether there should be capital punishment or commutation. That would avoid a political decision. The judges would know whether it was a diabolical crime by a deliberate killer or whether emotion was associated with the crime. Because of their experience the judges would be able to assess the degree of murder and say whether there should be a recommendation for mercy. We have not reached the position where there should be capital punishment for every degree of murder.

In the event of capital punishment being abolished and a person being found guilty and given a life sentence, it has been shown by the member for Light (Mr. Hambour) that in the Adelaide Gaol good behaviour ensures fairly good amenities, so no great penalty is suffered there. If a prisoner can prove to the authorities that he is on good behaviour, his sentence can be reduced to 20, 18, 15 or even 12 years. If he is young, once released for good behaviour he can be free in the community for a long time.

My mind then travels back to the questions: "What did he do 18, 15 or 12 years ago? He committed a murder and was found guilty. What retribution do the relatives of the murdered person feel has been exacted?" We have to consider all these things in what we are doing here today in the matter of capital punishment. I should have preferred to see an amendment tried out in this Parliament relating to degrees of murder, something on the lines of the English or Scottish law. We should take steps to deal with this matter

in this Parliament because it has been brought well before the public. The question is whether we in South Australia have reached the stage where we can amend the present law or whether we go over completely the other way. Before I am prepared to go that far, I favour the question of degrees of murder being considered but, as we cannot consider that under this Bill, the Government should appoint a Royal Commission to consider whether it is desirable that the present law be amended along English or Scottish lines, by introducing degrees of murder, or whether we should abolish capital punishment altogether. That would satisfy me because I have not been trained in law or made a deep study of criminology. I read detective stories for relaxation and find that the "who-dunnits" challenge one's wits. I relish the challenge but that does not make me an expert on capital punishment, degrees of murder and all the rest of it.

I am anxious and most sincere about this decision. The member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) should be commended for bringing this Bill before the House. I commend him for alerting my mind to the necessity of considering this important question. I do not agree with him entirely that we should turn right over but I think we have reached the stage now where we should re-examine the position. At the moment I am not prepared to say we should go completely with the honourable member. I oppose the Bill but hope the Government will consider going more deeply into this question, eliminating the political angle and giving the judges of the Supreme Court who know more about this question the task of making the final decision, thereby taking it out of politics altogether. Having sifted all the evidence given before the jury, they can then determine whether it is a diabolical first-degree murder, the man being a real killer, or whether it is an emotional murder. The judges can assess that far better than I can. At this juncture in my political career I am not prepared to go all the way in the abolition of capital punishment but would like to see a Royal Commission making its recommendations to Parliament.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Works)—I do not intend to be very long or indulge in any controversy, but I feel the matter is one on which we might all have something to say to indicate our views, and not one on which perhaps we should cast a silent vote. I have listened with much interest to the debate

thus far. If anything emerges from our discussions, it is that this is one of the most open questions that this House has discussed for a long time. I say "open" because of the wide divergence of opinions, the almost equal number of opposite opinions adduced from people with important names and titles, from ecclesiastics and lawyers, from laymen and judges. One could go on almost indefinitely sifting the various opinions and counter-opinions that appear to have equal force, weight and authority. I do not suggest, of course, that one should discount in any way the opinions of the authorities cited. We have all profited by listening to the debate, the authorities cited, and the opinions expressed.

Having listened to all the arguments put forward, I believe this is a question on which other people's opinions should carry some weight, as far as they go, and have some impact on our thinking and judgment. This question should be decided not so much on argument as on judgment. At this stage, I say that my judgment in this matter is that we should retain on the Statute Book of South Australia the supreme penalty for the supreme crime.

I listened two weeks ago to an address by a very good friend of mine to a group of men. He was discussing the influences exerted upon various persons that enable them to, shall I say, keep on the straight and narrow path. He suggested that there were possibly four major factors involved in the control of human behaviour in society as we know it and in which we live. First of all, he said, a person may be moral and legal in his behaviour because of his environment; if the people with whom he mixes, the company he keeps and the circumstances of his living are such as to assist or encourage him to observe all the moralities and legalities, then that would be a powerful influence upon him. He also suggested that some people have a powerful influence for good. It may be the person's parent, or the influence of a close personal friend whose particular personality has dominated the individual's life. The third reason he advanced was that because of the fear of the consequences of breaking the law the moral code operated. The fourth factor he suggested was that some people were innately good, honest and moral and they never thought of doing a wrong thing anyway. I think I am right in saying that every member of society is guided by and subject to the influence of all the four factors. No person

is entirely bad, and on the other hand no individual is entirely good.

There are those whose environment is not conducive to normal health and others who have lacked any powerful influence for good in their life, and probably have lacked it ever since they were able to apprehend the light of day. If we are to single out any factor, I believe that the most powerful in controlling a person's behaviour is the fear of the consequences of doing wrong, and I personally admit it. My friend said that people who admit that are simply cowards and have not intestinal fortitude to do wrong. I feel that if we are honest, it would be the fear of being found out which in the last analysis determines to a large extent our code of conduct. If we apply these thoughts to the people whom we are considering in this legislation, namely, those who commit murder, then I think it is fair to say that their environment probably was not conducive to their good behaviour and that the powerful influence of their parents or friends did not exist in the life of many of them. They are certainly not naturally moral or naturally good for the most part, and therefore the only deterrent factor that operates to any powerful extent in their make-up is the fear of being found out and the fear of the consequences of being found out. After all, self-preservation is the first law of life for every human being. I respectfully disagree with those members who have said that imprisonment for life is a greater punishment than the death penalty could be. It does not matter what the circumstances are, a person will attempt to save his life in the last extremity by every means available to him. I think it is correct to say that in the mind of every person there is nothing so drastic and so serious, as far as the deterrent is concerned, as the fear of losing his life. Therefore, I respectfully disagree with those who say that incarceration for life, particularly under the circumstances of modern prison arrangements, could possibly be as severe in the mind of the person concerned as the fear of death by some accelerated means.

Much has been said about those people who have been imprisoned for life and had nothing worse to fear in seeking their freedom and going to any length to procure it. I think that that would be the reasoning of the two men who are at present rampaging through New South Wales. Apparently, if the evidence so far reported is correct, they shot their way



out of gaol to obtain their freedom, and the worst that can happen for them is to go back from whence they came and continue their sentence. If they break out and commit two or three murders and are again apprehended, still no greater penalty will accrue. As the ultimate penalty of death has been taken from the Statute Book, they have nothing further to fear.

Something has been said, too, about degrees of murder and allusions made to the British system under which degrees of murder have been considered and apparently the penalty adjusted accordingly. I do not know much about the British system as now modified, but I venture the opinion that it is extremely difficult for any jury to decide exactly into which category a certain type of murder, as defined in the law, may fall. I believe that the actual operation of the mechanics of punishment in this State largely and automatically takes care of the things which the modified British law seeks to do. Much also has been said about the impropriety of society, through its law, in imposing the death penalty on one of its citizens. I object strongly to the view that our society is vengeful. We know how ordinary people, like we are, are prepared in an emergency to give their lives to save someone else. It is almost instinctive, and occurs so often that I believe ours is not a vengeful society and does not seek to impose a vengeful punishment. However, society believes in punishment. Why do we have penalties for any crime whatever? Why is it that from time to time in this House we have increased penalties for breaches of our legislation, and presumably will continue to do so? It has been said many times here that we had considered increasing penalties for such and such an offence because the law in its present form was not severe enough to restrain people from breaking it.

