

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, April 20, 1960.

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

QUESTIONS.**MENINDEE LAKES STORAGE.**

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Early last year much publicity was given to a scheme that would bring a large quantity of water from Lake Cawndilla, which is part of the Menindee Lakes scheme in New South Wales, to South Australia through an open channel. It was estimated that 38,000 acres could be irrigated if this were brought about, 28,000 acres for pastoral purposes and 10,000 acres for fruit-growing. As we have not heard much of this scheme recently, can the Premier say whether negotiations are still extant with the New South Wales Government on this matter, and whether their success is possible?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Negotiations continued with the New South Wales Government for a considerable time, and at one stage I believed they would have been successful. Mr. Cahill, when discussing the matter with me, appeared to be favourably inclined towards the scheme and it assumed considerable dimensions so far as the investigation was concerned. However, negotiations ultimately broke down because people below the reservoirs on the Darling were hesitant to agree to any water being diverted from the Darling into South Australia. Mr. Cahill wrote to say that the New South Wales Government could only agree to water being available in certain years and that it could not guarantee any safe supply. Obviously that immediately jeopardized the whole scheme, because we would want the water in a dry year just as much as in any other year. I therefore do not believe that an agreement with New South Wales is possible as the settlers lower down on the Darling feel that their position might be jeopardized.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I notice in the *Government Gazette* of last Thursday that the Motor Vehicles Act, which Parliament passed last year, was proclaimed to commence on that day. By letter some weeks ago I made certain submissions to the Premier regarding an amendment of the Act, in particular of section 118, which relates to a claim against a spouse by an injured person, and I then expressed the

hope that amendments might be made before the Act was proclaimed to operate in order to prevent certain anomalies. That has not been done. Can the Premier say whether the Government intends to introduce any amendments to the Motor Vehicles Act this session?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—If I understand the honourable member's question rightly, I think it relates to amendments included in the Act last year—I think in both instances rather against the Government's view at that time. The amendments created an anomaly because they did not provide for a limitation of the amount of damages that could be awarded against an insurance company. Following the honourable member's question, the Government has considered this matter, and the honourable member will be pleased to know that his representations have been fruitful, and that the Government intends to bring in amendments. It proposes to correct the anomaly by removing the present limitations, which we think are entirely wrong, so that limitations will not be imposed upon new sections, but rather the anomalies will be taken away altogether. We believe that the present limitations are not justified. They were put in at a time when it was considered there might be collusion between the passengers and the driver of a car; therefore, the amount of compensation was limited, but an examination of the position has shown that that is not the proper way to deal with collusion. The proper way of dealing with it is in a court of law, and it is not equitable or just to reduce a claim merely on the ground that somebody else may have been trying to get at an insurance company.

SAFETY ISLANDS.

Mr. TAPPING—It has been suggested to me that in the construction of safety islands in various parts of the metropolitan area insufficient light is being provided. Last week a motorist lost his life by colliding with one of these islands, and although I do not suggest that insufficient lighting was the cause I doubt whether there is enough light at these intersections. Will the Premier seek a report on this matter from the Minister of Roads and, if the lighting is not good enough, will he see that something is done to improve it?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—As members know, we have had some difficulty in getting uniform action on safety islands and approval of the type of safety island that should be installed. Various councils have different views. I believe that some safety islands have been successful, but that one or two have

been rather a handicap and have unduly restricted the traffic at the points concerned because they are too large. Some have, in my opinion, actually created a hazard. I will obtain a full report from the Highways Department on whether any action can be taken to improve the position, from the point of view of safety of the public, the lighting of the islands, or uniform action regarding their size and position.

LAND SPECULATION.

Mr. HARDING—An item in today's *Advertiser* could be headed "Fools and Their Money are Soon Parted." The article referred to the investment of £100,000,000 of South Australian money in the purchase of land for building purposes, and stated that this was causing concern to the Town Planner and the Government. It goes on to say that, if the rate continues, 50,000 blocks could be purchased this year. Another report states that the Town Planner did not approve of 18 subdivisions involving 1,927 blocks because the Engineering and Water Supply Department did not consider that they could be economically sewerèd or piped for water. Can the Premier say whether anything further can be done to warn people who invest money in such ventures?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Previously in this House I issued a warning that a person buying a building block should be careful to see that it was within an approved programme of the Engineering and Water Supply Department. If one examines any of the projects at present before the public he will realize that the amount of subdivision taking place is excessive by any standard, and that the land cannot be built on, sewerèd and watered within a reasonable time. Many of the subdivisions are unnecessary and are done for promotional purposes rather than meeting a public need. I have stressed that point often, but the fact remains that many people, having successfully sold a block at an enhanced price in the metropolitan area, think it a good process to go in for another speculation of that variety. Most of the land is being purchased for speculative purposes only, and in many instances it cannot succeed. The Government is interested only in necessary subdivisions for building purposes. It is not interested in subdivisions undertaken purely and simply for speculative purposes. We have tightened up considerably on the approvals in connection with water and sewerage, and these subdivisions will not be able to get water and sewer-

age unless the promoters are prepared to put in water and sewerage installations on a repayment basis when the houses are built.

Mr. O'Halloran—I suggested that years ago.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Leader of the Opposition will be pleased to know that I study his remarks daily and that when he brings forward a suggestion not only am I prepared to accept it but to acknowledge its source. The Government cannot possibly put in water and sewerage for the scattered development that will take place if people try to build on the enormous area of land that is being subdivided at present. I issue a solemn warning to the public not to buy blocks of land until they see that it is to be serviced.

VENDING MACHINE COMPANIES.

Mr. RICHES—My question relates to the advertisements that are appearing in South Australian papers inviting investors to put money in vending machine companies. I refer particularly to an article that appeared in yesterday's *Melbourne Age*, which indicated that the Victorian Parliament was bringing in legislation next Tuesday to control the operations of the vending machine companies. According to the *Age*, following on an inquiry by the Statute Law Revision Committee a Bill has been proposed enacting recommendations dealing with defects in some of the contracts entered into between investors and the vending machine companies. One of the complaints is that some firms offer an attractive rate of interest to investors but give no guarantee about the refund of capital. I think that the South Australian people are offering a 20 per cent interest rate. The committee reported that in law the investor had no interest in the operation of his machine; consequently it was possible for the firms to give uncertified particulars on the number of machines operating and their earning capacity. In one lease contract examined there was no assurance that capital would be returned if the owner of the machine died before the contract for the machine expired. Another defect was the absence of a provision in the contract for the automatic repayment of capital when the contract expired. Consequently, the investor, unless he could prove financial hardship, might find his capital perpetually committed. Has the Premier had any complaints about the operations of these companies in South Australia? They have been advertising extensively, and if he has had complaints will he look into the matter with a view to introducing similar legislation?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have had no complaints on this matter. I think that, in some instances at least, the basic law in South Australia is different from the Victorian law. For instance, vending machines are used in Victoria for the purpose of selling petrol, but that would be illegal in any case in South Australia because they would not comply with the Act dealing with the sale of inflammable oils. I suggest that already there are some limitations in operation but I will get a report from the Police Department on the matter, and the Weights and Measures Branch if necessary, as to whether further action should be taken.

PENSIONERS' HOSPITAL CHARGES.

Mr. RALSTON—Recently the Premier gave a undertaking in this House that if at any time a pensioner was dissatisfied with the assessment of his charges at the hospital where he had been treated the Premier would personally investigate the matter. This morning a complaint reached me by post from a Mount Gambier pensioner whose total income is £6 5s. 10d. a week. Out of that she has to pay £2 10s. a week rental, and she was assessed at the hospital at 16s. a day. That makes a total of £8 2s. a week, whereas she has an income of only £6 5s. 10d. Will the Premier investigate this complaint to see if a satisfactory arrangement can be reached?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—If the honourable member will give me the name and address of the person concerned and the name of the hospital where he was treated I will have the matter investigated. Since I made the offer previously I have had only two complaints, and in one case the complaint was completely unjustified as the person concerned did not disclose to the hospital authorities any particulars about his income and ability to pay. He only disclosed them to me after he had received the account.

