

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.**

Wednesday, August 10, 1960.

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

**QUESTIONS.****LICENSING OF ELECTRICIANS.**

Mr. O'HALLORAN—At the recent annual convention of the South Australian Branch of the Australian Labor Party the licensing of electricians was discussed and, although it was known that new installations were subject to approval by the Electricity Trust, it was felt that danger did exist and, in fact, accidents with serious consequences had taken place as the result of unqualified people tinkering with installations after completion. It was pointed out that South Australia was the only State that had not some kind of control over the licensing of electricians and, in view of the potential dangers that existed from the actions of unqualified people, it was suggested that I take up with the Government the question of introducing legislation to provide for a proper system of licensing. Will the Premier consider the matter and let me have a reply later?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—This matter has been examined on a number of occasions, and previous decisions of Cabinet have been that a law of the nature of that which the Leader suggested was not essential. The reason for those decisions was that all installations in this State have to be approved by the Electricity Trust before they are connected and also, although some people do not remember this, all additions to installations must be approved by the trust. I feel that the attention of the public might well be drawn to the fact that many people no doubt prejudice their insurance policies by putting in extensions and alterations that are not approved by the trust; these are not lawful and may, I believe, be disputed under the terms and conditions applied by insurance companies. Coming back to the Leader's question, installations, both primary and secondary, have always had to be approved by the trust so that they would comply with the law. Under those circumstances, the safeguard to the householder, which was considered to be essential and which was, I understand, mainly the reason for the legislation elsewhere, was not considered necessary in this State. The accident rate over a period has, I think, confirmed this. However, the Leader has raised the question and I shall

certainly have it thoroughly examined, place it before Cabinet, and advise the Leader in due course.

**CIVIL DEFENCE.**

Mr. COURCE—Recently the Premier attended a meeting on civil defence held in Canberra at the same time as the Loan Council meeting. In reply to questions previously asked by me the Premier has indicated the difficulties associated with this matter, but, arising out of the conference, I should like the Premier to state whether further recommendations were made by the Commonwealth and the States on this matter and whether any indication has been given of the personnel to be appointed in this State. If the Premier cannot answer now, will he make a statement later?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The conference I attended in Canberra was the continuation of a previous conference at which the Chief of the General Staff gave an appreciation of what action the General Staff considered would be necessary for Australia to take. That matter was fully discussed. The conference obviously had no way of disputing, nor did it desire to dispute, the conclusions of the officers of the Defence Forces and, as a result of those discussions, it was arranged that a senior officer of the Commonwealth would visit each State with regard to the type of organization to be set up in each State. It was understood at the first conference that the Commonwealth would be responsible for a considerable amount of the organization and staff to be set up. At the second conference, which took place after the visits of the officers to each State, the Commonwealth withdrew from any financial obligation and, as far as I can understand, the Commonwealth's decision at the moment is that financial support will not be given to setting up additional civil defence organizations. However, the States made it clear that they believed the Commonwealth also had an obligation in this matter, and I believe it has been referred back to the Commonwealth Cabinet. As far as South Australia is concerned—and I think this applies to every other State except possibly New South Wales, which may have gone somewhat further—the Government indicated at the conference that it was prepared to take the responsibility for the establishment of a Civil Defence Commissioner with the necessary office accommodation and ancillary personnel to assist him. It also understood that all Government instrumentalities would co-operate in the establishment of a civil

defence corps, without any cost to the Commonwealth, except in the case of some specialized equipment which might be recommended by the Commonwealth as being necessary and which would not be available to the States in any circumstances except through military organizations.

All the States have agreed to the establishment of a Civil Defence Commissioner and to make their own State organizations available without expense to the Commonwealth, but they have all insisted that defence is a Commonwealth obligation and that anything that extends beyond what might be regarded as normal civil activities should be a financial obligation on the Commonwealth. That matter is at present before the Commonwealth Cabinet. One additional important point is that it is not very good policy, in my opinion, to set up a civil defence organization unless the objectives to be reached by that organization can be understood and achieved, and at present the State has a very great difficulty in knowing, if it establishes a civil defence organization, what work it would be able to undertake or what work it is essential to undertake. South Australia and, I believe, the other States could easily establish a large voluntary organization, but a State obviously requires positive grounds upon which it can act and upon which it can train for things it should be essential for it to do. With the rapidly changing world conditions as far as military matters are concerned, I doubt if any authority can clearly outline what are useful things for civil defence organizations to undertake. Everybody knows of one or two obvious things, but I doubt whether any clear line can be given regarding the big problem.

New South Wales is slightly out of line with the other Australian States in this matter. The New South Wales Government went to much expense and trouble to try to set up a civil defence organization. At the outset I do not believe it got very much encouragement from the Commonwealth authorities, but it has set up an organization that embodies not only State activities but also local activities, and I believe that Government has conscientiously tried to organize some activities there. However, I believe it has come up against the very problem I have mentioned, namely, that it is difficult indeed to know what the work is to which it should usefully attend. I believe that is the first problem we in Australia have to meet—to decide what it is we should do. I do not believe the secondary factor of

getting the volunteers and the organization is going to be difficult if a clear line of policy is defined for us.

#### MITCHELL PARK BOYS TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked recently regarding the Mitchell Park boys technical high school?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The Director, Public Buildings Department, states that the work for which tenders have been called includes two combined woodwork and metal-work craft centres.

#### STOPPING OF VEHICLES.

Mr. HEASLIP—I have received complaints from country people who, when travelling to Adelaide in their trucks on highway number 1, have been accosted by apparently ordinary civilian people without a uniform, badge or card of authority, and told that they must have their trucks weighed. Can the Premier, representing the Minister of Roads, say whether that is so and whether those people who have evidently got authority to take this action could have some badge of authority, a card or other means of identification when they demand that trucks be taken to weighbridges?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I think that is a reasonable request, and I will have it examined and see if it can be complied with.

#### DESICCATED COCONUT

Mr. HUTCHENS—Last night's *News* reported that a quantity of desiccated coconut had been landed in Adelaide on July 26 and 27 and that one brand had been tested and found to be unfit for human consumption. The report also stated that Dr. Dwyer said that one lot of coconut was contaminated with a germ of the dysentery group and that another lot was being tested. I feel that the action of one wholesale company in having attention drawn to what it considered might be unsatisfactory supplies in its possession is generally appreciated. Can the Premier, representing the Minister of Health, say whether an investigation has been made, and can he give an assurance that none of this coconut has been made available to the public?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The desiccated coconut, because of the form in which it is produced and the treatment to which it is subjected in preparation for export, is a food that has been closely watched by the Health Department over a number of years.

This is not the first time we have had some difficulty concerning the importation of desiccated coconut that has been regarded by the health authorities as unfit for human consumption. They have been particularly active in taking samples of importations and checking them before they allow distribution. As soon as coconut is found to be unfit for consumption, appropriate steps are taken. I will direct the honourable member's question to the Minister of Health and find out what form the control takes when a foodstuff is condemned to see that it does not go into circulation. I will find out what orders are issued in those circumstances, and how they are policed.

#### VICTOR HARBOUR RAIL SERVICE.

Mr. JENKINS—At the request of the Port Elliot District Council, I was asked to make representations to the Minister of Railways to run a faster train service from Adelaide to Victor Harbour and return, and the Corporation of Victor Harbour requested that, if this faster train service operated, the timetable should be altered to certain times specified. The Minister's reply was:—

The conversion of the railcars for the Victor Harbour service will be completed early next year, and when the amended service is introduced with the new timetable, in May or June of 1960, an endeavour will be made to meet the wishes of the corporation in regard to departure times from Adelaide and Victor Harbour.

When will the faster train service operate and when will there be an alteration in the timetable?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will get a report for the honourable member.

#### GEORGE'S CORNER.

Mr. RICHES—A number of accidents have occurred near Port Pirie, at a place called George's Corner. They have been occasioned by semi-trailers and other vehicles finding difficulty in negotiating a very difficult and awkward corner. On behalf of those who have approached me, I should like to explain that we fully appreciate the department's action in so designing the corner as to make cross traffic from Nelshaby and Napperby reasonably safe. The accidents, with possibly one exception, have not been occasioned by collision but every month, at least for the last three or four months, there has been an accident at this corner. I asked earlier that signs be placed at each side of the corner to warn motorists against speeding around the corner. Signs are there indicating the route of the road but

there is no adequate warning sign against taking that corner at speed. Much publicity has been given to the need for this warning sign. Will the Minister again take up with the department the necessity of having adequate warning signs placed at that corner?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will have the honourable member's suggestion investigated.

#### FLORA AND FAUNA RESERVE.

Mr. BOCKELBERG—On several occasions I have raised the matter of a flora and fauna reserve on Eyre Peninsula. Would it be possible for an exchange of inferior land to be made for flora and fauna as has been done on Kangaroo Island? The rough country on Eyre Peninsula would grow the same kind of trees and breed the same kind of vermin. Therefore, could an exchange of good land for bad land be made? If that could be done, many settlers on Eyre Peninsula would be happy.

The Hon. Sir CECIL HINCKS—I will have the matter investigated and advise the honourable member.

