

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, August 17, 1960.

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

QUESTIONS.**NORTH-SOUTH RAILWAY.**

Mr. O'HALLORAN—About 50 years ago when the Northern Territory was ceded to the Commonwealth by South Australia, one condition was that the Commonwealth should complete the North-South line from the then terminus at Oodnadatta to the northern terminus. Since then there have been periodical discussions between the State and Commonwealth Governments on this matter, and last week I read a press report that the Commonwealth Railways Commissioner, Mr. Smith, on his return from a tour of inspection of the Northern Territory and the northern railways, had stated that it would now be a comparatively cheap proposition to build a standard gauge line from Marree to Port Darwin because of the improvement in rail construction brought about by modern machinery. Can the Premier say whether this matter has been discussed recently with the Commonwealth, or whether we can infer from Mr. Smith's remarks that it will possibly be discussed soon?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I believe that the Northern Territory will never be adequately developed until it has a railway line through the centre. The one way to develop outlying areas is to provide them with transport, as has been proved hundreds of times. The Territory's development is directly contingent upon a rail service through to Darwin. That, of course, is apart from any contractual obligation the Commonwealth Government has with this State under the Northern Territory—Surrender Act. It has a contractual obligation under that Act, which was repeated in more recent legislation when the standardization of railway gauges was approved by the States and the Commonwealth and when the Commonwealth's obligation to construct the North-South line was again stated. It was stated that the line should be of standard gauge and, indeed, some work was commenced, taking the standard gauge from Port Augusta to Marree. I assure the Leader that South Australia is materially affected by the Commonwealth's failure to carry out its agreement and we are most concerned that after so many years there has been a complete neglect to acknowledge a solemn bargain ratified by two authorities. However, I will take this matter up with the Prime Minister soon.

CEDUNA HIGHER PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. BOCKELBERG—In 1957 a request was made by the Ceduna higher primary school committee to have a fire hydrant placed in a more satisfactory position than the one which at present is 200 yards from the school buildings, most of which are of wood and prefabricated and which house much valuable material, and which are an everlasting danger to about 300 children attending the school. Will the Minister of Works ascertain whether the fire hydrant can be placed in a more convenient position so as to assist the emergency fire services should a fire occur at the school?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—This morning I discussed this matter with the Chief Architect, Mr. Lees, and as a result the Public Buildings Department is urgently considering it. I agree that it is desirable, particularly in country districts where fire fighting equipment may not be so extensive as in the metropolitan area, for the fire hydrant to be more conveniently located to the school buildings. I hope that within a few days some finality can be reached regarding an improvement at this school.

SCHOOL BUILDINGS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—On May 11 I asked the Minister of Works some questions regarding the possibility of using a portable type concrete floor in portable school buildings. Has the Minister any information on the matter and can he indicate whether that type of flooring would be practicable? I am more concerned with its use as a possible protection against fire.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I have a report from the Director of Public Buildings setting out the investigational inquiries made into the suggestions. The report emanates from inquiries made by the Principal Architect and the Works Manager at Finsbury, who is responsible for the construction and prefabrication of portable buildings. The report indicates that concrete floors would be a retardant where fires start on a floor or where they are deliberately lit under a building. The risk of fires starting on floors is remote in all new buildings where electricity is available in place of hard fuel stoves. They would not act as effective retardants where a fire starts against walls or in a roof. The contents of rooms are almost as serious a fire risk as the buildings themselves. Bitumen suggested for jointing is combustible. The report contains particulars of the relative costs of this type of flooring, which indicate that whereas the cost of a

standard timber floor for a classroom, with verandah, 24ft. x 32ft. at present is £251, to use the precast concrete on concrete stumps would cost about £571, an increase of 127 per cent. In the country the cost would be increased by additional transport of slabs, unless they were cast *in situ* (but this would lose the economy of mass production), and increased transport cost of cranes. Slabs of 12 feet 6 inches by 6 feet weigh approximately 1½ tons.

Based on metropolitan costs only, the adoption of this method would increase the actual cost on the present volume of production by £128,000 a year. This is based on an average of 400 classrooms a year. Costs of transfers of buildings would be heavier, due to the increased transport cost of the concrete slabs. It is generally conceded that there is no risk to children. That may need amplification, insofar as the Director is referring to the fact that up to the present time, at any rate, no fires that have reached any dangerous proportions have occurred in these buildings when occupied. The honourable member knows that provision has been made in all these classrooms for removable sections under the windows to allow the ready escape of children should such a fire occur and get out of control. From the point of view of material loss, it is not considered that it would be economical to increase annual costs by £128,000 to reduce to this slight degree the fire risk.

PETROL SALES.