MINGARY TO COCKBURN ROAD.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Early last year the Minister of Roads issued a statement to the effect that certain roadwork would be carried out during the year, and included in it was the sealing of the Broken Hill Road between Mingary and Cockburn. Will the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Roads, ascertain whether the work has been commenced and, if so, what progress has been made? If it has not, will he ascertain when the work is likely to be commenced?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I will inquire for the honourable member.

INDUSTRIAL ACCIDENTS.

Mr. HARDING—In the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech the question of time lost through industrial accidents was mentioned, and yesterday Mr. Frank Walsh referred to it and suggested that it was attributable to three primary causes: firstly, the intricate machinery now used; secondly, the monotony to employees, and thirdly, the excessive hours being worked. Can the Premier indicate whether any statistics reveal the major causes of this lost time?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Department of Labour and Industry is always investigating accidents with a view to determining whether any safety devices can be placed on machines or whether other factors can prevent accidents. We have a volume of statistics concerning accidents and the causes immediately responsible for them. Some accidents are due to the momentary inattention of an operator to his task, but it is difficult to ascertain the cause of the momentary inattention, particularly as personal factors and individual characteristics come into it. Last year this matter was the subject of expert study at a convention which was well supported by employers, the trade union movement, political organizations and the public generally. It was an extremely useful convention and I hope a somewhat similar convention will be held this year, because it is in the interests of everyone to overcome unnecessary accidents. It is extremely difficult in every instance to trace the origin of an accident. We believe that much can be done, through co-operation, to achieve beneficial results.

RAINMAKING EXPERIMENTS.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—In this morning's *Advertiser* under the heading "Big Rainmaking Triumph," an article refers to the great success that has been accomplished by the rain-makers in the Snowy Mountains and in the high rainfall areas of northern New South Wales. Dr. Bowen, who is the chief of the radio physics branch of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization said that experiments in South Australia, to the north of Adelaide, had failed and that an increased rainfall could mean a tremendous lot to the fringe areas of Australia's settled lands. He also said that rainmaking could have great significance in the areas of Australia with an annual rainfall of from 11in. to 30in. In South Australia we have a large area of fringe

country, much of which has an average rainfall of between 10in. and 12in. Can the Premier, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture, indicate whether peculiarities exist in South Australia (are our clouds different from those in the eastern States and won't they co-operate with the rainmakers) or what are the reasons why experiments have not succeeded here? Perhaps the Premier will inquire to ascertain whether we are being victimized in this respect.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Frankly, I was rather surprised to see the claims made by the C.S.I.R.O. in this matter. Quite recently, as members know, I investigated certain work on the Snowy River scheme to see what effect it would have on South Australia's water supply, and I then made specific inquiries from the authorities who were conducting me around as to the success of rainmaking experiments in the Snowy area and was told that there was much speculation as to the effect of the experiments, and that international statisticians who had been called in to check the claims that were being made had not been prepared to either confirm or deny them. This visit was only two months ago, and my informants were senior officers, and I presume they were not telling me something that was not completely in accord with fact. I do not know whether we can claim to be victimized yet, but I can say that the South Australian experiments were not a wash-out by any means.

WAGES BOARD MEMBERS' FEES.

MR. FRED WALSH—On numerous occasions I have asked questions concerning fees paid to members of wages boards and have asked for the position to be reviewed. The position has recently been discussed and those unions associated with wages boards are perturbed that the Government has not seen fit to increase the fees payable to members. It has been argued, of course, that a certain amount of work is performed by those members outside ordinary working hours, but those members who are paid by unions or by employers frequently have to attend numerous conferences to discuss matters which, when ultimately placed before the wages boards, are merely ratified, accounting for the short time taken by some wages boards in determining matters. In 1958 the Minister of Industry advised that there had been no considerable change since the last increase in fees, which was made as a result of the 1954 marginal increase, and last year I understand Mr. Bowes gave the same

reasons for not recommending any increase. In view of the increased basic wage—it has risen from £11 11s. to £13 11s.—and the 28 per cent marginal increase last year, will the Premier again have this matter reviewed?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from April 19. Page 212).

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens)—It is with pleasure that I support the motion so ably moved by the member for Albert and seconded by the member for Unley, both of whom presented the House with interesting information, particularly as this year we are experiencing a departure from the normal as we are having an earlier and separate session rather than a much longer and later one as has been the case in the past.

Mr. Millhouse—Do you think it is a good idea?

Mr. COUMBE—I will wait to see how it turns out, but at present I entirely favour it. I join with members in congratulating Her Majesty the Queen on the birth of the second Prince, and also in extending to Princess Margaret best wishes for her coming marriage. The wonderful service given to this State by Sir Robert George, who has recently retired as Governor of South Australia, has been mentioned. I join with other members in extending my good wishes to Sir Robert and Lady George and in hoping that their years of retirement will be most fruitful to them.

I also congratulate the Minister of Lands, Sir Cecil Hincks, on his preferment and the richly deserved recognition that has been given to his wonderful services to the State, both in and out of Parliament, over so many years. Let me add a few words to those of other speakers in referring to the late George Ham-bour, who was a personal friend to me as he was, possibly, to all members of this House. His participation in the debates will be sadly missed in years to come, as he was one of the fairest and most vigorous debaters this House has seen for a long time. I join with other members in mourning his loss.

We have just experienced one of the driest years on record, which turned out to be a severe drought year. References have been made to rain-making to overcome this problem, especially in the northern parts of the State.

Without considering this, however, although this was a record drought year the Government was able to get through the summer months without imposing water restrictions in the metropolitan area. This is in direct contrast to the position in some other States, where restrictions are imposed freely even in years when there is a reasonable rainfall. That there has been no restriction on water supplies in the metropolitan area has not received the publicity it deserves. The Government, the Minister of Works and the officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department in particular deserve great commendation for the way this feat has been accomplished. This is all the more meritorious when it is remembered that at the beginning of the summer the reservoirs were sadly depleted because they had not received normal intakes last winter. Taking that into account, and also that the department had to cater for a rapidly increasing population in the metropolitan area, their efforts were all the more meritorious and should have received more publicity.

I pay a sincere tribute to the Premier for his untiring efforts to secure an adequate water supply for the whole State. This season has shown beyond doubt, if nothing else has, how dependent the people throughout this State are on water. In fact, it is our life blood, and that is especially so of the River Murray water. An illustration of how vital this is to us is that most of last summer's water supply in the metropolitan area came from the River Murray through the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline. It has been recorded in this Parliament that the Public Works Standing Committee has approved a plan to raise the level of the Mount Bold reservoir to give it a greater holding capacity. The committee is also investigating a proposed duplication of the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline that will not only provide additional supplies for Whyalla for industrial purposes and for increased population, but (and this is most important) will later supply water to the northern parts of this State. Without these schemes it is plain that many people in this severe drought year would have faced stark disaster, and all these plans and facilities would collapse if South Australia were not assured of its fair share of the waters flowing down the Murray. We cannot rely on natural rainfall to meet our demands for water so as the years go by we must rely to a greater and greater extent on Murray water and, if South Australia does not get its fair share, the people of this State will suffer badly.

Most members remember the Premier's fight to preserve South Australia's rights under the Snowy Mountains scheme and the diversion scheme and they should be extremely grateful to him for his efforts, not only for the benefit of members of this House, but for every person living in South Australia, because, not only do we want supplies today, but we will want increasing quantities as years go by, so it is for the generations ahead and the industrial expansion that will occur that these quantities of water will be required. In this connection, the Premier is certainly a fighter for the rights of the State. We know that he is now engaged in discussions to establish a holding dam on the Murray below the Darling junction and I wish him and his officers well in this project, as I realize that a water supply is so important to South Australia. If this State last year had experienced similar conditions to those that applied in 1914, the position would have been markedly different.