#### AUSTRALIAN JUNIOR ENCYCLOPAEDIA.

Mr. JENNINGS—My question concerns the rather nefarious activities of door-to-door book salesmen. Honourable members will recall that last year, following questions by several members, there were criticisms of the tactics adopted by some firms and salesmen. It seems that, following that, there was rather a lull in activities, but now there appears to have been a resurgence of those activities, and the same tactics have been adopted in many cases. Also, a number of summonses are being issued at the moment for non-payment for books, even though the books have been returned.

My question particularly concerns an organization that has the effrontery to call itself the Australian Education Foundation. It is selling a book called the *Australian Junior Encyclopaedia* for £13, or £14 on an extended payment plan. This was very closely examined by Mr. Mares of the Department of English at the Adelaide University, and he has pointed out some interesting features of it. He said that this *Australian Junior Encyclopaedia* was first published in 1951, in two volumes, priced at £7 7s. A leading Adelaide bookseller said that a few years ago he was selling the remainder at 75s. the set. It seems the copyright was bought by the Australian Education Foundation, and the 1960 edition appears to have been reset,

though for the most part it follows the layout and preserves the pagination of the 1951 edition almost exactly, except for the insertion of some meagre new items.

Examination of the new items presents some obvious anomalies. Adelaide is given two different population figures—438,500 in the text and 514,000 under a photograph. According to the 1959 *Commonwealth Year Book* the 1958 population was 548,000. A picture of the 1960 Holden sedan goes with a text that obviously belongs to the 1958 Holden sedan. The Rev. B. P. Robin is still Bishop of Adelaide, and Dr. Mowll still Primate of Australia. The 1960 edition knows of only six Australian universities outside Canberra, has never heard of the Murray Report, and says that State Universities do not get money from the Commonwealth Government. The account of Australian literature obviously ends with the immediate postwar period, and appears to be unchanged from the 1951 edition. The Australian theatre does not get a mention. The Elizabethan Theatre Trust is not mentioned. Similarly, the articles on architecture and the arts appear to be unchanged from the first edition. The State's symphony orchestra is not mentioned, but an appearance of up-to-date-ness is given to the former by substituting a plate of the design for Sydney's new opera house for an earlier illustration.

One of Adelaide's most eminent scholars, who contributed several articles to the first edition and whose name is pointed to as an indication of the responsibility of the work, knows nothing about a revised edition and is distressed about the manner in which it is being sold. Is there anything further to be done or can any further action be taken to protect the public from being taken in by what is obviously such a comparatively worthless set of books as these?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—As a result of prominence given to previous questions by several members of the House and my replies to them, and also as a result of very effective work done on my behalf by the Deputy Director of Education, Mr. Griggs, I thought that the position had been remedied and there was at least the lull to which the honourable member has referred; but apparently there has been the resurgence that he has mentioned. I shall be pleased to re-examine the whole position and take whatever steps I think fit when advised of the present position. I will let the honourable member and the House know in due course.

#### SOUTH PARA RESERVOIR.

Mr. LAUCKE—Has the Minister of Works the report that he promised regarding the present holding of the South Para reservoir?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Yes. I ascertained that the holding of the South Para reservoir at 8 a.m. today was 4,059,000,000gall. It may be of interest to members if I report on the state of reservoirs generally and I have information as to the position as at August 8. In the metropolitan system, which comprises Mount Bold, Happy Valley, Hope Valley, Thorndon Park and Millbrook reservoirs, the total storage capacity is 14,020,000,000gall. and the actual quantity held is 14,044,000,000gall., indicating that one or two reservoirs are overfull and are running over their spillways. In the country the position is not so good. The total storage capacity of the country reservoirs, which include Beetaloo, Bundaleer, Baroota, Tod River, Barossa, South Para and Warren reservoirs, is 18,361,000,000gall. and the storage is 10,173,000,000gall. Beetaloo reservoir is two-thirds full; Bundaleer and Baroota are almost full; Tod River holds less than half—965,000,000gall. as against 2,495,000,000; South Para, as I have already said, is holding about 4,000,000,000gall. as against a capacity of 9,880,000,000gall.; and the Warren reservoir is full. It is interesting to compare the present figures with the 1959 figures. At this time last year the total holding in country and metropolitan reservoirs was 10,699,000,000gall., compared with 24,217,000,000gall. at present, so that we are 13,518,000,000gall. better off now. South Para reservoir is gaining at the rate of 60,000,000 to 65,000,000gall. a day and, because the Warren reservoir is full, it is anticipated that that intake will continue for some time, to a greater or lesser extent depending on what rain falls in the catchment area.

#### FINDON HIGH SCHOOL ADDITIONAL LAND.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Has the Minister of Education any information about the negotiations between the Education Department and the Woodville Corporation concerning the use of Matheson Reserve by the Findon high school?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Negotiations have been in progress for some considerable time between the Education Department and the Woodville Corporation for the joint development and use of the corporation's Matheson Reserve which adjoins the Findon high school. This reserve consists of approximately five acres. Last week Cabinet approved of the

scheme negotiated between the department and the corporation, and the corporation has been advised of this approval.

The scheme provides that:—(a) The Government will reimburse the corporation to the extent of 50 per cent of the purchase price of land; (b) the Government will reimburse the corporation to the extent of half the cost of fencing at present erected; (c) the cost of developing, levelling and grading the land as a recreation area and any additional fencing required will be borne equally by the Government and the corporation; (d) in return for the foregoing, the students of the Findon high school will have the use of the grounds from 8.30 a.m. to 5 p.m. on week days and up to 12 noon on Saturdays, with a proviso that on special occasions, and by mutual arrangement, the grounds may be used by either party outside the normal hours, and that in no case will the consent of either party to this latter arrangement be capriciously or unreasonably withheld.

This is a very happy conclusion of an arrangement whereby the local governing authority and the Education Department combine to obtain and develop a recreation ground for the joint use of the school children and of the local community which the school serves.

#### FENCING WIRE SUPPLIES.

Mr. HARDING—Recently primary producers have informed me that they are having difficulty in obtaining fencing wire and other steel products. Some fencing wire they have had to use would have been more useful for industrial purposes. At present they are forced to use Japanese wire. Can the Premier indicate the reasons for the present shortage?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have been somewhat concerned that supplies of certain steel products have not been freely available in South Australia in the last few weeks. I have inquired and have ascertained that one large shipment of steel products for South Australia has been held up in New South Wales because of industrial unrest. That is one reason for the present shortage.

#### IRON BARON ROAD DEVIATIONS.

Mr. LOVEDAY—Can the Minister of Works say whether the Engineer-in-Chief has yet reported on the proposed construction of deviations along sections of the roads used by vehicles travelling between Whyalla and Iron Baron and between Iron Baron and the southern end of the Middleback Range?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I do not know whether the report has been prepared, but I will bring the question to the notice of the Engineer-in-Chief and secure information.

#### SCHOOL AMENITIES.

Mr. HALL—I have been approached by the member of a primary school committee in my electorate who is rather concerned with some of the amenities that have been supplied to his school. One of the items supplied was a bird bath, which has been placed in a suitable position in the yard, but nothing can be done to induce the birds to bathe therein. I do not know whether the birds do not know about bathing or whether they choose to ignore the latest inventions of modern man. What could be termed a mouse house, for housing white mice, has also been supplied, but this has never been stocked with white mice. I do not know whether this particular part of my question should be directed to the Minister of Education, the Minister of Agriculture, or Minister of Housing. However, my informant advises me that over £30,000 has been spent on this type of amenity and, whilst he does not criticise such expenditure on a State-wide basis, he considers the money has been wasted at his school. Can the Minister of Education say whether this particular programme has been successful?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I must confess that I am somewhat intrigued by this information from this anonymous informant concerning some unnamed school. If the honourable member will do me the courtesy of supplying me with some factual information I shall be only too pleased to comment on it.

#### NORWOOD HIGH SCHOOL BOOK ALLOWANCES.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Earlier this session I drew the attention of the Minister of Education to the fact that the repayment of moneys for school book allowances in the Norwood high school seemed somewhat delayed and the Minister undertook then to examine the position. The person who approached me at that time finally received his payment in respect of the school book allowance in June of this year. Will the Minister of Education explain the procedure for getting the school book refund and state why there seems to be such a lengthy period—from the beginning of the school year until June—before getting the refunds?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—The honourable member did good not only for himself and for the person who made the representations to him, but for many thousands of others as

well, as scores of investigations have been made as a result of the explanation and question. I found there were long delays in making these refunds due to a variety of causes, one of which was lack of staff in that particular branch, and another of which was delays from some of the schools themselves which had not availed themselves of opportunities for obtaining refunds. At the same time I think there is a weakness in the system generally and, as a result, I hope to be able to submit soon to Cabinet recommendations for a complete revision of the system, which I think will be beneficial to the community at large.