Mr. O'Halloran—We have in monetary penalties.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I am not suggesting that we have not, although I believe it would also be correct to say that we had in some cases changed the monetary penalty to a term of imprisonment and in others increased the term of imprisonment or made the imposition of the term of imprisonment more readily available to the court. I am enunciating the principle that society believes in punishment and believes in imposing punishment which is intended to act as a deterrent to the criminal and restrain him.

Mr. Loveday—They would mostly be premeditated offences.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Not necessarily. We have on the Statute Book provided for imprisonment for a drunken driver if he commits the crime twice. Is the honourable member suggesting that he premeditates that crime? Normally, he is a person who has one over the eight and becomes a criminal. However, I do not think the honourable member would suggest that we should modify that penalty, nor do I think he would suggest that we would impose penalties that we consider unjust. I want to review the present situation as it operates. The crime is committed, the suspected person is apprehended, tried, and in his apprehension and trial—particularly in the latter—he is protected by all the provisions of the legal code. He is presumed to be entirely blameless until the accuser can prove him otherwise. He need not say a word in his own defence or call any witnesses, and he need not be represented at the trial unless he so desires. The option is with him. All he has to do is to say nothing and sit tight, and it is up to the accuser to prove him guilty.

In these rather emotional recent months we have tended somewhat to overlook all these things and to have rather a distorted view of the processes of law, and I want members to remember how those processes operate and what opportunities they present to an accused person to clear himself. An accused person has all the legal benefits of a trial and the direction of the judge, and the decision is in the hands of a jury composed of 12 ordinary citizens who are not necessarily versed in the law, but who are necessarily excluded from any relationship with the crime or the criminal. He has the right to challenge any of them, which right is exercised. These men retire in private to consider their verdict and, unless every one of them in a case of murder agrees that the accused is guilty, he cannot be pronounced guilty of murder and a death sentence cannot be imposed on him. That is no mean protection for an accused to have, but as such it is, and as such we have laid it down, and as such we have maintained it. It has been one of the cardinal things in British justice for centuries.

Having been sentenced, the accused has 28 days before the sentence is carried out, during which time he may appeal to a higher authority. He may appeal on a legal matter relating to his trial or ask for a new trial

if further evidence is available and, during the 28 days, Executive Council considers the case. What does the Executive Council do? Firstly, every member is provided with a transcript of the court proceedings, every word of which he is obliged to read, and he must sign a declaration that he has done so. After that is done, the Executive considers the matter in all its aspects. Its members are not bound to consider it as a matter of law, on which they are not necessarily well versed. If they so desire, they have the trial judge in attendance and they may ask him questions. They will consider the demeanour of the prisoner during his trial, his background, the circumstances under which the crime allegedly was committed and the degree of provocation—whether it be emotional, physical or otherwise; indeed, they must review the case in all its aspects. They must consider the attitude of mind of the prisoner. Although he may not have been adjudged insane under the legal rules governing insanity, they may decide that he was not able to control himself in all he was doing at the time and would therefore not be completely culpable. Without being trammelled by the niceties of the law and the ethics of court procedure, the Executive Council can and does consider these things.

Mr. Riches—How does the Executive consider his demeanour?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I have already said that the Executive may, if it desires, have the benefit of the attendance of the trial judge, who may be asked by the Executive if he has any comments to make about the prisoner. The Executive is fully aware of the responsibility imposed on it—I say this with sincerity, and I think members will accept it. After it considers the matter at length, there are two courses open to it—either to commute the sentence or to permit the law to take its course. I think members would be good enough to say that nobody envies the Executive its job in this matter. It is one of the things that I personally have had to face up to, and I know that I speak for my colleagues in this respect. As it is extremely hard it is not only the tendency, but the practice, to exercise leniency whenever it can be exercised, yet the Executive will not simply run away from its duty when it feels that it has a duty to do.

Of the 17 persons sentenced to death since this Government has been in office, the sentence was commuted to life imprisonment in 10 cases, six persons were hanged, and one case is still

before the Privy Council. The following people had their sentences commuted in the years mentioned:—1941, Turner; 1948, Weiss; 1950, Emms; 1951, McMahon and Piekutowski; 1952, Hostynsky; 1953, Dunn; 1958, Athanasiadis; and 1959, Stuart and Kiker. The following were executed in the years mentioned:—1944, Box; 1946, O'Leary; 1950, Griffen; 1953, Balaban; 1956, Feast; and 1958, Bailey.

Brown's case is still before the Privy Council. I will not read the circumstances relating to the persons whose sentences have been commuted, but I will mention the cases where the law took its course. In 1944 Box was executed for the murder of a motor credit financier. In 1946 O'Leary was executed. He was a forestry worker who murdered a fellow worker and set alight to him. He had been previously charged with murder in New South Wales. In 1950 Griffen was executed for the murder of a woman by cutting her throat. In 1950 Balaban was executed for murdering his wife, mother-in-law and stepson. A previous murder charge had been laid against him, but sufficient evidence was not available and he was discharged. In 1956 Feast was executed for murdering an elderly woman in the swamps at Wingfield. In 1958 Bailey was executed for the murder of three persons near Sundown Station.

That is a summary of the executions carried out in respect of cases since 1941, and it does not indicate that the Executive Council goes out of its way to find reasons to send people to the gallows: it rather proves very strongly that the Executive Council exercises the prerogative of mercy where the slightest reason exists for it to exercise it. All these safeguards, all these opportunities for commutation, all these things available to modify a sentence as it stands on the Statute Book allow the Executive Council to examine degrees of crime and impose penalties accordingly. I think that, having the benefit of all those things, it is proper that the death sentence should remain for those cases in which persons, in common with the people whose names I have read, have committed crimes so heinous that the death sentence seems to be the only punishment.

Something has been said about the death penalty being out of line with Christian teaching, but I do not accept that. I do not think it is proper for anyone to get up in this Chamber and say he is the master of all theology and that his views are right. I do not say my view is right, but I do not agree that

it is un-Christian. I think it is presumptuous for a person to stand up in this House and claim he is the sole authority to interpret Christian doctrine. Many widely varying opinions have been quoted for and against and I respect every one although I have formed my own opinion on my own initiative after examining the matter from every point of view of which I am capable.

A convicted person has been given all the benefits of the law of apprehension and the protection of a trial. Some of these procedures in the operation of the law should be given publicity because people should be informed of the processes of the law as they apply to capital punishment. Their view would probably then be more balanced. The convicted person has been given all the benefits of the law of apprehension and has been tried upon the assumption of his innocence, with the onus of proof entirely on the prosecution. He has not had to give evidence unless he desires; he has been judged guilty by 12 jury men. He has the right of appeal and has his case considered by Executive Council without limit in the scope of its decision as to whether or not the law should take its course. Then, and only then, is the death penalty carried out, and having regard to all those circumstances it is proper, wise and prudent that we should retain this penalty on the Statute Book.

Mr. KING secured the adjournment of the debate.

[Sitting suspended from 5.57 to 7.30 p.m.]

## THE ESTIMATES.

In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from October 20. Page 1138.)