Whilst I have always maintained that South Australia is essentially a primary producing State and that we all ride on the sheep's back, in recent years we have been able to achieve a better stability and balance in our economy by developing our secondary industries above the low level of 1914, which was such a bad drought year. The manufacturing industries of this State have been able to cushion the bad year a little, especially in the employment field. Having said that, I point out that, generally speaking, when the farmer suffers so does the factory hand; therefore this cushioning or buffer effect on our economy cannot be expected to last forever and if in the winter of this year and the summer of 1961 we experience a drought similar to that we have just been through I do not hold out any hope for our financial stability and especially our employment. It is unfortunate that in South Australia, with its very limited natural resources, the economy is bound up so closely with the vagaries of the season. I submit that the progressive developmental policies implemented by this Government over the past few years have certainly lessened this dependency, and that is a very good thing to work on.

The Lieutenant-Governor's Speech contained certain figures which indicated that the estimated deficit at the time of the Budget was £791,000, but the deficit at the end of June is now expected to be between £1,800,000 and £2,000,000. That is certainly a large jump in any person's way of thinking, and this is certainly due to several factors. It is due firstly to the dry season and the consequent loss of

railway and shipping freights, and to the increased costs of pumping water, especially on the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline where water has had to be pumped for months on end, in many cases for 24 hours a day, instead of there being the benefit of reduced tariffs on off-peak loads. Then, of course, on top of that we have the impact of the recent wage and salary increases, and the increased cost of purchases and services to the Government. We shall therefore be faced at the beginning of the next financial year with an opening deficit of about £2,000,000.

I feel that those items in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech have not yet received the attention in this debate that they deserve. After all, we in this House have to scrutinize very closely the Government's estimates of expenditure, because that is one reason why we are here. I sympathize with the Treasurer who makes up his Budget in August and then finds himself confronted at the end of the financial year, because of adverse seasonal conditions for which he could not possibly allow, with an estimated deficit of nearly £2,000,000. Apart from the concern at this drift in the State's finances, which we as responsible members of Parliament must feel, we as local members in our own districts must realize that when we put in for our little slice of the cake there will not be too many currants left in it. Just when we want to get support for our own little projects in our districts, at which we have been plugging away for years, we shall be going to the Treasurer and finding that the cupboard is almost bare. I feel that that will unfortunately be the case in the coming year.

This aspect of the Speech needs much more amplification, affecting as it does all aspects of our daily lives, our businesses, the welfare of our families, and the many organizations with which we are all connected. One of the most forceful, best prepared and documented speeches I have heard on this subject during this debate was given last Wednesday by the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday). Although I do not agree with every point he made I agree with many of them, and I think his speech was most helpful and balanced, rather in contrast to the speech we heard yesterday from the member for Enfield, who appeared to be making as many alliterations as he could in an effort to woo the electors of Light. His flights of rhetoric were very fanciful indeed.

Certain aspects of the financial position which this State and the nation as a whole is experiencing have been described by some

persons, mostly economists, as the present inflationary risk. We know that since the basic wage rise of 15s. last May the Australian economy has shown signs of returning to the inflationary condition which has been experienced on several occasions since the end of the second world war and which was, of course, most apparent during 1951. Undoubtedly the basic wage judgment and the margins judgment at the end of November have been major contributing causes to this effect, but the higher wool receipts and the larger Federal Government expenditure, coupled with increasing private capital spending and an accelerated rate of capital inflow, could also be factors conducive to this condition.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Are there inflationary tendencies in any country outside Australia?

Mr. COUMBE—There may well be, and the honourable member would probably know more about that than I do. I am discussing the position not only in this State but in the Commonwealth. We have witnessed the emergence of this thinking in the Commonwealth Parliament, where the Right Honourable the Prime Minister indicated the Federal Government's view on this matter last February. He announced several counter-measures which in his opinion—and I presume it was the considered opinion of the Federal Cabinet—were the best ways to correct this tendency. One measure was a decision to oppose a further immediate increase in the basic wage.

Mr. Fred Walsh—After they had scraped the bin for themselves.

Mr. COUMBE—That decision was made, and although the view has been held in some quarters that Governments should remain neutral in matters of wage-fixing and leave it entirely to the courts to decide, I consider that there must come a stage when Governments, unless they wish to shelve all responsibility in this matter, must indicate their views before such tribunals. That, of course, was done in this case. Within six months last year we saw the basic wage increase of 15s. and the margins increase of 28 per cent, and these increases have spread through the whole of our wage structure. I believe that it is fundamental—and I am sure all members here will agree with me—that every tradesman is entitled to his full margin to protect his status as a tradesman, and to encourage apprenticeship and particular skill. The margins decision of the Arbitration Court was not meant for general application, a fact that has been stressed since by one or more of the judges concerned. However, we have

found that every type of organization, whether it represents semi-skilled or unskilled workers, has climbed on to the band waggon, applied to the court, and received a marginal adjustment of some sort.

Mr. Fred Walsh—What about those who are not wage earners but salary earners? Some are the tall poppies.

Mr. COUMBE—I referred to semi-skilled and non-skilled workers. The effect of all this has been that the tradesman's margin as set out by the court has been whittled down again. I am a firm believer in a tradesman being entitled to his full margin for skill. I suggest that these numerous applications are tending to jack up unnecessarily our wage structure. Our total wage bill has been jacked up considerably and is far beyond the estimate of the court. Possibly this was considered by the Arbitration Commission when it decided last week not to increase the basic wage.

The second policy measure announced by the Prime Minister, which will not take effect for some months, referred to the determination to balance the Commonwealth Budget. The Commonwealth Government budgeted for a deficit of £61,000,000 in the current financial year. To meet that must be a tough assignment. The experience we have had of Governments of different calibre makes us doubtful about the action. When a Government has taken fiscal action to curb excess spending the people have looked for an example from the Government itself. In consequence, taxation increases have rarely, if ever, been deflationary in practice. They have only substituted one form of expenditure for another. If the Commonwealth Government intends to balance the 1960-61 Budget by trimming its activities according to its revenue it will be all right, and I hope it can be done, but to have recourse to an increase in the already heavy burden of taxation would damage seriously the prospects for the greater output, employment and productive efficiency that are now so urgently needed.

The third measure announced by the Prime Minister related to credit control. He referred to the freezing of excess bank liquidity during the last six months by the Reserve Bank and raising the statutory reserve deposit ratio already applicable to the trading banks. The Prime Minister announced that the Government supported the policy and said that the growth of excess liquidity would be restrained. Of course, this has been done before and it has been accepted. In fact, its impact may be rather weaker than generally believed. All it can achieve at most is the restriction of the

undue expansion of credit. It cannot improve the position at the moment; it can only arrest the drift. We have had credit restrictions of this type in Australia for at least the last 20 years and bank lending has diminished in relative importance in our financial structure. For example, in 1938-39 advances by the major trading banks were equivalent to 36 per cent of the national income. Last year they were equivalent to only 18.5 per cent. I am greatly concerned at certain trends in the offering by commercial and industrial companies of fantastically high interest rates to finance and investment companies, land speculators and the like. Mr. Riches referred to this matter earlier today and I heartily agree with some of the views he put forward. When one reads the elaborate and fantastic types of prospectus put forward one is amazed. Shylock and his pound of flesh pale into insignificance when compared with the flamboyant advertisements that try to trap the unwary investor. I am reminded of that old-fashioned word "usury" that can be used in this connection. Those trends are having a serious effect on various people, especially young people who are trying to buy land and set up a home. It is certainly having a marked effect on people on fixed incomes and pensions. The position is reflected in Government loans, flotation and interest rates, and the high rates that must be paid to purchase goods through investment.

The position today is that people are turning away from Government securities and loans for investment purposes to chase these golden get-rich-quick schemes that are advertised in our press. Offers appear every day in our newspapers, and each appears to outbid the other. In a newspaper yesterday one company offered a return of 17½ per cent on an investment. There was a similar type of advertisement in today's *Advertiser* offering a return of 20 per cent. It is right that attention should be drawn at this time to some of these apparently unscrupulous companies whose activities are having an adverse effect upon the economy of our country, especially Government finance. Although I dislike the principle of artificial controls of any type, it may be that we will be forced before long, whether we like it or not, to reintroduce capital controls on investments, including those on hire-purchase rates. The companies I have mentioned will have only themselves to blame for dangling this bait of easy money before the public, in many cases without very much security, as Mr. Riches so rightly observed. One of the tragedies of this type of investment is that the security is not always secure.