#### ELECTRICITY POLES ON PRIVATE PROPERTY.

Mr. BYWATERS—I was recently approached by a constituent who desired to install a fairly large irrigation system on his property. Needing extra finance, he went to the bank manager and mentioned in the course of stating his requirements that he would need to have two extra poles placed on his property, and that the Electricity Trust intended to charge him £100. The bank manager said he had heard a broadcast by the Premier stating that in future these poles would be erected by the trust free of charge. I took up this matter with the trust and was informed that it knew nothing of this matter. It would appear to me that perhaps the bank manager did not hear the broadcast correctly. To clear up this matter, as it affects many of my constituents and those of other country members as well, would the Premier clarify the position relating to any statement he made recently by way of a broadcast on the policy of the trust for irrigated areas?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have not made any comment at all relating to the erection of poles for installations and am frankly at a loss to understand how the bank manager could have construed any of my remarks on this matter in that way. It may possibly be that some remarks made a considerable time ago led to his error. Those remarks were made in connection with country installations and were based on a new departure in policy by the trust regarding the surcharge on country installations. For many years a surcharge was made for the electricity used to pay for any installation costs, which were heavy in country areas. At my request this matter was examined by the trust. I pointed out that an ordinary installation in the metropolitan area involved a certain cost to the trust. As a result of those representations all

country installations involving a surcharge are now credited with the normal cost of any normal installation in the metropolitan area. I believe that a normal extension costs about £300, which is carried by the trust in the ordinary way. Country schemes are now given the benefit of the deduction of a similar amount before the surcharge is required. I will set out precisely what was involved in that alteration of policy, but it certainly did not affect private installations on private property, the number of poles involved, or the cost of the poles. Since the trust took over, as far as I know the position has always been that, whereas the trust will make installations to the boundary of a private property, installations inside a property have always been the responsibility of the person receiving the service.

#### MOUNT BARKER PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. SHANNON—Recently I was invited by the chairman of the school committee (Mr. Crompton) and the chairwoman of the welfare club (Mrs. Carr) to visit Mount Barker primary school when the school was actually at work to see the conditions under which the children were operating in the old school on the main Adelaide Road. I did not need much convincing that the classrooms, which were of various sizes, were all seriously overcrowded. The children were sitting with their backs resting on the walls and there was not enough room on the side seats because the desks were close to the walls. In all, it was not a good position for children to be in, especially as Mount Barker is one of the noted cold spots of the State, and walls have a habit of reacting to heat and cold. There is a site on the southern side on which a new portable classroom has been erected for certain grades. The school committee and the welfare club requested the department to proceed with what the people in Mount Barker believe to be the original plan of building a new primary school on the new site which is, I think, of 10 acres, and to convert the old school to a purpose for which I believe it could be very well converted, such as adult education or child welfare work. As far as I can see there is no playing area, as the whole of the area is paved and is occupied by buildings. Will the Minister of Education state whether there is any school planned for the coming year? If not, will he state how long it will be before a new school is planned?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I cannot give any assurance on when the proposal for a new

school can be brought into our programme, but I agree with the honourable member that this is one of the older types of school of which I am not very proud and that there is a lack of playing space. I hope we will be able to do somewhat as the honourable member has suggested and make good use of the proper site for the new school. As soon as I am able I will make an announcement. The honourable member spoke of the unfortunate position of so many children with their backs to the wall: so many requests are made to me concerning educational facilities, or their lack, that my back seems perpetually against the wall, but I shall endeavour to comply with this request in conjunction with numerous others and announce a decision as soon as possible.

#### DOCTORS' FEES.

Mr. TAPPING—My question relates to persons apprehended by the police when driving a vehicle while affected by alcohol. I noticed in the press recently that in a case before Mr. Mills, S.M., the police doctor claimed £4 14s. 6d. for the usual examination and mileage. The magistrate eventually reduced the fee to £3 3s. and stated that such charges were too high. He also said that his medico would call at 2 a.m. for only 30s. Further, in the Port Adelaide Police Court a few days afterwards Mr. Downey, S.M., also queried a claim for £3 3s., implying that it was too high for the five minutes' work involved. In view of those circumstances, will the Minister of Education take up this matter with his colleague in another place to see if some reasonable fee can be arrived at between the police doctor and the Police Department?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Yes. If I understood the position correctly from what I have read in the press from time to time, it was not only the question of the alleged excessive fee but the type of evidence tendered by the doctor. I think the question concerns not only the Attorney-General but the Chief Secretary, and I shall be pleased to place it before both my colleagues and bring down a reply.

#### TEACHER TRAINING.

Mr. CLARK—An extract from an editorial in the *South Australian Teachers' Journal* by Mr. E. W. Golding, the President of the South Australian Institute of Teachers, states:—

Many of our teachers have been trained very long ago, while others have been taken into the service after a training insufficient for the

requirements of a modern education. Let's whisper it—some have not been trained at all. And it is not their fault, for, in a period of great difficulty, teachers have to be found and found quickly. They, too, require a face-lift—in this case, a professional face-lift. Large numbers of them realize it and are doing something about it. Many are taking subjects at various levels, though it is becoming more difficult to do so successfully. Others have enrolled for the far too few courses of instruction made available by the department.

Later in the editorial Mr. Golding continues:—

Large numbers of teachers realize the need for In Service Training of greater proportions and greater intensity than anything yet presented by the department. . . . During my recent visit to Indonesia, I discovered that the Government there, faced with a similar problem, had instituted a programme of In Service training which they claimed was the most far-reaching in the world. I was interested to find that teachers who had had some experience were being freed, on full pay, for periods of up to a year at a time, to improve their educational knowledge and to study professional methods.

Can the Minister of Education say, firstly, whether it would be possible to hold more courses of instruction or schools of method, as they were called in my day, and, secondly, whether the scheme mentioned by Mr. Golding as practised in Indonesia could be investigated to see if such a scheme would be practicable in South Australia?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—In answer to the first question, it is possible for more such schools to be held, and more of them will be held. We have a very able and brilliant man in Mr. A. W. Jones, the recently appointed Superintendent of Recruiting and Training, who is doing a magnificent job in both fields. Mr. Jones held a very successful meeting at the Wattle Park Teachers Training College some time back on in service training there, a meeting which I opened. He proposes more, longer, and much more ambitious schools, and I am sure they will be highly successful. I shall be only too pleased to have Mr. Golding's suggestion examined and, if feasible, implemented. I have not had time to read the article but I shall be very pleased to do so. I think the position generally will be gradually, if not quickly, remedied, for I think the old order is changing, yielding place to the new. Hundreds and hundreds of very able young men and women are coming into the training service; they will be highly qualified academically, and I hope in the foreseeable future that we will be able to be selective in the teachers we employ and in the young people who are coming into our training colleges.

## ROBERTSTOWN PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. NICHOLSON—I understand that there are available blocks of land adjacent to the Robertstown primary school. Has the Minister of Education any knowledge of negotiations between the department and the landholders for the purchase of that land, and can he say what stage those negotiations have reached?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I regret that on the spur of the moment I cannot recollect whether details of any negotiations have yet reached my table, but I shall be only too pleased to investigate and endeavour to expedite the negotiations, bring them to a successful conclusion, and let the honourable member and all interested parties know.

## SEWERAGE REGULATIONS.

Mr. RALSTON—During previous sessions of Parliament several questions were asked regarding the proposed sewerage regulations, and the information generally given was that they were being considered by the various authorities, departmental and otherwise. Can the Minister of Works say when the copies of the sewerage regulations will be available?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I will check on the matter again and give the honourable member a further reply tomorrow.

## MINNIPA BERTH, PORT LINCOLN.

Mr. RYAN—Will the Minister of Marine ascertain and advise the total expenditure on what is known as the Minnipa Berth at Port Lincoln?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I presume the honourable member refers to the berth that was created at the new hard standing with the shed adjoining. If that cost can be segregated from the total cost of the project at Port Lincoln I shall be pleased to provide that information for the honourable member. I do not know whether that can be segregated as a separate item from the overall wharf improvement programme which, as the honourable member may know, cost about £1,250,000.

## PENSIONERS' HOSPITAL CHARGES.

Mr. HUGHES—As the ownership of a car has no property value in the granting of a pension, will the Premier consider taking steps to free pensioner patients in Government hospitals who depend entirely upon their pension as income and are members of an approved hospital insurance scheme from having to pay an additional amount because of the ownership of a car?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will have that question examined and give the honourable member a reply tomorrow.

## URANIUM OXIDE CONTRACT.

Mr. McKEE—In view of the expiration in 1962 of our contract to supply America with uranium oxide, the men employed in this industry are becoming concerned regarding their future employment. Can the Premier say whether this contract is likely to be renewed? If that is not likely, can he indicate the future of the uranium industry in South Australia?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The contract with the Combined Development Agency was initially entered into by the agency for uranium for defence purposes. It is common knowledge throughout the world today that the stocks of uranium for defence purposes have now been fully procured, and I do not believe that the agency is entering into any additional contracts with any authority anywhere. In those circumstances the agency is not likely to renew the contract. In fact, every indication is that it is not renewing any contract anywhere, because its purpose has been fulfilled. The second question is very speculative and at this stage I cannot reply to it.

## SALT.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Three miles south-east of Terowie there is a salt lake known as Hiles Lagoon. According to local residents, this lagoon possesses salt with some peculiar qualities. For instance, when it was harvested for stock purposes, it killed the sheep that were dosed with it. Has the Mines Department investigated this occurrence to see whether the salt has any peculiar economic value, and, if it has not, at some convenient time would it conduct such an investigation?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes.