### TREASURER AND MINISTER OF IMMIGRATION.

Treasury Department, £40,407; Superannuation Department, £49,506; Motor Vehicles Department, £190,433; Agent-General in England Department, £72,127; Land Tax Department, £122,423; Stamp and Succession Duties Department, £36,738—passed.

Publicity and Tourist Bureau and Immigration Department, £311,179.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Some time ago I asked the Treasurer a question about the levy imposed by the Transport Control Board on passengers travelling in buses to various tourist resorts in South Australia, particularly to those in the Flinders Ranges that are becoming increasingly popular and to which there is no alternative means of transport.

This levy is a poor way of encouraging tourists to these undoubted scenic beauty spots. I always understood that the board's purpose was to prevent undue and uneconomic competition with the railways, but there are no railways serving the tourist resorts in the Flinders Ranges. People who use their own means of transport to these resorts do not have to pay a charge. Can the Treasurer say whether the Government has considered lifting this charge on tourists using bus transport in these areas?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—This matter has been discussed and I do not deny that there is much to be said for the Leader's suggestion. The argument normally used by the Transport Control Board is that it has provided a limited number of charters to these resorts and under those circumstances the charge is reasonable. I am getting a report and I will advise the Leader in due course.

Mr. HEASLIP—An amount of £5,500 is provided for the Adelaide Festival of Arts to be held early next year. I take it this is a special grant. I believe the festival will bring many people to South Australia. An amount of £18,676 is provided for advertising the State, no doubt to attract tourists here. We have some fine thoroughfares and streets in Adelaide, particularly North Terrace, but this fine thoroughfare has been spoiled by the provision of centre-of-the-road parking which has interrupted the traffic flow to and from the city. It has created a hazard in front of the biggest accommodation hotel in South Australia, where about 500 people go in and out two and three times a day. This hotel was one of the first to comply with the Adelaide City Council's request to provide off-the-street parking for cars, but the council by providing centre-of-the-road parking has created a hazard to the guests of that hotel who use the underground parking provided by the hotel.

North Terrace originally permitted the flow of traffic four cars abreast, but centre-of-the-road parking is responsible, at times, for cars being able to proceed only one at a time, and frequently the traffic is brought to a halt. The provision of pedestrian crossings to the Adelaide Railway Station was a splendid move, but the parking provision has aggravated traffic difficulties. Often cars and tourist coaches are stationary in front of the hotel picking up and putting down passengers and this further reduces the roadway available for traffic. We are proud of North Terrace, but the council has

blocked it in an attempt to get a few more shillings from motorists.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—In Monday's *News* under the heading "Police View Unchanged: jiggle bars 'no solution,'" the following appears:—

Police felt that jiggle bars proposed for North Terrace were not an answer to the problems caused by centre of the road parking on the terrace, Traffic Insp. R. A. Wilson said today.

There is no doubt that our tourist trade is increasing and that centre-of-the-road parking on North Terrace blocks the entry of tourists to the hotel accommodation they have booked. Centre-of-the-road parking is stupid when we have wide roads. North Terrace is a wide thoroughfare. Recently the Town Clerk of Adelaide and a Highways Department engineer went overseas to inquire about traffic problems. Now we have the position of one person recommending jiggle bars and another opposing them. Adelaide's wide streets should be used to permit the free movement of traffic. Some of them are being used for parking purposes. Recently there was an investigation by a number of authorities into the matter of providing a reasonable flow of traffic along the South Road for the benefit of local residents. For traffic going to the south side of the city there is the problem of going down North Terrace with parked cars in the centre of the Terrace, and passing through the traffic congestion at the intersection of North Terrace and West Terrace and at the corner of West Terrace and Anzac Highway. The matter has been taken up but not much has been achieved.

I support Mr. Heaslip in his remarks about the need to encourage tourist traffic but we should do it without creating traffic problems. Perhaps we should have another authority to provide for the better use of North Terrace and perhaps the Government could arrange for one of its engineers to take up the matter with the City Council. It is a serious problem. It is difficult for tourists to travel along Grote Street on a Friday in order to see some of our tourist attractions. What a grand time the pedestrians must have on Friday when they watch the traffic held up at the corner of Grote Street and King William Street, and see trams trying to turn in and out of Victoria Square, whilst the city fathers have provided for them a safety zone at the crossing. This is a bad advertisement for South Australia and does not do much towards encouraging tourists to come here. I hope the Treasurer will carefully consider this matter.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—In answer to Mr. Heaslip, the £5,500 is a subsidy on a pound for pound basis in connection with the Festival of Arts to be held in Adelaide next year. The committee arranging the festival will find £5,500, and the total expenditure will therefore be £11,000. Regarding motor car parking in North Terrace, I have seen some of the most famous streets in the world and North Terrace is equal to the best of them. I deplore any decision that will cause it to become a car parking area. The present parking arrangements greatly impede the flow of traffic. Surely we can find another place for the parking of motor vehicles. An honourable member, I think, suggested there would be parking meters in front of the Trades Hall. I should not be surprised if they appeared in front of Parliament House, which is becoming a parking area for many strange cars. I will have the honourable member's remarks and those of the Deputy Leader brought to the attention of the Lord Mayor.

Mr. SHANNON—I pay a tribute to Mr. Pollnitz, the Director of the Tourist Bureau, who does not spare himself in his work. The sum of £25 for entertainment allowance for an officer of his status is mean. Under "Loftia Park—Purchase and installation of filtration and chlorination plant at swimming pool," £6,500 was voted but not spent last year. Apparently, it has been wiped off altogether, for nothing has been voted this year. Tenders were called for the work last year but were considered high, and the work was not proceeded with. Had the sum been spent last year, the children in the area could have used the pool for the "Learn to Swim" week this year. That is a very important part of our children's education, but children have not the opportunities in the hills that they have at the beaches. Both the Mount Barker and Silver Lake pools are used to the maximum during the summer months, and the "Learn to Swim" campaign there is conducted by Education Department teachers, who do an excellent job in that respect. Loftia Park would fulfil the need of children in the hills area and money should be voted to put that swimming pool into condition.

Last year £25,000 was voted for the Glenelg Corporation towards the construction of a boat haven, and the vote this year is for £92,000, an increase of £67,000. Is it fair to give those living on the sea front such an increase over last year's vote, yet refuse a paltry £6,000 odd

for a swimming pool for the poor back-blockers living in the hills? This is not in keeping with a policy of providing facilities for those denied them. The boat-keepers are so mean about it that they are complaining because the Glenelg Council intends to levy its mooring fees at the rate of £1 per foot per small vessel. They say it should not be more than 10s. a foot. Loftia Park would probably pay its way from the fees from children using the pool.

A sum of £750 has been set aside for the Surf Life Saving Association of Australia (South Australian Centre). I pay a tribute to the work done by these young men who do a valuable job every week day and at the week-ends. I think that £750 is not much for them. For "Subsidies towards Recreation Areas" the vote has been cut from £25,000 to £5,000, which indicates that we are slowing down in providing necessary amenities for the public. At a time when the population is growing, the need for them is expanding, but we are cutting down. The Government may have cause to be careful with funds in the coming year. I am not complaining that the Government should be careful, but I think it could be a little more liberal in things that are of real national wealth.