Many of the old and established conservatively-managed organizations are more conscious of their responsibilities and more modest in their transactions. Thank goodness they are, for they are the backbone of our financial structure, and without them we would not get very far. Most of my comments refer to some of these Johnny-come-lately companies which are offering exorbitant rates of interest on little security. The dangers lie not only in the ways I have outlined but in the fact that if the bubble does burst (and it would burst quickly) the small investor will suffer—the person who can least afford it and who has, in many instances, put his life savings into these companies. He will be ruined.

I have dealt with three policy measures put forward by the Prime Minister. The fourth was, of course, the relaxation of import restrictions. This is probably the most spectacular and it has certainly caught the imagination of a certain section of the community. It is rather difficult at the moment to say whether or not this is good or bad. I am not at all sure that it will assist in overcoming the inflationary tendency and in improving our productive capacity and general living standards. However, it is a matter that the Commonwealth Government had the courage to face up to and only time will reveal whether it answers the problem. Restrictions have been relaxed and I trust they will be given a fair trial to determine how they work out and that they will not be reimposed capriciously at short notice because the danger of so doing would be to immediately sap the faith and enterprise of importers and the general public would be the loser.

Although we are all concerned at the price rises, which are virtually inevitable through the sudden increasing of the wages bill by, perhaps, £160,000,000 annually, we must avoid panic and hasty decisions. The future outlook for our industry and business is bright, but it would be completely destroyed if we allowed panic to enter our thinking and if we made hasty and ill-conceived decisions to overcome this problem. The situation, of course, requires firm and steady pressure rather than abrupt action. Some people mistakenly believe that inflation, such as we have today, is a kind of unavoidable disaster, whereas it need be neither unavoidable nor disastrous if adequate measures are taken in time to combat it. Everybody is against inflation, but at the same time everybody is also for higher wages, more subsidies and bigger welfare programmes. I suggest that few stop to think of the effect of this trend upon our export markets. If our export markets go then we go and all our work over

the past decade or so in building primary production and secondary industry would count for nought. If we cannot export, Australia cannot live. We cannot be self-supporting. Our export markets are dwindling and, in some cases, have been lost because of the high cost structure in Australia. I believe that the few remarks I have made concerning the financial aspects of the Commonwealth Budget were necessary and I trust that members receive them in the same manner as I have put them forward.

I welcome the announcement in His Excellency's Speech of amendments to the Town Planning Act this year. They are essential and long overdue, especially in view of the tremendous number of sub-divisions that are occurring in the metropolitan area and in the fringe areas close to our inner country towns. Yesterday the Attorney-General struck a timely warning on this matter when he pointed out the inherent dangers in wild land speculation, and when this matter was raised earlier in the House today the Premier issued a further warning. The Town Planning Office has calculated the requirements for housing in this State for many years to come and it has been shown that the present rate of speculation greatly exceeds our needs. It is certainly time that someone drew attention to this position and sounded a warning to the unwary purchasers. As was pointed out quite rightly today, most persons purchasing subdivisational allotments are unaware of the provisions of the Town Planning Act regarding services and I am afraid that many will be badly bitten.

Certain activities that have been going on in my electorate are worthy of comment, and I refer particularly to the work that has been undertaken by the Adelaide City Council. Since the Town Clerk, Mr. Veale, went abroad a year or so ago we have noticed marked improvements within the city in traffic control and in the beautification of park lands which have captured the imagination of a large section of the public. We have noticed traffic lights and traffic islands of various types to control traffic. In my electorate new golf links have been provided as well as small lakes on the River Torrens. The parklands have been greatly beautified and, although they are not the sole responsibility of Adelaide ratepayers but are enjoyed by people throughout the State, they are maintained by the Adelaide ratepayers.

Whilst every other capital city in Australia is on a major waterway, Adelaide has only the small River Torrens which, because of its size, would not be regarded as a river in many other States and in other parts of the world. We

should try to improve the appearance of the River Torrens and the city council is spending over £100,000 in the next year or so in sheet piling and in improving the banks. I was pleased to notice the recent decision of the Minister of Works regarding the future control of the river in its upper reaches where it passes through the districts of Walkerville and St. Peters whereby certain powers are being delegated to the local councils to act on behalf of the Minister in administering the River Torrens Protection Act. The councils have formed a standing committee to protect the river, to prevent the unnecessary dumping of rubbish on the banks, and to prepare a long range plan for its beautification by tree planting and by providing reserves. I trust that the Tourist Bureau will co-operate with the councils because many spots along the river would provide beautiful picnic grounds for small parties who do not wish to go right into the country. These areas are within a mile or two of the heart of the city and in time will be greatly sought after. I pay a sincere tribute to those councillors involved in this work and to Mr. Veale in particular. I support the motion.

Mr. RALSTON (Mount Gambier)—This debate provides an excellent opportunity for members from both sides of the House to discuss the merits or demerits of Government policy as outlined in His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech. It enables members to direct the Government's attention to matters of some concern in the electorates throughout the State, but before dealing with matters that I have in mind, in common with all members I desire to express my pleasure at the birth of another son to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen and Prince Philip and to wish Princess Margaret happiness and success in her approaching marriage. The kind references by previous speakers to the former Governor of South Australia (Sir Robert George) and Lady George were truly sincere and fully justified. His Excellency and Lady George endeared themselves to the people of this State by the pleasant manner in which they carried out their official duties and by their spontaneous friendship to people in all walks of life.

It is with regret that I refer to the death of our former colleague, Mr. George Hambour, the member for Light. We miss him greatly and the House is poorer for his passing. I extend my sympathy to his family in their bereavement. I take this opportunity of complimenting the member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) on his splendid speech in moving the motion for the adoption of the Address in

Reply. He covered many subjects of great interest to all members and especially to members of the Opposition when his views were in complete accord with Labor's policy on such subjects as monopolies, buying rings, trade protection groups, hire-purchase, excessive profit margins in industry, price control, Rundle Street farmers, and wealthy professional men who seek to capitalize excess income by investing in land at uneconomic values thus obtaining special taxation concessions as primary producers. I commend the member for Albert for his forthright opinions, and trust that he will always subscribe to the policy he advocated. Last year we heard an equally forthright speech advocating almost the same policies but I am afraid they weakened a little. I trust the member for Albert will not weaken.

Land settlement is a subject that must be causing all members of this House grave concern. The decision of the Commonwealth Government to cease acquiring further land for settlement leaves the way wide open for the State to institute a policy of land acquisition for closer settlement. There are hundreds of young people who were attending school during the last war who are now in their late twenties and early thirties. Much as they wish to go on the land, what chance have they without Government assistance? In my opinion, and in the opinion of many others, they have no chance whatever unless the Government is prepared to institute a policy of closer settlement on the lines on which it was carried out in years past.

The general public was recently invited to apply for certain areas in the south-east that had been partially developed. The cost of this initial development varied with each block but in general terms ranged from £9,000 to £16,000. In addition to the capital outlay a house had to be built, property stocked and in some cases fencing had to be completed. All this had to be done before any appreciable return could be expected. In those circumstances who but a wealthy person could hope to make a success of such a venture? I am sure that this was also the feeling of the Land Board because, irrespective of the qualifications of the applicant, unless he had substantial resources his chances of obtaining an offer were practically negligible. Surely members opposite realize that the policy of the Government, which has concentrated 62 per cent of the people in the metropolitan area, cannot continue much longer. To provide the basic foods such as milk, butter, cheese, and meat for Australia and this State's increasing population a bold policy of closer settlement in the high rainfall areas must be implemented without delay.