## ROAD SAFETY.

Mr. LAUCKE—There is a matter in connection with road safety to which I should like to draw the attention of the Premier as Acting Minister of Roads. The practice of parking heavy transports near the brows of hills on highways presents a major hazard to other traffic which, keeping correctly to the left of the road whilst passing over a hillock, is suddenly confronted with a parked vehicle causing it to swing out to the right to pass the transport. This inevitably leads to serious accidents. Will consideration be given to introducing an amendment to prohibit the parking of transports within a given distance of the brows of hills on highways?



The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will have that matter referred to the State Traffic Committee.

Mr. SHANNON—Recently, in discussions with a group of people interested in the problem of road accidents, it was represented to me that two things might be helpful in reducing the road toll. The first relates to the question asked by the honourable member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke), which I thoroughly endorse, about the parking of heavy transports at inappropriate points on highways. The suggestions made fall into two categories. The first is that it should be made an offence to park a motor vehicle anywhere on a roadway, be it a district road, a highway, or a street, without parking lights after the recognized hour for lighting up. The second is that an appropriate authority—and it is suggested that that might be the Traffic Division of the Police Department—have power to recommend areas where low-beam driving shall be obligatory. Everybody who uses the hills and lives there knows the problem of approaching cars with high beams, especially over some of our camel-backs. There is no need for it. I have promised to take up the matter here and suggest that the Premier secure some expert advice on these two problems.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The honourable member's questions involve one or two important questions of policy which will be embodied in the amendments coming before the House soon. I am not pretending that I can say definitely that I have the complete answer to all the traffic problems, but I think these two suggestions are generally commended by people who know about traffic conditions and hazards. The first is that there shall be an authority—this has been asked for by the Royal Automobile Association and many other people—that will be predominant so far as road traffic matters are concerned, particularly dealing with the arguments about traffic engineering, roundabouts and other matters. At present we have many authorities each controlling certain things.

It is proposed to have a committee of three people who, to all intents and purposes, would be the advisory body so far as "Stop" signs and miscellaneous matters were concerned. The three persons who have been considered by the Government would be the Commissioner of Highways and the Commissioner of Police (or their representatives), and some other competent authority who might be regarded as also representing the local governing authorities. This is in accordance with the procedure adopted in other parts of the world, and I

think it is necessary if we are to have co-ordination between the various road traffic authorities operating within the State. I think it will be welcomed by local government bodies, certainly by the R.A.A. which has been advocating it. It will be most useful.

The second suggestion is to enable this authority to prescribe rules that will apply to certain sections of the roads. Particularly it will have the power of recommending an alteration of the speed limit on certain roads or sections of roads. We have now a general speed limit, which in the metropolitan area or the municipal areas is 35 miles an hour. Outside those areas the general speed limit is defined as driving without negligence or without endangering the public. There are in the metropolitan area certain areas where 35 miles an hour is undoubtedly too fast and where a special rule should apply. There are many areas in the metropolitan area where probably 40 miles an hour is usual and safe. For instance, a speed limit of 35 miles an hour on the Anzac Highway would take a tremendous amount of policing now.

Reverting to the question, the new amendments to the Road Traffic Act will provide for a co-ordinating authority with the power to determine many matters that may be regarded as traffic engineering matters, including the control of the speed limit for special areas. I will examine the honourable member's suggestion that this committee should have power to prohibit parking, under certain circumstances, in areas that might be regarded as dangerous for parking. That is the best I can do at present with the honourable member's suggestion.

#### LAND SETTLEMENT.

Mr. HUTCHENS—In an Australian Broadcasting Commission news broadcast recently it was stated that the New South Wales Government had recently passed legislation, as war service land settlement had practically finished as far as the Commonwealth Government was concerned, which would now enable the New South Wales Government to assist not only ex-service settlers but civilians desiring assistance to settle in new areas. When I heard the news, I thought our legislation provided for assistance to settlers, not only ex-servicemen but also civilians. However, a search of our Statutes reveals nothing that will assist them if they desire to purchase land. Have we such legislation and, if not, will consideration be given to introducing legislation to assist both ex-servicemen and civilians?

The Hon. Sir CECIL HINCKS—I listened with interest last night to the report of the legislation proposed by the New South Wales Government. It would not be fair at this moment to comment upon or criticise the merits or demerits of the scheme, but at first blush it appeared to be similar to legislation under our Crown Lands Development Act, though not perhaps quite so good because applicants would have to find a considerable amount of cash, whereas over the years, as the Treasurer mentioned yesterday when introducing the Loan Estimates, an amount is made available under the Crown Lands Development Act for advances to help develop land under that scheme. Certainly under the Crown Lands Development Act that is available to ex-service-men and civilians for development.

#### TONSLEY SPUR LINE

Mr. FRANK WALSH—My question concerns the area which I understand was surveyed by the Railways Department for the Tonsley spur line. It concerns also Mitchell Park boys technical high school on its eastern boundary. My information is that the Education Department is willing to pay its share of the cost of fencing. Is the Railways Commissioner prepared to fence that boundary? Also, can the Premier, representing the Minister of Railways, ascertain from the Commissioner when this spur line is likely to be constructed, if at all, as it would appear that some tenants of properties where this line is proposed to be established have recently been moved to other areas because of the land being acquired?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will get a report for the honourable member.

#### SOLOMONTOWN BEACH WALL.

Mr. RICHES—About 18 months ago when the Minister of Works visited Port Pirie he heard representations concerning the erection of a beach wall at Solomontown and he undertook to take the request to Cabinet when he thought the time was opportune. He said that the work could not be done until work was being carried out at the Port Pirie harbour. Has the Minister had further discussions on this matter and can he say whether there is any chance of this work being put in hand for next summer? I do not know whether any provision has been made on the Loan Estimates, or whether that is necessary, but I should welcome any information the Minister can give.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The honourable member's outline of the position accords with

my memory. We are about to commence work on a big scheme at Port Pirie. The question of the embankment at Solomontown has not been overlooked, but I have not tried to finalize the matter, either with the Harbors Board on the method or with the Government on the question of any assistance that might be given. This matter was raised in my discussions with the board only a few days ago. I do not know when our gangs will be going to Port Pirie to commence the work there, but that will be the time to determine this matter and I will do so then.

#### RIVER MURRAY ROADS.

Mr. KING—The roads from Kingston to Cobdogla and from Berri to Loxton are both subject to inundation during high rivers. Will the Premier, as Acting Minister of Roads, obtain a report from the Highways Commissioner on the practicability of raising these roads, particularly as the settlements are now protected by floodbanks and the raising of the roads would not create any hazards to them?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will have the matter examined.

#### EVIDENCE ACT.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Following upon decisions of the Labor Party conference I ask the Premier whether it is the Government's intention to introduce a Bill to amend the Evidence Act this session and whether he will consider including in such a Bill a provision to suppress from publication the names of persons until such time as they are convicted and, secondly, whether provision will be made to suppress from publication evidence which is given at a preliminary inquiry on a committal for trial? The reason for these requests is that there have been many complaints that evidence at preliminary inquiries, through the columns of the press, reaches a potential jurymen who will be sitting upon the case finally and, whether intentionally or otherwise, he goes into the court with some information already concerning the matter that he has not heard in the course of the trial in the proper manner. Will the Government consider these two amendments?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will have them examined and advise the honourable member in due course.

#### STUDENT TEACHERS' SALARIES.

Mr. CLARK—I have been informed that frequently students in the teachers' colleges are required to wait some time before they receive

their first payment of salary, which causes real hardship to them. Will the Minister of Education have this examined and ascertain the reasons for the delays and, if possible, have the initial payments expedited? It has also been pointed out to me that it would be of material advantage if these salaries could be paid weekly. Will the Minister examine also the practicability of that suggestion?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I shall be pleased to have both matters investigated. I would be the last to see that any real hardship was caused to these desirable young people by any unnecessary delays in payments of their allowances. I cannot understand the cause for any delays, but I will certainly have the payments expedited. I do not know what can be done about weekly payments, but I will have that suggestion examined.

#### SEWERAGE OF CAMPBELLTOWN.

Mr. JENNINGS—Part of my district at Campbelltown is growing rapidly. Many new homes which have been constructed there and also one school are suffering a great disadvantage because the area is not sewered. Numerous individuals and the Campbelltown Council have approached me seeking an extension of sewerage. Will the Minister of Works obtain a report on this matter?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Yes. It will assist me if the honourable member can supply me with some details as to the precise area so that I can make a specific request of the Engineer-in-Chief.

#### BELAIR NURSERY.

Mr. BYWATERS—At a recent meeting of the Murray Valley Development League a delegate mentioned that he had heard that the experimental nursery at Belair was to be closed. He was the only person present who had knowledge of the suggestion, but concern was expressed because a number of councils obtain trees from that nursery. Will the Minister of Forests inquire whether there is any truth in the suggestion?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I do not think there is anything in the rumour. I will try to find out, by asking the Conservator of Forests, what could have given rise to the rumour. The officer in charge of the nursery was living in an old house that had previously been a summer residence of an early Governor, but that house has been transferred to the National Park authorities and a new house has been occupied by the officer. Possibly that change-over may have caused some speculation. If there is any additional information to be had, I will get it.