Last year £200 was voted towards expenses of country delegates to the Good Neighbour Council, but none was spent. If the conference did not take place, I deplore it, and hope it takes place this year. It is a movement that should be encouraged.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Last year £1,500 was voted for additions to the chalet at Wilpena Pound and £1,000 was spent. No provision is made for additions this year and I believe this is because additions were completed at a lower cost than was anticipated. An amount of £4,000 is provided for painting and repairs to buildings at Wilpena Pound as against £4,840 expended last year. The chalet has had a somewhat chequered existence for some time. I understand it is now leased by the Government to a gentleman who, according to conversations I have had with people who have stayed at the chalet, is doing an excellent job and therefore should be encouraged in every possible way. I trust that as a result of the expenditure last year and that proposed this year the buildings will be so improved that his very fine efforts will be maintained and the chalet will become an important tourist centre in the north.

I deplore that the amount set aside for recreation areas has been reduced by £20,000

this year. These areas should form part of the campaign to combat juvenile delinquency. We should give teenagers the opportunity to participate in outdoor activities and thereby save them from the street corner and the milk bar psychology. I favour more recreation grounds rather than the building of bigger and better gaols.

The amount set aside for swimming pools has also been substantially reduced. Last year £25,000 was voted and £17,855 was expended, and this year it is proposed to expend £11,000, a reduction of £6,855. The amount allotted to Loftia Park last year was not expended and has disappeared into the limbo of forgotten things on this occasion. I do not know whether the Government is satisfied that the number of swimming pools already provided is adequate. I am one who has advocated the provision of facilities for children to learn to swim, where that is physically possible. To teach children how to swim may result in the saving of lives later. The Government is not over-generous in its provision in this direction. I understand that it will match the money raised and spent by local organizations on swimming pools to the extent of £1,500 in any one year. As it costs considerably more than £3,000 to establish a swimming pool, it naturally follows that the work of the local organization must be spread over a number of years. After the first year the Government is prepared to grant another £1,500 in the second year and an additional £1,500 in the following year.

The Government provided nearly £4,500 towards the cost of a swimming pool at Peterborough, but the amount having to be spread over such a long period makes it difficult for local enthusiasm in the raising of funds to be maintained. Last year £22,000 was voted and £26,925 was spent in providing subsidies to municipal authorities to develop swimming pools, but this has been reduced to £17,000 this year. This, like the levy on bus passengers, does not appear to be the way to encourage tourists. I understand that these amounts are made available to councils to establish caravan parks and other facilities. I read in this morning's *Advertiser* that the Minister of Roads and the Director of the Tourist Bureau are going to Canberra to attend a conference on the tourist trade, but if we are to encourage tourists we must provide at least as much as was spent last year. Of course, I realize that we are running into financial difficulties, since we have become a non-claimant State, but the

tourist traffic is the most profitable traffic any country can have. It is an invisible export—we sell our beauty spots and tourist facilities to people from other places for cash. It is almost 100 per cent profit and, as I have been reminded by the member for Chaffey, we still have them after the tourists go home. This is a revolving means of getting revenue, in that the State receives revenue from business interests which builds up the economy.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—There appears to be some confusion about items relating to this department, so it will perhaps assist members if I give an explanation of one or two lines that have been discussed. Firstly, the total amount provided for the Tourist Bureau this year is not a reduction on last year, but is a £38,000 increase over last year. We had one or two heavy lines on this department's vote that had to be taken care of. We desired to complete the work at Glenelg, which was reported on by the Public Works Committee. It will be completed this year, and I hope will be available for the use of the public during the coming summer. That was rather a big item to swallow in the Budget. Secondly, we knew we would be short of water this year and therefore felt it would be inadvisable to encourage a large expansion of swimming pool activity, as these pools use great quantities of water provided at a low cost. A lake has been constructed in the east parklands but, under present-day conditions, it is a dead loss because it will not contain any water until nature provides it. Water will be rationed in some northern districts this year, and it was felt that we should meet our outstanding commitments. We met all our obligations up to last week and we have not been harsh regarding this item, but have just slowed down a little in a dry season. Cabinet has carefully considered making large amounts available to enable projects to be hastened. The first application before us was for a swimming pool to cost £86,000. If we had approved that application, all other swimming pools in the State would have been left without anything.

Mr. O'Halloran—But you could set a maximum.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—We set a maximum of £1,500 in any one year on a 50-50 basis for work carried out in that year, so that any activity that cost £3,000 in one year could get a 50 per cent subsidy if the work had been approved and properly carried out. Do not forget that these local authorities understand how to apply the rules

in the best way. They get a subsidy of £3,000 immediately they start, as they arrange to start the work in June and get £1,500 in respect of the financial year just ending, and continue their work in July and get another £1,500. The Government appreciates the requirements of swimming pools, and has been able to assist in developing a large number. I am quite certain that the reduction in the amount will not cause any hardship.

The member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) mentioned recreation reserves. Some years ago the Government made certain land at West Beach available as a recreation reserve for the metropolitan area. In conjunction with the Glenelg and West Torrens Corporations, it set up a trust and committed itself to special expenditure, and the corporations also agreed to provide funds to develop the area. The obligation on that particular reserve was fulfilled some years ago, but when the Government honoured its specific agreement with the corporations it continued to provide additional money for that area by way of subsidies, and the vote—which was a special vote—for West Beach last year was £25,000 for development and was quite apart from the agreement that had been reached. West Beach Reserve is now reaching the stage where it can produce much revenue towards its maintenance and further development. As Glenelg is this year having a large amount spent on a boat haven I considered that it would not hurt the West Beach Recreation Trust if, instead of getting an amount as large as last year, its allocation were down. Instead of getting £25,000 it had been cut down to £5,000 this year. That item relates to the West Beach Reserve and has nothing to do with the purchase of land. Both corporations would say we have honoured our obligations on grants more than 100 per cent and we have continued to support them long after our agreement has expired, but this year, because we had such a heavy amount to pay out on the Patawalonga scheme in the immediate district, we decided to cut the amount. That decision was also affected by the fact that many shacks, caravan parks and other revenue producing activities have put West Beach on its feet.

Honourable members know that subsidies for various amenities have gone much further than pure amenities. They have been used by local authorities for some very useful additions to their areas and we have been able to help to a certain extent. This year we are

confronted with what might amount to nearly £1,500,000 pumping expense on the pipeline to pump water. That is an enormous expenditure in one year and I felt that minor departments should observe reasonable economies in the same way as other departments. That position is temporary and seasonal rather than a permanent change of policy.

Mr. KING—I refer to the two items regarding advertising the State, for which a sum of £18,676 has been provided, and advertising tours outside the State, for which the bureau acts as agents and for which £750 has been provided. Advertising is a prime function of the Tourist Bureau and I am glad that amount has not been reduced from last year. Tourist business in Australia has been underestimated in the past and it is refreshing to hear that recognition has been given to the wonderful value in Australia and this State of the tourist business. In a bad year like this when primary industry is suffering and our loss of natural income can be offset by bringing this much needed revenue into the State, I commend the Treasurer for keeping that expenditure up. It has been estimated that tourists leaving the State take out something like £8,000,000 to £10,000,000 annually. People are entitled to go out of the State but the State is equally entitled to attract people to spend that amount of money in the State and we can do that by advertising here and elsewhere.