At this stage I draw the attention of country members, of whom there are 26 in this House—nine being Labor, two Independent and, until recently, 15 Liberal—to the results of the recent Leaving Examination as they applied to Commonwealth scholarships. These results will give country members, especially those opposite, food for thought. Let us now examine the results as published in the *Sunday Mail* of February 20 last, together with a supplementary list in the *Advertiser* of February 23. The *Sunday Mail* stated:—

The Education Minister, Mr. Pattinson, today announced the names of 332 candidates who gained sufficient marks in the Leaving examination to be offered open entrance Commonwealth scholarships. Selection is based on the marks obtained in the best five subjects at the Leaving examination. Mr. Pattinson said acceptance of these awards would depend upon the successful candidates being able to fulfil the requirements of the Commonwealth scholarship scheme. The scholarships pay the fees for approved degree and diploma courses at Adelaide University, the Institute of Technology and other approved tertiary institutions and provide a living allowance to scholars who are eligible according to a means test.

I take that to mean that if parents are sufficiently well-off they cannot avail themselves of the scholarships. The number of Commonwealth scholarships offered to students who gain sufficient marks in the Leaving examination was 375. The really important aspects of these results will become obvious when they are analysed. The following is a list of the schools outside the metropolitan area whose students were successful in qualifying for scholarships:—

School.	Students qualifying for scholarships.
Darwin high	2
Gladstone high	1
Glossop high	3
Gawler high	4
Jamestown high	1
Kadina high	2
Millicent high	3
Maitland area	1
Murray Bridge high	1
Mount Gambier high	3
Mount Barker high	2
Naracoorte high	1
Nuriootpa high	3
Port Lincoln high	1
Port Augusta high	1
Port Pirie high	5
Renmark high	1
Strathalbyn high	2
Victor Harbour high	5
Whyalla technical	1
Woomera higher primary	1

44

The results are much better in the private schools and colleges in the metropolitan area. The following list shows the numbers to qualify from these schools:—

School.	Students qualifying for scholarships.
Blackfriars College	1
Christian Brothers College	1
Concordia College	2
Cabra Convent	1
Girton School for Girls	4
Immanuel College	3
Loreto Convent	3
Methodist Ladies College	5
Prince Alfred College	25
Pulteney Grammar School	10
Presbyterian Girls College	5
Rostrevor College	5
Scotch College	11
Sacred Heart College	6
St. Peters College	18
St. Peters Collegiate Girls School	1
St. Aloysius College	1
St. Ignatius College	1
St. Michael's College	1
Woodlands Church of England Girls Grammar School	7
Wilderness School	5
Walford Girls Grammar School	6

124

Metropolitan departmental schools had outstanding results, as the following list will show:—

School.	Students qualifying for scholarships.
Adelaide boys high	23
Adelaide girls high	27
Adelaide technical high	16
Brighton high	18
Enfield high	7
Findon high	3
Marion high	3
Norwood high	37
Urrbrae agricultural high	3
Unley high	50
Woodville high	20

207

If private schools and colleges are eliminated from the list on the ground that the students are drawn from both city and country we get a clearer picture of what is happening in departmental schools. I draw the attention of country members to the results obtained in the country areas of South Australia compared with the metropolitan area. I suppose many country members on both sides of the House, but mainly opposite, must feel extremely concerned that no students from the electorates they represent were successful in being offered Commonwealth scholarships, and they could spend a little time considering that angle. Each year the Education Department publishes

in the January *Education Gazette* a list of schools and their average daily attendances. As this year's issue is not yet available I have had to use last year's issue but for the purpose of comparison it would be reasonably accurate. From this publication it appears that, for the 26 metropolitan technical high and high schools listed, the total average daily attendance would be about 16,000 students, although the figure this year may be slightly different. The total average daily attendance at the 31 country high schools, 17 area schools and 18 higher primary schools would be about 10,000 so that, even though appropriate allowances are made, the results obtained by country students are highly disturbing.

I am sure that, when the parents of country students realize what is happening, Liberal and Country members opposite who have been complacently lauding the Government to the skies will have to face up to some straight talk in their electorates. If there is a satisfactory explanation for this disturbing state of affairs no doubt when the Minister of Education, in whom I have every confidence and whom I am pleased to see has recovered from his illness and is again in this House, will be only too pleased to inform the House why country students have not achieved a standard of education comparable with that attained by students attending metropolitan schools. I have endeavoured to obtain further statistical information about the results achieved throughout the State at Leaving standard. The letter I received from the department was signed by the Acting Minister of Education, Mr. Jude, and it replied to the points I had raised about the number of students who sat for the Leaving Examination and the number successful. The letter read:—

I have made inquiries regarding this matter and find that official statistics relating to the number of students in departmental schools who sat for the leaving and who passed are not available in the Education Department.

I think that is an extraordinary statement. The Education Department does not know officially how many students from the various schools sat for the Leaving Examination or the number that passed. The letter continues:—

To obtain them it would be necessary to write to all departmental schools conducting secondary classes, students of which, sat for the University examinations, and on receipt of such returns collate them to provide the information you require. I consider that it is hardly reasonable to instruct that this should be done in view of the time and work involved.

That may be the opinion of the Acting Minister of Education, but I assure him it is not the

opinion of every parent in this State. Yesterday the Premier, in answer to a question, said that the statistical figures were available to superintendents and secondary school inspectors, but they were not available for publication. He said it was undesirable that they should be known. That is a rather extraordinary attitude, too.

I feel that some comment is necessary on the repeated statements made in this House, staunchly supported by members opposite, that any increase in wages would immediately accelerate the inflationary spiral and completely ruin Australia by pricing this country out of overseas markets. All of this sounds most impressive. Members opposite speak with due deference of the greatest capitalistic country on the face of the earth—America—and deeply respect the power of the almighty dollar. What are the facts about wages? Perhaps the observations of a Mr. Yankus who has lived in both Australia and America, and who is now working at Pope Products Limited will carry some weight. Recently Mr. Yankus, speaking about wage costs, said:—

An American doing work similar to my job as a clerk at Pope Products Limited would earn about twice as much as my weekly £16. A factory clerk in America could buy a new Ford or a Chevrolet for about 26 weeks' pay. It would take 60 weeks' pay of his Australian counterpart to buy a car of similar quality.

Mr. Hall—How much do Americans pay for high-quality beef and for other necessities of life? At least twice as much as the price here.

Mr. RALSTON—Surely the honourable member does not think Americans are importing Australian beef into America at a loss.

Mr. Hall—They pay twice as much on a wage and time basis as we do.

Mr. RALSTON—Do they pay the Australians twice as much? Can the honourable member tell me what they pay for Australian beef in America? I think the honourable member is off the beam. Mr. Yankus continued:—

An American clerk could buy a refrigerator for three weeks' pay, but it took 14 Australian pay cheques to buy the same article.

That apparently shows the benefit of a capitalistic country.

Mr. Stott—They pay 42s. for a steak in America.

Mr. Hall—Why didn't Mr. Yankus stop there?

Mr. RALSTON—He will answer that question. Consider these facts and the trenchant comments made by Dr. Coombs, the Governor

of the Reserve Bank of Australia, during his recent visit to Adelaide, on the lack of efficiency at administrative levels and its effect on production in Australia. In the past employer organizations have invariably been only too happy to blame the worker for their own lack of efficiency and shortcomings and have endeavoured in every way to restrict his wages and lower his standards of living, little realizing that the worker, who must buy all his needs in the home market, is the most valuable customer of all. His ability to buy freely our primary products and those of secondary industries should be, in principle, their first consideration. Surely we do not have to suffer another depression to learn the basic principles of commerce. The first principle of commerce is that, while the worker is fully employed and receives a fair share of the results of his labour, it is axiomatic that the nation itself must prosper.