#### PORT PIRIE HOSPITAL KITCHEN BLOCK.

Mr. McKEE—Can the Minister of Works indicate when work is likely to be resumed on the kitchen block of the Port Pirie Hospital? Several employees have been displaced from work through the unfortunate stoppage of this work.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Unfortunately, I cannot say definitely when work will re-start. The whole position has been extremely difficult. The contractor ceased business and steps had to be taken to try to resume the work. That has created difficulty, particularly in making arrangements with the liquidators and in measuring up work and so on. The Director has had many conferences with me on this problem and I think he is now getting nearer to its solution. Yesterday we discussed certain outstanding matters and I hope he will be able to re-start the work before long. I am most anxious, as is the department, to get on with finishing the work as soon as possible.

#### MOUNT BURR AND NANGWARRY SEWERAGE.

Mr. RALSTON—The member for Millicent (Mr. Corcoran) joins with me in this question. I understand that the Woods and Forests Department is considering a scheme to sewer the Mount Burr and Nangwarry settlements. Can the Minister of Forests say whether that is correct and, if so, when the scheme is likely to be commenced? Will the rentals of departmental homes be affected?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—The department is considering installing sewerage in those towns, but details of the rentals of the homes and when the work will be undertaken are not available at present. I will advise the honourable member as soon as possible.

#### VICTORIA ROAD, BIRKENHEAD.

Mr. TAPPING—On two or three occasions I have asked the Minister of Works about the possibility of constructing a dual highway along Victoria Road (Birkenhead), which extends from the Birkenhead Bridge to Outer Harbour. On at least two occasions I was advised that funds did not permit such work being carried out. This work is vital, particularly as big industrial expansion is taking place on Le Fevre Peninsula and many houses are being erected there. Last week a lady was killed on the road, which is very narrow, and which converges narrowly in one location. Will the Acting Minister of Roads inquire whether this work can be regarded as vital?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will have the matter examined.

#### AMENITIES IN INDUSTRY.

Mr. RYAN—Workers in private industry are supplied by employers with certain amenities, which must be of a specified standard. Recently, in the Commonwealth Arbitration Court, Mr. Justice Ashburner, when considering this matter for incorporation in a new award applying to waterside workers, said that if he ordered certain amenities in the award that he considered absolutely necessary for the industry, those provisions could not be enforced because employers could not implement them. I ask the Minister of Marine if it is the intention of the South Australian Harbors Board in the near future to provide amenities, similar to those provided in private industry, for waterside workers employed by employers who cannot supply those amenities?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I am not aware of the alleged deficiencies as between the Harbors Board and private industry.

Mr. Ryan—Buckets to wash in!

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I have heard about that and about certain amenities that have been provided, but unfortunately are not very freely used. That, however, does not bear with any great force upon the present request, although it does supply some background to it. The Australian port authorities have been considering this as a matter of general policy throughout the Commonwealth and I believe they have recently given additional consideration to it. I do not know what was in their minds or on what particular matters their deliberations were centred, but I will ask the General Manager of the Harbors Board if he can tell me what the present view is and what requests for amenities are outstanding. I know that requests have been made and have been considered. Some have been granted, but others refused. I will ask the General Manager if he can give me any statement on the matters raised by the honourable member.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION: SEWERAGE.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—When answering a question from the member for Mount Gambier a few minutes ago I undertook to give him details of sewerage in certain South-Eastern settlements. I wish to correct the impression that I may have inadvertently conveyed that I would give him some information in advance. I momentarily assumed that he was the member for that district. I shall also certainly see that the members for the districts of Millicent and Victoria have the information when it is available.

#### LAW OF PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### DECENTRALIZATION.

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

That in view of the alarming concentration of population in the metropolitan area of South Australia, an Address be presented to the Governor praying His Excellency to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into and report upon—

- (a) whether industries ancillary to primary production, such as meat works, establishments for the treatment of hides, skins, etc., and other industries for the processing of primary products should be established in country districts;
- (b) what steps should be taken to encourage new secondary industries or branches of existing industries to establish in country districts;
- (c) whether more railway construction and maintenance work could be done at established country railway depots;
- (d) what housing provisions should be made to assist a programme of decentralization; and
- (e) what amenities, particularly sewerage schemes, are necessary to make country towns more attractive?

In the preamble I say there is an alarming concentration of population in the metropolitan area, and I propose to quote briefly from our statistical and other records to prove that contention. For comparative purposes I have taken the years 1939 and 1959. The following table shows the distribution of population in the metropolitan and country areas for those two years:—

	Metropolitan.	Country.	Total.
December, 1939 .. .. .	323,000 (54%)	276,300 (46%)	599,300
December, 1959 .. .. .	570,700 (61%)	363,700 (39%)	934,400
Increase .. .. .	247,700	87,400	335,100
Increase % .. .. .	77%	32%	56%

Our experience over the last 20 years has shown that the rate of increase in the metropolitan area population has been approximately two and a half times that of the country areas and, at the present time, 61 per cent of the State population lives in the metropolitan area and 39 per cent in the country areas. The inclusion of Elizabeth in the country areas does affect the proportion to some extent. Elizabeth should be included in the metropolitan area as it is regarded as a northern suburb of the metropolitan area. If this trend continues, by 1991 only 25 per cent of the population will remain in the country areas and 75 per cent will be in the metro-

politan area. We will then be faced with the twofold problem of decayed country areas as well as insufficient people engaged in primary pursuits to maintain the colossal population centred around the metropolitan area.

I will now give another set of figures, which reflect substantially what is conveyed by the population figures I have just given. The following table gives the enrolment figures for the House of Assembly. Members will note that for the purposes of this table I have taken the 21-year period between the elections held in 1938 and 1959.

	1938.	1959.	Increase.	Per cent Increase.
Total enrolment . . . . .	364,884	497,456	132,572	36
Metropolitan enrolment . . . . .	211,963	312,712	100,749	48
Country enrolment . . . . .	152,921	184,744	31,823	21
Average metropolitan enrolment	16,300	24,100	7,800	48
Average country enrolment . . . . .	5,900	7,100	1,200	21

Members will see that the percentage increases for both the metropolitan enrolment and the average metropolitan enrolment were the same, namely, 48 per cent. Furthermore, the percentage increases in both the country enrolment and the average country enrolment were the same, namely, 21 per cent. I believe that there is some relationship between the electoral system, which is portrayed so aptly by these figures, and the centralization of population and industry in the metropolitan area, and I shall have more to say on that point later. The disproportionate growth of the metropolitan population compared with that of the country has been due to:—

- (1) lack of employment for those not actually engaged in primary production;
- (2) positive discouragement of settlement of population in the country through failure of the Government to provide employment there;
- (3) policy followed by the Government in serving the interests of landowners who, because they own the land and can provide amenities for themselves, etc., remain in the country while other people have to come to the metropolitan area;
- (4) retention, encouraged by the Government, of the good land in the hands of a relatively few people;
- (5) special precautions taken by the Government to ensure that closer settlement and industrial concentrations shall not take place in districts represented by members of the Liberal and Country League.

Employment in both primary and secondary industries must be provided in the country regardless of party political interests, which must be disregarded if we are to give effect to a sound policy for the future and the permanent welfare of South Australia. The obvious type of employment would be that afforded by industries allied to the appropriate primary industries already established in the country. Other industries, not so allied, must also be encouraged to establish themselves by the provision of such services as would give them a reasonable chance of becoming self-supporting.

In 1938-39 the number of individual land holdings amounted to 31,280, and in 1958-59, the number had fallen to 28,105, a reduction of about 3,000. From these figures it can be seen that there is considerable scope for closer settlement, enabling many more people to derive their living directly from the land in the better areas. During this period we have been favoured by many discoveries, which have increased the productive capacity of land, particularly in the higher rainfall areas. The decrease in holdings has occurred in a period when the population of the State has increased, as I pointed out earlier, by 56 per cent. To maintain the *status quo* in regard to land settlement at the figure which existed in 1938-39, instead of there being a reduction of 3,000 in the number individually settled on the land there should have been a very substantial increase in that period, particularly when we realize that during the latter portion of the period we have embarked, in partnership with the Commonwealth Government, on a land

settlement scheme for ex-servicemen which has been responsible for placing over 900 settlers on the land in various parts of the State. The undoubted possibilities for closer settlement and placing more people on the land have been completely and pathetically neglected by this Government.