The Treasurer said these undertakings could be made to pay. His point is illustrated by a caravan park on the river which, on one night, accommodated 300 caravans. In one year it made a considerable profit. The established parks can cater for 1,000 caravans nightly. Some of them are privately-owned and some are community-owned.

Recently the Berri Hotel has been opened and it is claimed to be one of the finest in Australia. The accommodation provided for visitors is unexcelled. The investment of money to assist these people to develop our national facilities is well spent. Since the Berri Hotel improved the accommodation available for visitors, one half of its profits, which exceed £10,000, are derived from the house section. If we are going to invite tourists to these places we must have hotels that are capable of giving service at least equal to that provided by the hotels on the river. Perhaps hotels that make a special effort to cater for tourists could receive a concession in the licensing fees paid so that they would be

encouraged to provide accommodation as well as to sell ale. In South Australia we have many types of places to see—the Flinders Ranges, the Adelaide Hills, the South Coast and various towns on the Murray River. If we had only one type of attraction we would not have much to offer, and we should develop our varied areas to attract tourists. The Government should also continue to assist people through the Town Planning Department so that ultimately we will have a city of which we can be proud.

Mr. LAUCKE—I am concerned at the reduction of £20,000 in the amount to be provided as subsidies for recreation areas. I commend the Government for its recent innovation of subsidizing on a pound for pound basis the purchase of land for recreational areas by councils when that land is purchased in accordance with a Government valuation, but I wonder whether the demands for assistance under that scheme will be met by the £5,000 herein provided.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—That is committed.

Mr. Shannon—For West Beach.

Mr. LAUCKE—A deplorable feature of modern living is the tendency for people to become onlookers and critics rather than participants in active sports. Delinquency can arise from idle hands not engaged in active, healthful outdoor sport and I hope the Government's offer to subsidize the provision of recreational areas will be taken advantage of to the good of the State. One learns to become a good citizen on the sporting field, but not through watching and criticizing.

Mr. HAMBOUR—The Government's policy in respect of swimming pools has done much in helping young people to learn to swim, and I hope it will continue that policy. I understood that the Government's offer to subsidize on a pound for pound basis the purchase of recreational areas was only propounded this year, but there has been a hue and cry for more recreational areas in the metropolitan area which I cannot understand because the south parklands, for instance, are still in the same condition as they were when I lived in Adelaide 35 years ago. There is already ample scope for the development of areas in the city. My local council has decided to purchase additional land adjoining its recreation park and although only a small amount is involved it is appreciative of the fact that it may get a subsidy from the Government. I believe that with new development the Town

Planner insists on recreational grounds being provided and that will help to meet the demand for such provisions.

I do not favour too much State money being spent on such facilities because I believe their provision is a local responsibility. The total Tourist Bureau vote is over £311,000. I am all for attracting tourists to South Australia, but where will they be accommodated? I have a permanent booking at one hotel for Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday nights, but this week I came down early with the member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) who had to ring four hotels to secure accommodation for himself, but when he arrived he was locked out. He had to come here and sleep under his dressing gown. I sought accommodation at the hotel where I normally stay but was told it was booked out. However, I was provided with accommodation in a lounge. If that is the position regarding accommodation in Adelaide what is the use of spending over £311,000 to bring people here? Where will they be accommodated? The Director of the Tourist Bureau, Mr. Pollnitz, has also spoken on this matter. Hotel licences are not expensive in South Australia, but how many licensees in the metropolitan area take in boarders? There are a few good hotels in Adelaide that have to bear the entire brunt of the accommodation demand. If a man wants a liquor licence he should be obliged to provide accommodation.

Mr. Heaslip—He is.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Yes. The house side of a hotel, if properly run, can show a profit. If we are to attract tourists Parliament must see that proper accommodation is available. Every licensee should carry out his obligation to provide accommodation. A football team from my district tried to get accommodation in Adelaide, but had to split up the party amongst three hotels in the West Torrens district. The hotel accommodation position should be improved before we increase the vote to encourage tourists to come here.

Mr. FRED WALSH—It is obvious that the member for Light is at present in the role of Rip Van Winkle because apparently he has not been around the suburban areas to see the hotels that have been constructed in recent years. They compare favourably with hotels in other States. I refer to the one that was opened last Friday week. It is as good as any in South Australia and has about 14 first-class bedrooms with all modern conveniences. The tariff is modest. The honourable member does not know what he is talking about when he says

there is no accommodation available in Adelaide for visitors.

Mr. Hambour—I can prove it.

Mr. FRED WALSH—It may be the position in Hindley Street. If a licensee refuses accommodation that he has available he should be prosecuted.

Mr. Harding—Do you think our hotels are up to world standard?

Mr. FRED WALSH—It depends on what is regarded as "world standard." Our hotels are certainly not up to the standard of some American or Canadian Pacific Railway hotels. I wholeheartedly support the remarks made about the need for more recreation reserves. There has been too much apathy in their planning, particularly in the metropolitan area. We are fast reaching the time when it will be almost impossible to provide them because suitable land will not be available. A couple of acres is not enough. There should be at least 11 to 12 acres so that the youth of the district can indulge in the smaller field games. The opportunity to provide more recreation reserves has been lost because councils have had insufficient money to purchase land for the purpose. The Government should act in this matter, even though it may be temporarily short of finance. If it cannot act now, my suggestion should be borne in mind for future action.

I do not think the Adelaide City Council does all that it could do. It concerns itself with a particular part of the city and forgets the other parts. Since Mr. Veale's return from overseas, an attempt has been made to develop some of the parklands. The member for Light (Mr. Hambour) says that the south parklands are in the same condition now as they were 30 years ago. At the corner of Glen Osmond Road and South Terrace and at another place along South Terrace there are two children's playgrounds; otherwise, there is no change. The plan for beautifying the east parklands should have included the Victoria Park racecourse, which is a public reserve. No attempt has been made by the City Council to beautify it, despite the revenue from the Adelaide Racing Club for the lease, and the fees paid by the football and cricket clubs that use it on Saturday afternoons. The Caulfield racecourse in Melbourne has been provided with an artificial lake by the local governing body there. Such a scheme should be carried out at the Victoria Park racecourse instead of in the east parklands, where few people will know about it.



The Government should stretch its resources to the limit to finance further the surf lifesaving clubs, which have been developed over the last few years by a group of enthusiasts who give their time throughout the year to keeping fit and do a wonderful job on the beaches during the summer. In my district there are three surf lifesaving clubs—Grange, Henley Beach and West Beach. Members of the Henley and Grange Council—and in particular, the mayor of Henley and Grange—have been generous in their assistance to them. Funds are raised in various ways by the clubs, but this is unfair because the people from outside the district benefit from the activities of the clubs. The Government should increase the vote to these clubs to encourage them in their work.

The West Beach Reserve has been developed along the right lines. I believe the ultimate scheme will go further than the original scheme envisaged by providing facilities at the southern end of the reserve. In the main, the West Beach reserve is used by people who do not reside in that district. They come down there in their caravans and the people who used to spend time in the shacks near the water-line cannot do so now because the shacks have been removed. I regret that in the West Beach Reserve scheme Henley and Grange did not come in. Originally the Henley and Grange Council desired to establish a caravan park in its part of West Beach. I headed a deputation to the Treasurer, seeking financial help. The Treasurer told us of a vast area that had been bought by the Housing Trust which would not now be required for building. It was made available to the three councils under certain conditions, but the Henley and Grange Council would not come into the arrangement and left it to the Glenelg and West Torrens Councils.