I conclude my remarks by drawing the attention of the Government to the extreme dissatisfaction throughout the South-East at the type of sleeper accommodation provided for people patronizing the railways. At the annual meeting of the South-Eastern Local Government Association, at which all the municipal and district councils except two were represented, a motion was carried condemning the Government for its neglect of the South-East by its failure to provide modern sleeper cars on the night train to the South-East. The motion was carried unanimously after delegates had listened to a senior officer of the Railways Department who had been sent especially to explain all the reasons why the people of the South-East could not have sleeping cars equal to those provided by this Government jointly with the Victorian Government for interstate passengers. Four Parliamentary representatives of the South-East, three of whom were Government members, were present at the conference and I am pleased to note that questions have been asked in another place, so it is evident that Government members are much perturbed at the resentment felt in the South-East at the Government's attitude toward the needs of the people in that area. The people there are willing and anxious to trade with the merchants of Adelaide because they are well aware that the prosperity of this State depends largely on trade and commerce remaining within the State as far as possible. However, this lack of interest on the part of the Government in fostering trade with what is possibly the most prosperous country area in the State, and

certainly one with a tremendous potential for expansion unequalled elsewhere in South Australia, is almost an open invitation to the Victorian merchants and manufacturers to take over the trade of the South-East from Naracoorte southwards. I believe that is happening, and it is greatly to the detriment of the people of South Australia. If the Government is not willing to appreciate the need for full confidence in the future of the South-East, then I am sure a Labor Government will not hesitate to show its confidence whenever an opportunity occurs. I support the motion.

Mr. HALL (Gouger)—Mr. Acting Speaker, I add my voice to those that have expressed sorrow at the passing of the late member for Light. It is with much regret that I look at the seat next to me and realize that sad fact. In occupying the seat I do, I had an association with him in the last 12 months, as close as anyone. As a new, and at the beginning a very green, member of this House, I was glad of that 12 months' association with him. I also add my congratulations to the Minister of Lands on his well-earned honour. I wish him well in his future political career.

I do not think that the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech contained much new matter, and it was not necessary that it should because the whole trend of our economy and political life has been one of daily, weekly and monthly expansion. It is with us all the time, and there is no need to emphasize any one point in that speech because members know that all the people in the State know that the expansion is going on continually.

Mr. O'Halloran—Do you think we have reached the optimum?

Mr. HALL—I assure the honourable the Leader that we have not reached the optimum. If that were so, there would be no need for us to occupy these benches, or for anyone to be in the Chamber. That is self-explanatory. Anyone who listens to the Premier's weekly broadcasts knows that progress is a weekly affair in South Australia. I congratulate the Electricity Trust, and my comments in this regard are not a general congratulation, but a particular one for what the trust has accomplished in Gouger. My property has been connected with power in the last two months, and I express here my satisfaction and the satisfaction of the district generally for the single wire earth return schemes that are now going into the country. They are bringing the service to the country at a very reasonable rate, and it is cheaper to use power supplied by the trust than it is to generate one's own

electricity. These connections are welcomed by the hundreds and thousands who are connected yearly.

Mr. O'Halloran—How does that square up with the private enterprise policy of the Liberal Party?

Mr. HALL—I should like a more definite question from the Leader. We have a rather full policy. What does the Leader want?

Mr. O'Halloran—Something on the general principle your Party is always parading.

Mr. HALL—There's a kind of fundamental opposition in the attitude of members opposite towards governmental and semi-governmental enterprise.

Mr. O'Halloran—We believe in Socialism.

Mr. HALL—But you do not tell the electors of Light that. Why don't you tell them the whole story.

Mr. Lawn—I have told them that they would get a cheaper electricity rate than in the metropolitan area under Socialism, and that is more than your Party can offer them.

Mr. Ralston—To what extent will you benefit by the reduction of 10 per cent in the charge for rural power?

Mr. HALL—My area does not happen to be an industrial one. The honourable member is going off on a tangent. He well knows that there is not much electricity used for industrial purposes or for pumping water in my area. All the people there connected with electricity are very happy and I have others writing to me nearly every week asking to be connected. I shall not be side-tracked from the charge that the Labor Party believes in Socialism. Every governmental enterprise is nothing more than an extension of private enterprise. Where did the funds come from for the Electricity Trust and for investment in our social services? There is silence opposite. The members there know it comes from the ample production of private enterprise and nowhere else. It is no use the Opposition saying that it is a socialistic programme. That is false.

Mr. Riches—If it is not a Government enterprise, you have no right to take any credit for it.

Mr. HALL—The Government supports private enterprise. We get ideas from the other side, many of which are not worth discussing. After spending one session and portion of another session as a member of the House one tends to make an assessment of what one has been through. I am really sorry for those honourable members on this side who have been here so many years and have had to listen to

the Opposition. How do they suffer the submission of these ideas year after year, ideas which have no foundation, backing or reason behind them? How can one follow their arguments? When one asks how the suggestions are to be given effect to, one is met with silence. Their policy reminds me of the ship *Tarpozianna*, with six decks and a straw bottom. Socialism is all facade.

Mr. Millhouse—A sham?

Mr. HALL—Exactly. A divided Labor Party is going to the electors of Light with false information, and it is about time that someone said that it was false. The Opposition knows it is false. In today's *News* the Labor candidate (Mr. Wurst) is reported as saying:—

The urgent need in this State is to arrest the alarming drift of population to the city.

In the same issue of that paper we are told that there will be 200 more voters entitled to vote at this election than a year ago. How can we reconcile that? The Opposition's statement is false, and it is time that the electors of Light knew it was false. I challenge honourable members opposite to check up the position with the Electoral Department.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Did you read the leader in *The Advertiser* this morning?

Mr. HALL—No. It is said that there will be 200 more electors to vote than last year.

Mr. Jennings—You should check that up in the Parliamentary Library, and not accept a newspaper report.

Mr. Riches—The number is still 700 fewer than 10 years ago.

Mr. HALL—How far can the Opposition go back? If they go back to 1835, they will find that there was no-one in this district except a few natives. The Labor Party's candidate is selected by people who do not live in the district. My Party's candidate was selected by people resident in the district. That is the final aim of democracy. The people of Light who vote for our candidate vote for a man who was chosen by the local people. The House was invited the other day by Mr. Jennings to remember something done in the last days of the Chifley Socialist Government at Canberra. They were dark days, the days when we had black markets and industrial unrest and all the bad and sorry things that went on in those days under Socialist administration. The fact remains that the Labor Party is so unchangeable that it has not changed one iota from that day to this. Has it altered its programme much in that time? It remains the same Party that fostered those conditions that existed in 1949.

Mr. Tapping—At least my Party has not changed its name.

Mr. HALL—The Liberal Party changes with the times.

Mr. Jennings—I'll say it does!

Mr. HALL—My Party marches with the times and it will continue to do so. One cannot say what the Party's policy will be in 30 years' time, because one does not know what will be the exigencies of that day. However, we know where the Labor Party will be in 30 years—sitting on the other side with the same policy.

Mr. Ralston—Fifty thousand more people in South Australia thought that my Party should be sitting on your side.

Mr. HALL—In assessing the position, we should get the issues truly before us in proper perspective and not cloud them with emotionalism. I went to *Webster's New World Dictionary* and got definitions for "Socialism" and "Communism." I think it is well that the public should know what the Labor Party stands for. The definition of "Socialism" given is as follows:—

The theory or system of ownership and operation of the means of production and distribution by society or the community rather than by private individuals with all members of society or the community sharing in the work and products.

The definition given of "Communism" is as follows:—

(a) An economic theory or system of the ownership of all property by the community as a whole.

(b) A theory or system of the ownership of all means of production and distribution by the community or society; with all members of the community or society sharing in the work and the products as in the Soviet Union since 1917.

Is there any difference in those definitions?

Mr. Fred Walsh—The man who wrote that did not know much about the Soviets in 1917.

Mr. HALL—Someone should write and tell him. It is the same definition. I suppose it all rests with how far the Opposition would take it. Do you think that the electors of Light should gamble on how far they should go?

Mr. Fred Walsh—Do you know anything about the Australian Constitution?

Mr. HALL—Every man who works for himself and votes for the Labor Party's policy is in danger of losing the results of his endeavors. There is no other way of looking at it.

Mr. Fred Walsh—You are talking rot.