All sound political thought is against the continued increase in metropolitan population and the concentration of industries in the metropolitan area. In order to prove that point I have a table which shows a large number of country towns that have lost population as indicated by the census figures of 1933 and 1954. I ask permission to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

*Country Towns—Decrease in Population.*

Town.	Popula- tion. 1933.	Popula- tion. 1954.	Decrease.
Blyth . . . . .	659	503	156
Booborowie . . . .	675	446	229
Boooleroo . . . . .	852	617	235
Burra . . . . .	1,951	1,599	352
Bute . . . . .	849	693	156
Caltowie . . . . .	651	366	285
Edithburgh . . . .	800	610	190
Hamley Bridge . .	870	725	145
Hawker . . . . .	688	495	193
Jamestown . . . .	2,134	1,877	257
Kapunda . . . . .	2,027	1,614	413
Kimba . . . . .	950	815	135
Melrose . . . . .	606	463	143
Minnipa . . . . .	516	376	140
Morgan . . . . .	777	575	202
Orroroo . . . . .	1,047	846	201
Pinnaroo . . . . .	1,528	1,153	375
Port Broughton . .	819	598	221
Quorn . . . . .	1,946	1,813	133
Saddleworth . . .	622	565	57
Snowtown . . . . .	950	854	96
Warooka . . . . .	575	419	156
Wasleys . . . . .	534	386	148
Wirrabara . . . .	981	670	311
Yongala . . . . .	626	243	383

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I draw attention to the fact that included in this list are towns such as Burra, where the population has decreased by 352 in the period. Burra is a historical and well-established town which up to about 20 years ago had substantially maintained the prosperity of the area as a result of mining activities, particularly during last century. The continued prosperity of Burra was mainly because in the early days of this century, as a result of a vigorous closer settlement policy promulgated by the Labor Party and given effect to firstly by the Kingston Government and subsequently by the Price-Peake Government, many large estates were subdivided for closer settlement. The result was that the business community in Burra benefited from production from the land which substantially

took the place of the business increment due in days gone by to production from the mines.

Subsequently a re-aggregation set in, and today there are very few of these original closer settlement holdings still extant in the Burra district.

Mr. Clark—It does not apply only to the Burra district, either.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—No, as the honourable member has pointed out, it applies to many country areas in some of the best rainfall districts of the State. It is true that large aggregations were subdivided in the years between 1902 and 1914, but in their place we have what is a much greater menace than were the large estates. The latter called for some action because they were so obvious that people passing through the area were staggered at the sparsity of population, with the result that subdivision became the almost constant and imperative cry. The accumulated effect today is even worse than was the effect of the large estates.

The town of Hamley Bridge during that period lost 145 and Jamestown 257 of its population. Very similar conditions to what I have mentioned at Burra have been responsible for the loss of population in the Jamestown area. Kapunda lost 413 of its population in that period. Here again, the conversion of small holdings into large holdings has been responsible to a very marked degree for the business stagnation in the town which resulted, as any honourable member can see when passing through this town, in closed shops and in a run-down appearance in the area. There are very few country towns with populations exceeding 500 and this supports my contention that the aggregation of population in the metropolitan area is much worse in South Australia than in other States.

I have a list, based on the 1954 census, comprising approximately 660 country towns, townships and localities. Of this number, about 540 have populations of less than 500—the great majority very much less. Of the 120 towns with populations exceeding 500, 67 are in the 501-1,000 group, 28 in the 1,001-2,000 group, 16 in the 2,001-5,000 group, seven in the 5,001-10,000 group, and two only—Mount Gambier and Port Pirie—have more than 10,000 inhabitants. This proves conclusively that there is a greater aggregation of population in our metropolitan area than in other States.

It is obvious that there must be a stipulated minimum size for a community before an adequate and economic provision of amenities is possible. Members ought to be able to see, notwithstanding any political myopia they may

be afflicted with, that in the interests of the State's progress and stability we must disperse our population and that can only be done by making amenities available in country areas. Members will say that this would cost money, but the cost would pale into insignificance compared with what has been spent in the metropolitan area in providing amenities for its increasing population.

Let us consider the Adelaide water district as an example. In 1946-47—about the time the increased concentration of population in the

metropolitan area began—the capital cost of this water district was £5,900,000. By 1958-59 the capital cost had increased by 388 per cent to £28,800,000. Those are startling figures, and they will increase still further if the Premier's vision of a population of 1,000,000 people between Adelaide and Gawler within 25 years becomes a fact. The following is a table of revenue and expenditure relating to the Adelaide water district, and I ask permission to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

*Adelaide Water District.*

Year.	Revenue. £	Expenditure. £	Result. £	
1948-49 . . . . .	608,000	458,000	150,000	Surplus
1949-50 . . . . .	631,000	529,000	102,000	Surplus
1950-51 . . . . .	680,000	631,000	49,000	Surplus
1951-52 . . . . .	860,000	768,000	92,000	Surplus
1952-53 . . . . .	908,000	847,000	61,000	Surplus
1953-54 . . . . .	969,000	992,000	23,000	Deficiency
1954-55 . . . . .	1,079,000	1,450,000	372,000	Deficiency
1955-56 . . . . .	1,359,000	1,577,000	218,000	Deficiency
1956-57 . . . . .	1,506,000	1,991,000	485,000	Deficiency
1957-58 . . . . .	2,106,000	2,588,000	482,000	Deficiency
1958-59 . . . . .	2,122,000	2,491,000	369,000	Deficiency

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I think probably the explanation for the increase in revenue from just over £1,000,000 to just over £2,000,000 in the last five years was mainly the increase in assessments that occurred during that time but, despite that, the deficiency for 1958-59 was still £369,000.

Let us now look at what happened in country districts in the same period. In 1946-47 the capital cost of country water schemes was £13,600,000, and in 1958-59 the capital cost was £25,700,000—an increase of 89 per cent. In the same period in the metropolitan water district the increase in capital cost was 388 per cent—a striking comparison. The following table shows the revenue and expenditure in country water districts for the period shown, and again I ask permission to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

*Country Water Districts.*

Year.	Revenue. £	Expenditure. £	Deficit. £
1948-49 ..	371,000	908,000	537,000
1949-50 ..	385,000	994,000	609,000
1950-51 ..	418,000	1,157,000	739,000
1951-52 ..	441,000	1,259,000	818,000
1952-53 ..	507,000	1,319,000	812,000
1953-54 ..	537,000	1,316,000	778,000
1954-55 ..	664,000	1,514,000	850,000
1955-56 ..	724,000	1,672,000	948,000
1956-57 ..	825,000	1,803,000	978,000
1957-58 ..	983,000	2,157,000	1,174,000
1958-59 ..	1,005,000	2,232,000	1,227,000

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I suggest that these figures tell two different stories. In the first instance, up to 1953-54, there was a surplus in the metropolitan water district which was substantially able to meet the deficiency in the country, and this was felt to be a proper apportionment of the burden because country water schemes were developmental. In fact, in some instances, they were imperative for development.

Of course, in the final analysis the wealth produced in the country has a very astounding impact on the business and community life of the metropolitan area but, as a result of country towns being denuded of their populations, the revenue from the water services in country areas has not kept pace with the capital expenditure. My point is that if we had developed industries and population in country towns to the same extent as in the metropolitan area in this same period we would have had a much better result from country water schemes to help counter-balance the drastic result in the metropolitan water district.

Members, of course, are familiar with the figures given in the Loan Estimates yesterday showing the tremendous increase in the cost of school buildings, hospitals and other amenities rendered necessary in the metropolitan area as a result of the growth of its population, and

so it becomes difficult to provide necessary services in the country because of the haphazard and costly metropolitan development. Another point to which I wish to refer briefly is the position of the population in the event of war. I certainly hope we will never have to face another war, but if we do it will be an atomic war and it will be impossible to defend the huge population in the metropolitan area. I noted with considerable interest that this question was raised this afternoon by the member for Torrens when he asked the Premier for a statement on civil defence measures to be taken by the State and Commonwealth Governments. In his reply, which I think was factual, the Premier indicated what a difficult problem it was. I submit that every increase in population in the metropolitan area makes it more difficult still.

I shall not try to lay down what new industries should be established in country districts: I suggest that that is a matter for an expert committee, and I am giving the Government the opportunity in this motion to appoint such a committee in order to have the matter properly and completely investigated so that we will know what the blue print for the future will be and we may prescribe for the carrying of that blue print to its successful completion. I draw attention to the fact that this Government in 1946 made a pretence of doing something about decentralization but, of course, it makes a pretence of doing anything. The Premier particularly makes grandiloquent statements about a new industry here, a new port there, and something else somewhere else, all of which are ultimately lost in the limbo of forgotten things. The body appointed by the Government had a very good personnel. The Chairman was Mr. M. A. F. Pearce, C.B.E., A.F.I.A., Secretary to the Premier. Its members were Messrs. C. M. Hambidge, L.S. (Surveyor-General), D. V. Fleming, O.B.E., A.S.M.B., M.I.E. (Aust.), Commissioner of Highways and Director of Local Government, J. R. Dridan, B.E., Dip. Mech. Eng., F.S.A.S.M., A.M.I.E. (Aust.), Deputy Engineer in Chief, and the secretary, Mr. R. G. Hitecox of the Chief Secretary's Department. This committee was appointed for the purpose of developing something in the nature of a regional plan and in 1946 it made a report on regional boundaries. It went into all manner of things dealing with the physical characteristics of the various districts, such as rainfall, minerals, soil types and so forth; quite a valuable report if anything

had been done about it except placing it in a pigeonhole and forgetting all about it, which is precisely what this Government did.

I suggest that we take up the investigation where that body left off, with another investigation as to what can be done to develop industries in country areas. One point that is germane to the argument as regards a number of country areas is the question of railway maintenance and the production of railway equipment. We have at Peterborough, Tailem Bend and other places railway depots where a considerable volume of maintenance is carried out, and my submission is that more work could be done in these depots. I have had discussions with railway men on the subject, and they assure me that it is only a matter of having skilled personnel in these places and, with existing equipment, they could do much work which is now sent to the metropolitan area for fabrication. Here is an opportunity to make a start in the decentralization of population and industry.