Mr. JENKINS—I suppose that my district is as tourist conscious as any other in the State. Strathalbyn is a beautiful town and has three excellent hotels. There are also three hotels at Victor Harbour, two at Goolwa, and two at Port Elliot, all of which provide excellent accommodation at a reasonable tariff. For many years Granite Island has been under the control of the Harbours Board, but shipping business died away and the department did not take much interest in it. The causeway and jetty have been placed in good order and the town is grateful to the Tourist Bureau for its subsidies, which have been used to establish various facilities for tourists. At the camping ground Victor Harbour caters for the working man, with facilities

and amenities at a cost within his means. This area has been developed over a period of 10 or 11 years. Last year the corporation made a profit of £1,100 and this year has spent more than £2,000, plus a £1,300 subsidy from the Tourist Bureau spent on the grounds. There are about 130 public conveniences at Victor Harbour for the use of tourists and they cost the town quite a lot each year. The Treasurer offered the corporation the control of Granite Island. About a fortnight ago a deputation from the corporation waited upon him and it was agreed that the subject discussed should not be disclosed, because it might prejudice something that might come in the future. The Australian Broadcasting Commission, the *News* and the *Advertiser* rang the town clerk and myself, but we honored the agreement, and did not disclose what had happened. Two days later in an editorial in the *News* it was said that the corporation was endeavouring to procure funds for the development of Granite Island. I refute that. All we asked for was sufficient to rehabilitate the run-down facilities.

In view of the large amount provided for boat havens on the Patawalonga, I think that the metropolitan beaches have been treated very well. My corporation is anxious to put the facilities at Granite Island in reasonable order, as they have been allowed to deteriorate by the management over the years. If it takes over the island, the corporation hopes to be able to find the money to develop it if development is approved of. I expect that the Tourist Bureau will then provide a fifty-fifty subsidy. The present facilities are not adequate, and are outmoded. The shelter sheds and other amenities are worn out and need renewing, and the corporation will endeavour to do this. It will certainly attend to the development if it takes over the island. I am grateful to the Tourist Bureau for its past help and we expect further assistance in future.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Mr. Fred Walsh said that I was completely ignorant of the facts when I said that hotels could provide accommodation and show a profit. I admit that the licensed premises in the city proper are not doing particularly well in the liquor business, and therefore in my opinion they have an opportunity to develop their house trade. When the Berri Hotel can show a profit of £10,000 in the diningroom and on the accommodation side with charges much lower than most of those in the metropolitan area, I

suggest that there is something wrong with the management down here. Bed and breakfast with a bathroom and toilet facilities are provided for 32s. 6d., with lunch at 8s. 6d. and dinner at 12s. 6d. I suggest that those people whom Mr. Walsh is defending should take a week off and visit the Berri Hotel and I am sure that the management would teach them how to run their business. If we hope to develop our tourist trade, suitable accommodation must be provided. It is the responsibility of licensees to do their share. They are not doing it, and should be made to supply the accommodation.

Line passed.

Prices Control Department, £65,329—Passed.

Miscellaneous, £7,299,390.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—For administration, maintenance, etc., of temporary housing accommodation, £90,310 is provided. The Treasurer has stated that the Government proposes to demolish single-unit emergency homes in the Springbank area. When I have visited this area, I have noticed that some of the galvanized iron huts are vacant and that damage has been done to doors and windows. Can the Treasurer state how soon they will be demolished, whether solid construction trust rental homes will be built in this area, and whether any of this land will be used for schools? I point out that toilet accommodation and particularly the laundry facilities are most inconvenient for the people living in these homes.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Government approved of the trust's pulling down the army huts purchased from the Commonwealth when they became vacant. Although these huts were not an advertisement for the State, they have provided full accommodation but, when other accommodation can be provided, steps will be taken to demolish them, although I cannot give specific dates. The Government's policy is to get rid of temporary homes as soon as possible without causing hardship to the present occupants. From time to time temporary homes have been sold for use in the country as sheds, and this practice will continue. I have told the Under-Treasurer that the general policy of the Government will be not to spend large sums of money on reconstructing temporary homes. It was suggested that they should be reconstructed and made more fireproof, but even if this money were spent they would still be only temporary homes. Instead of doing this, the Government proposes to sell its

interest in these homes, which will be used as sheds in other places. I cannot give any dates, because sometimes accommodation will have to be provided so that people will have a roof over their heads, but I can say that the homes in this area will be the first pulled down.

Mr. RICHES—Last year £1,481 was spent as a payment under guarantee under the Industries Development Act. No amount was voted last year and nothing is provided this year, so no information has been given to the Committee on this matter. Can the Premier state the nature of this expenditure?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—As there is no expenditure this year, I regret that I have not the details, but I will obtain a report for the honourable member, probably tomorrow.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—When temporary homes were built at Mitchell Park, which is in my district, there were not many other homes in the area, but it is now built up with a good class of home. Emergency homes were also built in the Warradale camp area, which is in the adjoining district represented by the Minister of Education. There are many good class homes in that area. Will solid construction homes replace the present temporary homes in the Mitchell Park area?

Mr. HUGHES—I refer to the item relating to the Wallaroo distillery. Rosewarne's firm which occupies those premises has recently laid off 19 of its work force. Is the Government going to continue to allow that firm to occupy the building?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Government does intend to allow the firm to continue operations because it is not the fault of the firm that, because of the dry season, farmers are not buying the bulk handling equipment carried by the firm. The firm is doing its utmost to maintain employment in the district and the Government will give it every encouragement. I would not at the moment express an opinion on the point raised by the member for Edwardstown because much policy is involved in the question.

Line passed.

#### MINISTER OF LANDS AND MINISTER OF REPATRIATION.

Lands, £710,357; Government Motor Garage, £38,329—passed.

Advances to Settlers, Vermin-Proof Fencing and Loans for Fencing and Water Piping, £1,727.

Mr. STOTT—The Government should further consider increasing advances to settlers, and this should be done by direct advances to settlers or by loans from the State Bank. The settlers should be encouraged, particularly in the marginal areas, to put down bores to obtain water for irrigation so that they might be able to provide fodder for their stock. Farmers who have done this have proved how successful the project can be. In bad years like this farmers cannot get finance to put bores down but if they had bores they would, by producing lucerne, be able to save stock. In my district artesian bores have proved their value. Much land that is suitable for irrigation needs water than can be secured at a depth of 150 to 200ft. Sufficient water could be pumped to grow lucerne that could be baled and stacked in good seasons to carry the farmer through bad seasons.

Line passed.

Miscellaneous, £150,812.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I refer to the item "Purchase of town lands" for which £30 was voted last year and £379 spent. The vote this year is £15,000. Can the Minister say what is involved in this rather substantial purchase?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS (Minister of Lands)—The amount referred to is provided for the purchase of land in Whyalla and for blocks in the extension.

Mr. NANKIVELL—The sum of £16,000 is provided this year for the construction of an artificial lake at the National Park. The amount provided last year was £5,000 and that amount was spent. Is this amount to be spent for beautification purposes?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—The amount is to be spent for beautification with the idea of attracting more people to National Park, which is a very beautiful area. The area has in the past attracted—and is still attracting—thousands of people. The directors consider that a lake will create a further attraction to tourists visiting the park.