Mr. HALL—What the Labor Party believes in is a mixture. Some amazing things have been said in this House during the last two weeks. For instance, the member for Mount Gambier decried the amount of money spent on hospital buildings. At Mount Gambier £1,250,000 was spent on the hospital, and none of that was contributed by the honourable member's own people. We also heard the Leader of the Opposition saying that too much money had been spent in the city. The member for Port Adelaide (Mr. Ryan) says, "The cost of houses does not matter." That appears in *Hansard*. The Opposition is so preoccupied with the profit motive that it gets completely out of touch with its financial policy. It reaches the stage where it says, "The cost of a house does not matter." That absolutely floors me. I did not think anybody here would say that the cost of a house was irrelevant. I have no answer to it except to bring it to the notice of honourable members.

I should like to deal shortly with allegations made by the Opposition that the country towns are decaying. It has been apparently most concerned about this matter. I thought of my own town and the new houses that have been built there in the last few years. I thought, "This strikes me as strange. How is it we have all these new houses going up when the Labor Party says the town has been decaying?" To test the sincerity of that claim I thought to myself, "Light is in prominence as an electorate. If I find out what has happened to some of the towns in that district as regards their building programmes, I can ascertain if there is anything in the statements made by the Opposition." I rang the responsible authorities there and was amazed to learn of the activity that has taken place in those towns, the very towns that the Opposition says hundreds of people have left in the last few years.

Mr. Jennings—So they have.

Mr. HALL—One authority was amazed at my asking if there was any big exodus from his town. He said he had seen that in advertisements, but not in actual fact. For instance, there has been a big building programme in Eudunda, where 17 new houses have been erected in the last five years. That is rather a good tally for a country town. At Hamley Bridge in six years 10 houses have been erected—quite a big increase, possibly greater than the average rate of increase. At Robertstown 10 houses have been erected in the town and surrounding country. Saddleworth has 10 new

houses. At Riverton in the last six years nine new houses have been erected.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Is this an election speech?

Mr. HALL—I think too many false statements have been put around and it is time they were corrected. How many houses have been built at Kapunda (a town in which I believe the Opposition is very interested) in the last three years?—no less than 22 houses. I am convinced that that tells a story completely different from the one that has been circulated in that district. Much has been said by members opposite about decentralization and where they would put industries, but they have not given us their recipe. They do not know how they would do this. I should like to quote some of the things that the Government will do as regards a country abattoirs. There is a standing offer, which is a good one, by this Government of financial assistance to any proposition that has been approved by the Industries Development Committee. On that committee, by the way, are two Liberal and two Labor representatives, and one Treasury representative. The Housing Trust will erect the necessary houses; the services will be supplied by the various Government departments and, as long as the abattoirs are at least 80 miles from the city, they will get a 50 per cent quota. If that is not a good standing offer, I do not know what is. The same applies to other industries. The Housing Trust is renowned for encouraging new industries and supplying houses for their employees. I doubt whether any other State Government in Australia is so generous in that respect.

What else will the Labor Party do? It probably will not do nearly as much. It is appalling that members opposite should be criticizing inflation—not that I mind criticism of inflation, for I, too, do not like it. However, they are coupling with their criticism of inflation a demand for a 35-hour week.

Mr. Fred Walsh—That has been the policy of the Labor Party for 20 years.

Mr. HALL—The public can add up; the public can add two and two. They can see that if one-eighth of the working hours is taken away the goods will cost more.

Mr. O'Halloran—Are you looking for a pool of unemployed?

Mr. HALL—The Labor Party says that the cost of a house does not matter. It is worried about profits and the consumer means nothing to it. I am confounded that it should write down the electors as much as it has by its false and ridiculous propaganda.

Mr. Jennings—You are not only confounded but confused!

Mr. HALL—I am amused by some of the pamphlets put out by the Labor Party. I am wondering whether we may have a new set of names like "slugger" or "Dutch." These things will be remembered. My contention is that the Labor Party gets its support in troubled waters and not in a country that is going ahead as smoothly as this is. What else can a 35-hour week mean at this moment but troubled waters? Can one say whether it will be possible in 25 years' time? I am concerned with this moment. What else can it cause but troubled waters? It is put forward by a Party with a bad record of industrial relations when in power.

Mr. Fred Walsh—You don't remember conditions when the Chifley Government or the Curtin Government was in office?

Mr. HALL—I well remember them.

Mr. Fred Walsh—But not during the Chifley Government?

Mr. HALL—It was only when the sky fell in on Socialism in 1949 that we got rid of them. There is no drift from the country, especially in Light, where there has been an increase in activity. A fact that cannot be refuted is that much home-building activity has taken place in those towns. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. TAPPING (Semaphore)—I support the motion. I join with other members in paying a tribute to the former Governor of South Australia (Sir Robert George) and his lady. They both rendered yeoman service for the advancement of South Australia through mingling with people throughout the whole State, irrespective of their politics or their station in life. I have no doubt that their departure has been a severe wrench to South Australia, and I feel that all members will subscribe to that viewpoint.

I join, too, with other members in paying a special tribute to the excellent services rendered by Sir Mellis Napier over many years. I agree entirely with the Hon. Frank Condon, a member in another place, who said in his Address in Reply speech that it would be fitting for Sir Mellis Napier to be appointed to the important position of Governor of South Australia. Such an appointment would be a recognition of the excellent service that Sir Mellis has rendered to the State over so many years. He has carried out the very important duties of Lieutenant-Governor on

numerous occasions, and in so doing he has shown his ability and commanded the respect of all people.

I join with other members in offering my hearty congratulations to Sir Cecil Hincks (Minister of Lands) and his lady on the very high honour conferred on him. Sir Cecil Hincks lives at Largs Bay, which is in my electorate, and I know the respect he commands there. It was indeed a fitting tribute to him to be so recognized. Sir Cecil and his lady are a very fine couple, and I wish them well in their future activities.

I refer now to the sad passing of Mr. George Hambour, the former member for Light. Other members have extolled his virtues in no uncertain manner, and I endorse those sentiments. He was a very courageous man; he put some life into this House and entertained us, and apart from that he made very concrete suggestions to this Parliament. We are all the poorer for the passing of such a very fine gentleman, and I offer my respects and condolences to his wife and family.

The member for Gouger, who has just resumed his seat, disappointed me sadly. When he came to this place I was convinced beyond any doubt that he was a man who had a wonderful future in politics. However, he disproved that today when he made no contribution which could be deemed worthwhile. I heard nothing enunciated by the honourable member concerning his own district of Gouger, and he has therefore given no service to the people he claims to represent. I think it is tragic that he should have spent most of his time condemning the Opposition.

Mr. Corcoran—With hostile criticism.

Mr. TAPPING—Yes. I thought the reason for his attack was that next Saturday we have a by-election in the district of Light. The Opposition is not concerned about the outcome in Light; its members are doing their best to put forward the Party policy, and as democrats they are going to stand by the judgment of the people. I think that is a fair view, and I also think that for a member to spend most of his time in this debate denouncing the Australian Labor Party instead of offering something tangible is an unfair approach. The honourable member produced figures, with much confidence, concerning the position in the district of Light. He is prepared to accept the figures given in the *News* concerning the number of people who voted at the last election. However, those figures are not accurate, and if the honourable member can find the time to go to the Parlia-

mentary Library and check those figures he will realize that the statement I am about to make is founded on fact. At the last election 6,301 people in Light had the right to exercise the franchise, and on this occasion there are 6,211, a decrease of 90. The honourable member tried to bolster up his Government's case by arguing that decentralization was taking place. I think he said that 11 or 12 houses had been built at Kapunda in the last three years, but I point out that there could have been demolitions.

Mr. Hall—I said that 22 houses had been built at Kapunda.

Mr. TAPPING—The actual position is that the number of electors has decreased by 90, which shows a retrograde position.

Mr. O'Halloran—They are official figures.

Mr. TAPPING—Yes, from the official returns of the Electoral Department. The honourable member's speech was hardly worthwhile replying to, but I thought I should take this opportunity of making it known that he made a very grave error.