To show that there is nothing new in my proposal I briefly quote from something that occurred some time ago. It will be remembered that in 1942 the Commonwealth Government appointed a committee to investigate the possibilities of decentralization of population and industry after the war on a nation-wide basis. Invitations were issued to prominent figures in the various States, and I quote from the evidence given by the then Leader of the Opposition in South Australia, the Hon. R. S. Richards. He said:—

Decentralization of secondary industries should form part of the reconstruction scheme. The promotion of secondary industries in country areas should aim at providing employment for those members of rural families who are unable to be permanently employed on the land. It must be apparent that it is not possible to continually subdivide land to accommodate all members of rural families. Those who wish to enter industry should have ample opportunity to do so without swelling the population of capital cities. If provision were made for local industries reasonable amenities would be available to rural populations, thus tending to prevent the concentration of population in congested areas which has been found so undesirable and dangerous in time of war. This close association of industrial and rural interests would ultimately break down the existing prejudices between city and country and promote a wider knowledge of the total dependence of a nation upon the productive capacity of the land.

These remarks were pertinent and correct when made in 1942 and are more pertinent and more



correct and desirable today, but unfortunately this Government—this allegedly Liberal and Country League Government which is supposed to have the interests of the country at heart—has taken no steps to give effect to a policy which would make Mr. Richards' vision come true.

In May each year the Catholic Church in Australia sets aside one Sunday as Social Service Sunday, and prior to that day the hierarchy of the church in Australia publishes a pamphlet dealing with some aspect of social service or some moral aspect upon which they feel the community should be informed. I make it clear that the Church does not intend to intrude into politics: the bishops merely set out their views clearly on the moral and social issues to which they desire to draw attention. In the 1955 statement on social justice they referred particularly to big cities, saying:—

Is it not the duty of Government to give the lead in a programme which ensures that no further growth of factories or industries be permitted in the State capitals and all cities above a defined size; and which, by consequence, deflects industrial development and all increase in population to smaller centres?

About the time that pamphlet was printed I suggested that we should call a halt to the growth of the metropolitan area by refusing to provide amenities outside a defined distance from the city, but I was severely criticized by the Premier and his supporters, who said that it was a frightful proposal and something quite beyond the ken of civilized man. Yet, we find that that is what is advocated by the hierarchy of the Catholic Church in Australia when it says that we should arrest the growth of big concentrations of population and use the resultant saving of capital expenditure to provide amenities and encourage the growth of population in other areas. At page 8 of their statement the bishops drew attention to this aspect by saying:—

So much capital spent on building up the metropolitan cities is so much capital taken away from the development of country towns and rural areas. It involves us also in a vicious circle. The fact that these facilities are added annually to capital cities is a constant inducement to secondary industries to establish themselves in the capitals, setting up a further demand for housing and services. There is a limit to the capital annually available for investment in the development of Australia. If so much is spent on the expansion of the cities, it is inevitable that the development of the inland will be retarded. That is economically and socially bad.

At page 10 the authors referred to the responsibility of Governments by saying:—

The damaging effects of centralization on the life of the nation are in themselves sufficient to warrant the strongest action by Governments to put a limit on the size of the major industrial cities and to take all the necessary measures to make that limit effective. The first essential of any programme of decentralization is to impart the conviction that decentralization is a practical programme which can be carried through. One of the major factors which operate against decentralization is the popular superstition that the continuous growth of cities is in some way inevitable and that it cannot be prevented without flying in the face of progress.

If it is progress to continue to herd a disproportionate number of our people in a few big wens in this country we should be preserved by our Governments from such progress in the future. The statement continues:—

In fact, the opposite is the case. Practically the only factor making naturally for centralization in most of the Australian States is the scarcity of good harbours. Almost every other factor which has led to centralization is man-made—the direction of rail and road systems, freight rates, the expenditure of a great part of the public revenues on public works and amenities attached to the cities and so on. These man-made factors are by no means inevitable, and it is possible to substitute for them measures of a quite different kind.

Is that not precisely what I have been saying this afternoon? Indeed, I said it in 1952, yet my words then fell on deaf ears, but I trust my words today will fall on more enlightened ears. Dealing with the restriction by Government action of the growth of certain areas, the statement continues:—

The recommendations of the Utthwatt and Barlow Royal Commissions (Great Britain) should be applied in the various States. This would involve a direct ban on building any new factories within a specified radius of cities over a certain size. This ban would be reinforced if it were accompanied by taxation incentives to industries establishing themselves along the road and rail links to the new ports . . . The development of agricultural settlement for Australians, both returned soldiers and civilians, and migrants, in regions thus created around these focal points, should be proceeded with to provide the agricultural base for an expanding Australian economy. The many millions of pounds which are being devoted to solving traffic and similar problems in capital cities might be invested with greater profit in settlement of the land. The expansion of agriculture and of country industries should be accompanied by the extension to these areas of the social and cultural amenities and the facilities for recreation with which the cities are so lavishly endowed . . . All increases in secondary and tertiary industries would be centred in thriving country towns, whose ultimate size would also be controlled by the indirect means of limiting industries within them. These towns in their turn would exist

in a thriving agricultural hinterland, for agriculture would have been expanded to serve as the base of a thriving and populous nation.

I shall quote the conclusion of their Lordships at the end of this pamphlet, because it sets out more effectively in their language than in language I am able to use what this policy is intended to lead to, what it should lead to, and why it should be implemented. Their conclusion is:—

Without assuming competence to speak authoritatively in technical matters, it seems to us that these proposals are worthy of mature consideration since they are one of the few systematic contributions presented to solve the problem of centralization. Finally, it should not be forgotten that the successful achievement of a thorough-going programme of decentralization would furnish outstanding proof of the vitality of our people and of their capacity to respond to the challenge of their history. Only those men and women who are true patriots, who are truly confident of their nation's capacity to become great, will be capable of the moral effort needed to develop Australia's resources to the full. Without a genuine programme of decentralization these resources will be untapped and unharvested in many regions, and many of the opportunities to enrich mankind with which Almighty God has endowed this Continent will be wasted. It is our hope that once these obligations have been explained, and once the pattern of policy necessary to fulfil them has been outlined to our people, they, in their turn, will respond to the challenge, turn back the tide of history, and remake Australia.

That is what I am suggesting we should begin to do in South Australia, the worst State in our continent as regards decentralization, through a petition to His Excellency to appoint a Royal Commission to consider the steps necessary to be taken to bring about decentralization of industry and population. I move the motion with confidence, because in the three years since I last moved a similar motion in this House everything that has transpired around us bears out the truth of what I said then and what I am saying now, and the necessity for some steps to be taken at once to correct the evils that are growing up and gradually encompassing this fair land of ours and its people in a monopolistic grip of great combines, as has been instanced recently by the take-over of various types of manufacturing and tertiary industry, with organizations bidding against each other for the right—and I say this advisedly—to exploit the people of this country. What we on this side of the House desire is population spread throughout our State in accordance with the national conditions which lend themselves to supporting such a population.

I also believe—although I am not, of course, supported by the great captains of industry—that in the final analysis it would be better economics for our State to have development along these lines. However, what we are concerned about are men and women. We think it is the duty of the Parliament of a State such as ours to take steps to see that the men and women in the State have the best possible conditions, and we do not think that spreading our metropolitan area from Gawler to Hallett Cove, incurring as it will (and as it is doing in many instances now) long journeys for workers to and from their employment, is in the best interests of men and women. As I said earlier, the position could easily be reached that in another 30 years 75 per cent of the people of South Australia could be living in what we call the metropolitan area and 25 per cent in the country, and we do not think that is a good thing for any State or nation. I hope that members opposite will support this motion. After all, what it seeks is what the Government itself did after the war when it appointed a body to investigate reasonable planning. Unfortunately, the report of that very competent body was, of course, dropped like a hot potato, but if it were thought proper to make an inquiry then surely it is much more urgent and necessary to make an inquiry now. Now is the time for the Government to accept the proposal for a proper and competent inquiry into decentralization, population, and industry in South Australia.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I second the motion.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Edwardstown) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Lottery and Gaming Act, 1936-1956. Read a first time.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I move—

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

I thank the House for suspending Standing Orders to enable me to proceed with the explanation of my Bill. I am concerned with section 9 of the principal Act, which provides under paragraph (b):—

- (i) such sums of money so allotted and distributed are expended solely and entirely in the purchase of paintings, drawings, or other works of art; and
- (ii) the proceedings of such association are carried on in good faith for the encouragement of the fine arts.

My proposals are not really new. Clause 3 of my Bill provides:—

(1) An application may be made to the Chief Secretary for a permit to conduct a lottery in accordance with this section by any of the following bodies, namely:—

(a) any club or association, the principal object of which is to carry on an outdoor sport or game and which makes no charge for admission to matches or contest, and does not derive any income from any such charge.

Much sport is played where no charge is made for admission, although subscriptions may be made towards club funds. Functions such as dances are also held to raise funds for clubs but these may not be as successful as hoped for. Clause 3 continues:—

(b) Any association or body of people carrying on any school or religious institution, hospital or other institution to assist the sick, the infirm, the aged, or the needy, so that such institution is not carried on for gain or profit to the individual members thereof.