Line passed.

#### MINISTER OF WORKS.

Public Works Department, £7,782—passed.

Engineering and Water Supply Department, £3,650,233.

Mr. STOTT—I have previously referred to the problem of salinity in the River Murray. In flood years water overflows into the country filling the back lagoons and tributaries and when the flood subsides the water flows back

from the lagoons and tributaries into the river bringing with it salt, which contaminates water for future irrigations. That is having a bad effect in the Waikerie district and in other parts of the upper Murray. In reply to questions the Minister of Works said that his officers were still looking at the problem, but we want more than that; we want action. Citrus trees are already going out in Waikerie and unless this problem is soon overcome more areas will go out of production. I realize the problem is not easy of solution, but the trouble is that insufficient water is stored in the eastern States to provide a constant flow during dry years to keep the salt down and to ensure a fresh water supply.

Prior to the last election the Treasurer announced a scheme whereby water from the Menindee Lakes would be brought by a pipeline to serve Barmera, Renmark, Berri and part of my area and I visualized that that could be a means of keeping fresh water in the river. Unfortunately, I understand that the New South Wales Government intends to commence some irrigation settlements and use that water and, consequently, the Treasurer's plan will go by the board. That being so, we must look for other means by which we can overcome the problem of salinity. Have the departmental officers any plans? Have they considered building Lake Victoria to a higher level? I do not know whether that is possible, because I am not an engineer, but I am concerned about the ever-increasing problem of high salinity in the river. If additional storage cannot be built up with the co-operation of the Victorian and New South Wales Governments we should take steps to provide it, possibly by using Lake Benney, so that a fresh flow can be maintained to flush the river. There is danger from salinity on two occasions; in the high flood years, and in the low flow years when the salt is at the bottom of the river and there is not a sufficient flow.

Mr. Quirke—Aren't the pumps on the bottom of the river?

Mr. STOTT—Yes. I suggested that our engineering experts might consider lowering the level of locks from underneath instead of from over the spillway, but the Minister said that this proposal has been considered and had been rejected by the experts. Some time ago the Treasurer took High Court action in respect of the Snowy River scheme with the result that South Australia was assured of a greater flow of water in drought years, but in a year like this when Victoria and New South

Wales get the first draw-off there is not much surplus water for South Australia. Tremendous development can take place on the Murray. Experts have said that the land from the border to Waikerie is the best type in the Commonwealth for growing citrus. The proprietary firms in the Barossa Valley are acquiring land for vineyards in the area and this is a wise move because one can visualize what will happen to the grapes in the Barossa Valley this year. The soil conditions on the Murray are ideal for vines provided proper water is available. It is the Government's duty, and the duty of this Parliament, to tackle this problem realistically to ensure a better water supply. South Australia depends on the flow of water in the rivers in other States. I visualize that within the next few years the Governments of New South Wales and Victoria will undertake more irrigation schemes, which will place South Australia in a difficult position in the matter of water supplies. I do not know whether there could be more storage space in Lake Victoria or whether Lake Bonney could be flushed out occasionally in order to build up supplies.

These are matters that should be considered. Hundreds of acres in the upper Murray settlement will go out of citrus production if the water position is not satisfactory and there is too much salinity. If our engineers cannot find the answer to the problem at the moment they should be sent overseas to inspect schemes adopted in other countries. They could look at the Tennessee Valley scheme. I know the Minister is concerned about this problem, but people in my district continually ask me what the Government is doing about it, and that is why I bring it forward. We may have to spend a tremendous sum to maintain present settlements and to develop others. I do not know what the Government has in mind in this matter but perhaps the Minister will be able to provide information that will be a help to the settlers who are worried about the problem.

Mr. KING—The matter raised by Mr. Stott has been exercising the minds of growers' associations, councils and corporations, and as a result there was formed the River Murray Water Users' Association, which asked that arrangements be made to have the problems considered. Consequently, with the permission of the Minister, I asked Mr. Dridan, the Engineer-in-Chief, if he would visit the Upper Murray districts and discuss the matter with the various organizations. He said that the

salinity in this State originates in South Australia and that it is not so much due to the salt found in the lagoons. After the 1956 flood water penetrated into the banks where it dissolved the salt and it has taken an equal time to seep out and bring salt with it. On the question of storage Mr. Dridan said that tests had been made of 30-odd sites to ascertain whether they could be used for storage purposes, but the layout of the country prevented any work of value being done.

He said that it would help if some of the lagoons were closed and the water was not allowed to evaporate. He also said that the salt would continue to rise when the flow in the river was restricted, and consequently it is necessary to keep the water flowing. The Minister told me that although we had had drought conditions in South Australia there had been snowfalls and rain in the River Murray catchment areas which would guarantee fresh water coming down the river during the present irrigation periods and keep down the salinity. That deals with the immediate problem, but for a long term view I refer members to an article by Mr. Dridan in a book edited by Dr. Best. In it he pointed out that before the turn of the century in South Australia we shall have to decide whether water is to be used for domestic and industrial purposes or for increasing our irrigation potential.

This serious position must be dealt with promptly. I know that the Government has not been asleep on this matter and that various aspects have been examined. Mr. Stott mentioned the Tennessee Valley. Departmental engineers have inspected that scheme but it is not possible to transfer it to Australia, so we must make the best use we can of what we have. I leave it to the Minister to explain what further steps can be taken to improve the position.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Works)—I agree with the remarks of both Mr. Stott and Mr. King. The general problem of salinity in the river is serious and we are using our best endeavours to mitigate, if not overcome, it. The House will remember that earlier this year it was announced that negotiations were in train with the New South Wales Government with the object of bringing water from the Menindee storage across country to a point somewhere north-east of Renmark by a channel system which would, if possible, bring good quality water into the river at that point; and it could be used

*en route* for various types of irrigation projects. Negotiations with the Premier of New South Wales have been in progress following the earlier announcement, and he has recently advised our Treasurer that at the present stage of the proceedings the Government of New South Wales will be able and willing to provide water from the Menindee storage. The New South Wales Premier indicated, exactly as the member for Ridley (Mr. Stott) has said, that the Government of that State had proposed to expand its irrigation projects along the Darling. The people lower down on the Darling had been concerned that the flow of water there would be restricted and that thereby some of their projects might be jeopardized.

Communications from New South Wales are to this effect that, although its Government at present would be able and willing to provide the water, there could be no guarantee as to the future. That is a serious matter, in the light of long-range projects. On receipt of that advice, the Engineer-in-Chief and myself were asked by our Treasurer to investigate any possible alternative that would to some extent replace the earlier proposal. This evening in his weekly broadcast the Treasurer spoke on that and announced that a proposal was being investigated to, as far as possible, use Lake Bonney as the present Lake Victoria storage is being used; he said it might be possible to raise the level of Lake Bonney by 10ft. which would, of course, enable a large quantity of water to be impounded. Thus, the amount of water available to us in a period of lean flow would be increased, and it would also be available for flushing the river or reducing the salinity, the two objects for which it is necessary to pursue the project.