I think all members will agree that the article in today's *Advertiser* concerning land speculation discloses a rather tragic position in this country. The article points to the fact that speculators in this State—and no doubt other States, too—are more concerned with profit than building homes, a fact that has been evident in South Australia now for years. People may ask what the solution is. My reply is that during the war we had more stability when we had control over land sales. It seems that this Government is not prepared to control the price of land, and the position is going from bad to worse and having many repercussions on the economy of this State.

Inflated land values are making it very difficult for home builders. Young people desiring to build a home today have to pay between £900 and £1,000 for a block of land, and it is therefore becoming almost impossible for them to face up to a contract which is going to be so burdensome. The result of these inflated land values is that council rates are also reacting on the people. Councils are guided in most cases by land values and, consequently, when councils determine the rates each July increases are applied. I know of people on Semaphore Road paying rates of £22 6s. a year on a house on a block 38ft. 6in. by 140ft. With each increase in land values—fictitious values—the council rates are increased, and the burden becomes even greater upon the people who are trying to buy or who have already bought a house.

I appeal to the Government to take some action to prevent this land speculation. The figures are alarming, because they show that 40,000 allotments have been or will be sold in 12 months, whereas our building activity in this State represents only about 9,000 homes a year. That indicates that eventually somebody will suffer. People will be holding blocks of land that will not be built on, and in the years to come, after paying so much in rates, instead of being a sound speculation it will be just the reverse. True, people should visualize this type of thing and not buy, but with high-pressure salesmen in the land business we find that people are willing to buy; then when they find their rates are so high they will try to sell the land, and, if they cannot sell and have to hold it for a number of years, they will discover that it is a losing proposition. We should protect the people in this State and introduce legislation to control land sales. During the last war the Prices Department determined the fair value of each block, and therefore both the buyer and seller were protected. I appeal to the Government to act in this matter.

Legislation dealing with hire-purchase business was before the House last year and it is expected that it will be brought forward again this session. I have previously referred to the bad practices adopted by hire-purchase companies. There was an instance at Albert Park where a Kelvinator was being purchased on hire-purchase. The woman got behind in her payments because of the ill-health of her husband, and representatives of the company came to the house while she was out, forced open the door, and took away the Kelvinator. I was amazed that such a thing could happen in South Australia. I had always thought that even a policeman needed a warrant to enter premises, but under clause 7 of the hire-purchase contract the company had the right to force and enter in order to repossess. That is a sorry state of affairs in a land that is regarded as democratic. I was amazed to read last year, during my absence from the House through illness, that a provision in the Bill permitted this, but it would be a very retrograde step to accept it. A second case brought to my notice about a month ago was worse than the other. A lady boarding at Semaphore had bought a radiogram on hire-purchase. She went to a country district to live for a time and got behind with her payments. The company concerned used the same clause to force and enter the premises to repossess the radiogram. This case was different from the other because the lady was

only boarding, and the representatives of the company forced and entered the residence of another person. The Bill makes it abundantly clear that the hire-purchase companies have the right to do this, but I hope Parliament will seriously consider the provision and delete it from the Bill, because it is unfair. Some people cannot keep up the payments because of illness and other things, and to use a provision like that is most undemocratic.

Recently, because of illness, I resigned from the Public Works Committee. I pay a tribute to the members of that committee for the work that they perform so zealously. Following on my observations over seven years I can say definitely that it is a committee completely divorced from politics, and that it functions with benefit to the State. I sat under two chairmen, first the late Mr. Arthur Christian and then Mr. Shannon. Mr. Christian was an able chairman, but Mr. Shannon is as good, and he does much work in making himself conversant with the matters before the committee. Any committee that benefits the State so greatly as does the Public Works Committee must be a good one indeed. It was a severe wrench for me to act on doctor's orders and resign.

One of our great problems today is child delinquency. It is causing much concern and it is regrettable that it occurs mostly in industrial areas. It is our duty as Parliamentarians to do all we can to give a lead in trying to stop the delinquency that is so prevalent. In a small way I have studied it in my district, particularly at Osborne, and I have found that much of it is due to the wife having to work to supplement the family income in order to pay the many bills. I am referring particularly to the families where the husband is on the basic wage. It is said that some of the trouble is due to such things as washing machines being bought on time payment, but they are essential and should be in every house. The income of these families is not sufficient to meet the demands made on it, with the result that the wife has to do part-time or full-time work. Often this results in the children coming home from school when the parents are not there. We should foster youth clubs, particularly in industrial areas, and consider the adoption of a scheme on a Federal basis to supplement the income of the home where the wife has to go out to work. There should be some form of endowment to the wife instead of her having to take on this work. We might ask where the money will come from, but for *bona fide* purposes we can always find the needed money. This is a matter that is dear to our hearts.

Boys who have attended these clubs have had their morals improved and become better citizens. However, youth clubs need money for building purposes or for paying rent, and then there are the expenses incurred in providing equipment. If we can keep the boys and girls interested and active it will pay dividends in later years.

I come now to the matter of Sunday sport. I feel, with other members, that we should not have a Continental Sunday, but we should move with the times. What happened 50 or 60 years ago should not apply today. I can remember that about 50 years ago the Semaphore beach had a dividing line so that males would bathe on one side of it and females on the other. In those days mixed bathing was not countenanced. As the years went by it was found that this dividing line was unnecessary, and now mixed bathing takes place without any apparent adverse results. More consideration should be given to having Sunday sport if it will occupy the minds of our young people. Some weeks ago we read in the press that Tommy Steele, the famous English singer, decided to take part in a soccer match with the Edinburgh Club one Sunday afternoon, but before the game ended the police intervened because a collection had been taken up in aid of a local hospital. Because of our outmoded and antiquated regulations the collection was not completed. We must consider this matter realistically. I realize that we cannot have a Continental Sunday and that we must draw the line somewhere, but if football or soccer matches were permitted, entertainment would be provided for spectators and the contestants would be kept out of mischief and improved physically. The Government should consider issuing permits in certain cases. For years hospital finances have been affected because our laws forbid large outdoor functions on Sundays.

I congratulate the member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) on his excellent speech in moving this motion. Naturally I do not agree with all he said, but his mode of delivery and the thought behind his remarks merit commendation. I cannot give the seconder of the motion (Mr. Dunnage) the same marks, although he was most entertaining and we did not have to pay amusement tax.

In South Australia we are most concerned about our tourist trade. Since Mr. Pollnitz

took office—and I do not cast any aspersions upon his predecessor—our tourist trade has undoubtedly improved, and he and his officers are to be congratulated. However, I believe that much more can be done. On a previous occasion I referred to the distinct possibilities of Outer Harbour as a pleasure resort, and those members who have visited Outer Harbour on Sundays would have observed the thousands of persons watching the overseas liners and the yachts. The Harbors Board is to be congratulated on the way Outer Harbour is laid out. Over the years trees have been planted to provide shade in the summer. If the Railways Department co-operated by offering excursion fares on Sundays and public holidays I believe its revenue would be more buoyant and its annual deficit not so great. Rail transport, with the advent of diesels, is comfortable and speedy and we should do everything possible to induce increased passenger traffic. Outer Harbour has much to offer as a pleasure resort: fishing and swimming, and boats for hire.

I pay a tribute to the Leader of the Opposition who, as usual, delivered a fine oration, parts of which were appreciated by Government members. The Leader always presents a constructive case. It was pleasing this afternoon to hear the member for Torrens refer to Mr. Loveday's contribution to the debate. In his short term in this House Mr. Loveday has revealed outstanding ability and has proved that he has the interests of the State at heart. I believe he is playing an important part in aiding the State's progress. The member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) yesterday made an excellent contribution to the debate. He has revealed his ability on many occasions and yesterday he delivered one of the best speeches we have heard here.

Mr. Millhouse—Who did?

Mr. TAPPING—The member for Enfield. I thought the member for Mitcham appreciated it because he listened with rapt attention, although possibly he did not agree with it. I support the motion.

Mr. HARDING secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.37 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, April 21, at 2 p.m.