(c) Any association which is not carried on for the purpose of profit or gain to the individual members thereof and which carries on some other work or activity which, in the Chief Secretary's opinion, is charitable.

My Bill refers to schools and religious and charitable institutions. Many schools are finding it difficult financially to carry on their work. I may have to refer to the Adelaide Children's Hospital later. Paragraph (c) refers to any association not carried on for the purpose of profit or gain. This would include such societies as the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. My Bill continues:—

(2) A club, association or body of persons shall not be granted more than one permit under this section in any financial year.

(3) An application for a permit shall not be granted unless the Chief Secretary is satisfied—

(a) that the net proceeds of the lottery will be devoted to a purpose, work or activity such as mentioned in subsection 1 of this section.

One in 12 months might be considered satisfactory. Then paragraph (b) provides:—

that no person will be engaged for hire or reward in the management or carrying on of the lottery; and

(c) that no money prizes will be distributed in the lottery.

That is essential in this matter. Recent press reports have indicated what has happened in regard to a lottery in New South Wales, and I do not wish that such abuses should occur here. My Bill prohibits money prizes, which would help prevent such abuses. There is also a provision:—

(d) that at least nine-tenths of the members of the association or body of persons are resident in South Australia.

That clearly makes it a local matter. The Chief Secretary shall have discretion to grant or refuse any application and may include any conditions in any permit granted. A fee of £2 shall be paid on every application, half of which shall be refunded if the application is not granted. An applicant to whom a permit is granted must comply with every condition of the permit and a penalty clause is provided for failure to comply. Provision is also included to enable regulations to be made. I point out that it would not require a large staff to administer this Bill.

It may be appropriate if I refer to some of the matters that have prompted the introduction of this Bill—matters that have received prominence in the press. Earlier this year the Ampol Company conducted what it called a *Treasure Chest*, from which persons all over Australia were eligible to receive prizes. No entry fee was required and no person was obliged to buy a stipulated quantity of petrol or oil. South Australia was the only State in which there was an embargo on the competition. In the *News* of March 2 appeared a report of the findings of Mr. Clarke, P.M., on the charges against the company. It was convicted on two counts of running a lottery, and it took the Police Magistrate half an hour to read his judgment. He found that the company had contravened sections 7 and 8 of the Lottery and Gaming Act, section 7 of which provides that no person shall promise or agree to pay any sum of money, or deliver any goods, or do or forbear doing anything for the benefit of any person in any lottery.

I am not trying to defend any oil company. At present another oil company—Vacuum Oil Company—is conducting what I believe is a type of lottery (although it may not be a lottery within the meaning of the Act) on football. On June 2 I wrote to the Chief Secretary about this matter and contended that its "Pick the Players" competition was a lottery. My information is that a person must select 12 players from the four matches played each week and list them in their order of merit. If his selections accord with the selections of four judges—presumably representatives of the company—who attend the matches, he receives a prize. In the *Advertiser* of June 3 appears a report headed "3 Months Old—And Wins £50," which states that a child named Gary—the

son of a prominent league footballer—used his napkin pin to pick 11 of the 12 players selected by the judges as best in the previous week's series of matches.

Mr. Jennings—That is not a lottery; that is skill!

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I fail to see the difference between skill and chance, according to the Act. Is it skill to get a pin and poke it into a piece of paper on which footballers' names are written?

Mr. Quirke—It is skill to poke the pin into a nappy.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I agree that there is skill in correctly fastening a safety pin to a baby's napkin. I am concerned whether skill or chance is involved, and I believe it is more chance than skill when it comes to using a pin to select names on a piece of paper. If one match were selected, and people were invited to enter a competition involving that match only, and had to select the three best players on the ground, I would not then dispute that it was a matter of skill or judgment, but in the case I have mentioned it is not necessary for the competitors to go to any football match, and that is where I think it falls about the ears of the Chief Secretary and his department. The Chief Secretary replied to my letter on June 23 and said:—

With reference to your letter of 2nd June, I desire to inform you that the matter raised by you has been investigated by the Police and Crown Law Departments. The Crown Solicitor has expressed the opinion that the scheme is not a lottery: therefore, it is not proposed to take action in the matter.

It comes to this, a competitor goes to a service station and obtains a form; he does not have to go to any football match, but may listen to the radio commentators, read the press reports or obtain information from his friends. He then has to write 12 names on a piece of paper. That procedure could make him the successful competitor.

Mr. Lawn—Does the Vacuum Oil Company charge anything for the entries?

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Not as far as I know. I say that not one person uses skill. It is a matter of chance, and that is all that is involved in this matter. It is a chance that your opinion resulting from attending one match, listening to a broadcast or reading a paper will agree with that of four people from the Vacuum Oil Company who have each attended a different match. In the opinion of

the judges the father of the child named Gary missed out by one in this case.

My whole point is that it is chance and not a matter of skill, and to try to overcome that problem I ask that this House seriously consider the matter. If members desire a straight-out lottery and have permission for these matters to be included, that would be all right. I would have no objection to that.

Mr. Quirke—Could you raffle a cabbage under your Bill?

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Under my proposals you could raffle any article.

Mr. Jennings—That would cover most things.

Mr. Quirke—Once a year?

Mr. FRANK WALSH—If any football club, hospital, charitable institution or school wished, it could make application and if it fell within the ambit of clause 3 of this amending Bill the Chief Secretary, under the regulations, could allow it.

Mr. Quirke—Could you raffle only one thing, or could you have a multiplicity of raffles over one show?

Mr. FRANK WALSH—There are two points involved in this. If a series of articles were to be raffled, followed by a function, and then further raffles were to be conducted, I would not say whether that would be in order. All I say is that it is legal to run some of the raffles in the afternoon and some in the evening, provided one had a bottle of peas or conducted some other competition under which people had to guess a number or estimate the weight of something. It then becomes a matter of skill and not chance, and it is therefore legal.

This Bill will do all that is required for honest people whose operations come within the term of "amateur sport," school committees and other organizations raising money for educational purposes or those interested in organizing functions for hospitals and other charitable purposes, and they will be able to conduct these schemes under the Bill. Towards the end of last year a Holden car was raffled and the people connected with the college responsible for the organization of the raffle were questioned by the police. They were informed that it was illegal under the Lottery and Gaming Act. It seemed that there would be a donnybrook in the matter until some bright person came forward and said, "Before having the draw, give it a name, and we will let you off on this occasion." That comprised skill! I do not want this to occur again; I would

like these people to be permitted to conduct another such raffle legally.

At a recent fund-raising effort attempted on behalf of the Adelaide Children's Hospital, and known as "Operation Doorknock," over £30,000 was paid to the organizers of the appeal—and members should not try to bury their heads in shame. Many of the younger people of this State, some of whom I met, went around from door to door in the rain trying to raise money for this appeal. No prizes were given, but I suppose most of the collections went to the people who assisted to organize the campaign. Another competition held recently involved naming a house. I should like to know whether the people running that competition obtained the Chief Secretary's authority. If they had permission I should like to know whether the matter was judged on the skill involved in naming the house or on the result of a draw. This Bill is an honest attempt to permit people to raise money for a good purpose.

Mr. Quirke—Would it be correct to say that under your Bill you could raffle a cabbage or a motor car but not a cabbage and a motor car?

Mr. FRANK WALSH—A charitable organization would apply to the Chief Secretary, pay a fee of £2, and be given permission to hold a lottery, the proceeds of which would go to the organization; it would not matter if there were one article or 100 articles.

Mr. Quirke—Can you interpret it that way?

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I do not want to divulge the source of my legal information but I have been assured that that can be done under this Bill. I am prepared to give every explanation I can to obtain support. I ask members to support the second reading and, if any amendments are necessary, they can be moved in Committee. I have introduced this Bill in the hope that it will receive the full consideration of the House. I commend it to the House in the belief that it is necessary in the interests of the people of this State.

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

#### ENFIELD GENERAL CEMETERY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Enfield General Cemetery Act, 1944-1956. Read a first time.

#### STATUTES AMENDMENT (PUBLIC SALARIES) BILL (No. 2).

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of the general revenue of the State as were required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) moved—

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution:—That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Agent-General Act, 1901-1953, the Audit Act, 1921-1957, the Industrial Code, 1920-1958, the Police Regulation Act, 1952-1955, and the Public Service Act, 1936-1958, and for other purposes.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

#### CELLULOSE AUSTRALIA LIMITED (GOVERNMENT SHARES) BILL.

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) moved—

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution:—That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to enable the Treasurer to take up shares in Cellulose Australia Limited, to appropriate money from the Loan Fund to pay for such shares, and to enact other incidental provisions.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

#### PUBLIC FINANCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Finance Act, 1936-1954. Read a first time.

#### ADMINISTRATION AND PROBATE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and

introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Administration and Probate Act, 1919-1956. Read a first time.

**AMUSEMENTS DUTY (FURTHER SUSPENSION) BILL.**

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) moved—

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution:—That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to suspend further the levy and collection of amusements duty under the Stamp Duties Act, 1923-1960.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

**MILE END OVERWAY BRIDGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.**

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Works) moved—

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution:—That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Mile End Overway Bridge Act, 1925.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

**ADJOURNMENT.**

At 5.16 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 11, at 2 p.m.