Mr. Stott—What do the engineers think about the salinity of Lake Bonney now?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—It is not now completely good. It is rather high but that does not mean that under the proposal to fill it in times of high water the salinity would not be reduced to reasonable levels. After all, it is a question of finding some suitable area of land on the upper reaches sufficiently close to the river and at the required altitude. Such an area is not easy to discover. I told the Engineer-in-Chief that he might look further afield than he has done because, if we are entertaining a scheme of this magnitude, from Menindee to Renmark, a considerable project in terms of expenditure, it would

possibly enable us to reach areas of land rather more remote than we had contemplated. Lake Bonney appears to be the best of the areas investigated so far. We have not been idle in this matter. The project will be examined. It appears it is possible by either of two methods—either by constructing a channel or by using the natural inlet from the lake. However, as soon as more information is available, it will be released.

Mr. STOTT—I thank the Minister for this information, which will alleviate the situation somewhat. Crossing the river from Berri, one comes into contact on the southern side of the river with Bookpurnong Cliffs. It might be possible to construct some sort of storage dam in that area. Unfortunately, the other side of the river is low-lying with some hundreds of acres of what is known as commonage where in times of flood the banks have to be built up. I should like the Minister to consider whether the commonage could be utilized in some way. It may be necessary to consider a long-term agreement with Victoria to use storages in that State. There are places towards Murtho and beyond where, when a flood comes down, instead of following its natural course the river cuts across country. Perhaps consideration could be given to using the old portion of the river as a storage. I am grateful for the information supplied and hope that we shall be able to get somewhere.

Line passed.

Architect-in-Chief's Department, £211,500.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Is it true that the Architect-in-Chief's Department is to be reorganized to provide for the Architect-in-Chief to be responsible for planning, with a manager to attend to administration? Mr. Slade, the Secretary, has done a big job, and but for his efforts the department would be in turmoil. In saying that, I do not reflect upon other officers. The Architect-in-Chief was trained in architectural work, but because he is a good architect it does not necessarily follow that he is also a good administrator. Therefore, I should like to know whether the Government intends to review the position and appoint a manager for the department.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—For some time we have been considering the re-arrangement of the department, and what the honourable member has said is part of that consideration. When a department grows to the extent that the Architect-in-Chief's Department has grown, it is always an open question whether the head should be an administrator or a technical man.

In many Government departments we have been fortunate in having heads who were good technical men as well as good administrators. I do not know who the personnel will be when the department is re-arranged. The Architect-in-Chief (Mr. Siddall) will retire within a month or two and it will be necessary to fill that position. It has been proposed to change the name of the department to the Government Buildings Department and the head will be called the Director. The position is open as to whether the future head will be an architect or an administrative officer. The titles and status of other officers immediately under the head of the department are under consideration, but decisions have not been arrived at.

Mr. COUMBE—I understand that for some years there has been a grave shortage of trained architects in the department, with the result that certain important Government works have been delayed. Does this position still obtain, or has it improved, and what steps are being taken to augment the professional staff?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—It is true that in this department, as in some other departments, there is a shortage of trained personnel, particularly in some sections, and this tends to create a bottleneck. I do not know what projects the honourable member considers have been held up. The rush of work has been unprecedented, particularly in building numerous schools and similar buildings. To avoid delay, we have adopted the practice of sending work out to private architects, and this has helped relieve the position considerably. However, it is not policy to adopt this as a permanent basis, but rather to endeavour to maintain the staff of the department at a base loading capacity in order to cope with normal requirements, so it is necessary to utilize outside consultants for emergency jobs or to meet a peak in the department's activities. Every effort has been made to obtain staff, but it has been almost impossible to get people from anywhere in the world, particularly for the surveyor's section and the Engineer-in-Chief's draftsmen's section.

Mr. QUIRKE—In my opinion this department is rapidly being run into the ground. Is it necessary for it to hammer every nail and drive every screw in this State? In every district there is a big lag of work at schools, and in my district it goes back over 12 months. We have to wait until the depart-

mental gang comes along and does the work. They must stay at the nearest hotel, which costs £10 a week, so the cost must be colossal. Gangs are sent out many miles to seal the playground of a school, yet there are hundreds of country contractors who could do the work. Even when prefabricated buildings are to be erected, men are sent from Adelaide to do the work. In some cases, however, the materials have been sent and the school committee has erected a shed, a job which they are quite capable to do, as there are many tradesmen in country towns. There is much work to be done in areas adjacent to Clare, Burra and Jamestown, so let us organize and get local teams to do the work.

I make a plea to lift this burden off the shoulders of the department, which cannot do all the work, although it seems to want to do it. It is no use calling tenders, because country contractors do not see them. I do not blame the department, which does really good work, but I would like the Minister to consider this aspect. School construction work costing £7,500,000 will this year place a heavy burden on the department, and it will not be able to carry out the small jobs. When the Minister of Education visited my district 12 months ago he approved certain things, yet they still have not been done, although they are simple repair jobs in the main. Does the Minister of Works think that my suggestion is practicable?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—We are endeavouring to do most of the things the honourable member suggested. I have let some contracts in recent months for such work. For instance, a tender was let in one contract for work at 22 schools in the district of Eyre. The Architect-in-Chief's inspector does his best to get offers from local tradesmen for repair work to buildings in remote areas. In the last two years the department has caught up much leeway. Indeed, figures of expenditure on maintenance work strongly suggest that, and the officers make that claim. I appreciate the honourable member's suggestion, which is of value to the department.

Mr. QUIRKE—They could get in touch with the member for the district, who might be able to assist.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—He could help if he felt inclined to do so. I have instructed the department that small advertisements should be inserted in the local press stating that tenders are being called, say, in Burra for repairs to schools there. People interested

could then inquire from Adelaide about the nature of the work to be done.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Has sufficient provision been made in the Estimates for the reorganization of the Architect-in-Chief's Department? How has the Housing Trust been able to get sufficient architects and draftsmen when the Architect-in-Chief's Department has not been able to do so? Perhaps the department is hamstrung by the Public Service regulations. I believe the department will not be able to get sufficient professional staff until it pays reasonable salaries. The Minister has not stated whether the Director of the Architect-in-Chief's Department will be a professional man. I hope we shall not see a repetition of something that occurred in the district of the Minister of Education, where the Architect-in-Chief's Department approved certain big earthworks, but they were not acceptable to local residents. The contract for that work was not in accordance with the plans submitted to the Public Works Committee for investigation. Was the Architect-in-Chief's Department or the Education Department responsible for that work?

Mr. CUMBE—I understand that the department has for some time been preparing plans for the new building at the Royal Adelaide Hospital to replace wards that are 100 years old. What progress has been made on this project, and will the department undertake the planning of this big scheme or

will it let it out to private practice as in the case of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The personnel under the re-organization of the Architect-in-Chief's Department has not been decided. That will be a matter for recommendation by the Public Service Commissioner in due course. The departmental officers will come within the jurisdiction of the Commissioner. I understand the planning of the new building, which will be a large and complex one, at the Royal Adelaide Hospital will be done by the Architect-in-Chief's Department. It will, of course, be done in stages extending over some period and it would be difficult, even if it were desirable, to allocate the work to outside professional men to the same advantage as would accrue from retaining the work within the department where the whole planning for future projects is available for consideration. Up to the present no suggestion has been made that the Royal Adelaide Hospital planning should be undertaken by other than officers of the Architect-in-Chief's Department.

Line passed.

Government Offices, £202,100; Cemetery, £17,500; Public Stores Department, £120,225—passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.33 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, October 22, at 2 p.m.