Mr. HEASLIP—Earlier this session I asked the Premier a question regarding the supply of petrol in the metropolitan area over week-ends. Country people coming to the metropolitan area find it difficult, if they arrive with an empty tank, to replenish it over the week-end, particularly if a holiday follows the week-end. In his reply the Premier said that this question had caused difficulty over a number of years; he also said:—

During the next week or two this matter will be the subject of discussions between the Minister and the Chamber of Automotive Industries, and under those circumstances I say no more than that the matter is being considered and that I hope a conference can be arranged in due course, as it is a matter of some moment.

I understand that that conference has taken place. As a result of the conference, has any suggestion been made or a solution arrived at whereby automatic vending machines or some other method could be used to overcome this difficulty?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Petrol is readily available at the week-end in all areas of South Australia, except the metropolitan area itself. The Minister of Labour and Industry (Mr. Rowe) has conducted some negotiations with the Chamber of Automotive Industries in South Australia about this matter and has tried to reach some agreement with the chamber, which has some system whereby there would be at least a rostered service available in the metropolitan area of, say, half a dozen service stations at the week-end, but we have not been able to reach any agreement. I think the policy of the service stations in the metropolitan area would be for shorter hours rather than longer hours. The Government has been rather opposed to the introduction of vending machines, because it knows that the sale of petrol is material to the people who are giving service to the public and, of course, a vending machine supplies no service except the supply of petrol for which a token is presented. If services such as tyre-changing are required they cannot be given by a vending machine. Recently I conferred with a large distribution firm in this State about this matter and, arising from that conference, a suggestion was made that applications be invited from persons who would be prepared to have a roster system of services in the metropolitan area at week-ends. That suggestion will be considered by Cabinet soon.

ELECTRICAL COMPANY'S QUIZ.

Mr. HUTCHENS—I have been advised that a company operating in the city of Adelaide under the name of "Empress Electrics" rings people at numbers it finds in the telephone book and indicates that it is prepared to accept the person who answers the telephone as a contestant in a quiz competition and that there is a prize of £50 for answering three questions. The questions are so easy that they are ridiculous. After the questions are answered correctly the people who have been telephoned are told, "You have won the £50, but we should have told you that this is £50 that you can receive off a television set that you buy from our establishment." If the person has a television set he is told that he can have £30 off the cost of some other electrical appliance. Will the Minister of Education take up with the Attorney-General the question of whether this practice is legal under our Lottery and Gaming Act and, if it is not, whether he will issue a warning?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Yes, I shall be pleased to do so.

TEACHER TRAINING.

Mr. CLARK—Has the Minister of Education a reply to a question I asked on August 10 about the possible extension of “in service training” for teachers?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—The duties of the Superintendent of Recruiting and Training are mainly in three categories:—(1) the recruiting of trainees for the teaching service; (2) the superintending of teacher-training in the teachers colleges; (3) in service training. They are all highly important services, but the one most pressing and urgent for the welfare of the department, its teachers and the children under their care is recruiting. Therefore, the major portion of the Superintendent’s efforts must be devoted to recruiting. Developments in teacher-training in the teachers colleges in policy, courses, use of television, staffing and mere physical growth are such that the Superintendent could be engaged in them full-time.

Despite the immediate importance of the other aspects of his work, in service training has not been neglected. Twenty-eight conferences, schools of instruction and schools of method have been planned to be held throughout the year. It is also proposed to hold several others including management for headmasters and demonstrations in the Cuisenaire methods of teaching arithmetic. This method is a new one, using apparatus and coloured rods, which has been introduced by a Belgian by the name of Cuisenaire. He will be visiting Australia shortly and will come to Adelaide. It is proposed that he will give some demonstration lessons in his method in our practising schools at an in service training function. The extent of the in service training work will continue to grow, but it cannot be fully developed until additional staff is supplied to this branch.

In his report on his American experiences on a Fulbright grant, and in his writings in journals, the superintendent (Mr. A. W. Jones) has stressed the importance to teachers of self-improvement and keeping abreast by means of in service education. The implementation of a scheme of a year-long period of in service training similar to the one outlined by Mr. Golding, like many other suggested improvements, must await an adequate supply of teachers. Some nations less advanced than the United Kingdom, the United States of America and Australia have not experienced such acute shortages of teachers and are consequently more able to release some teachers for extended periods without over-burdening the others.

EDUCATION ALLOWANCES.

Mr. LOVEDAY—Has the Minister of Education an answer to the question I asked recently concerning “remote” allowances for teachers?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—The reply I gave previously without notice was correct in every detail, except that I omitted to inform the honourable member that some months ago, as a result of correspondence from the Teachers’ Institute, I had approved of the Director of Education having a detailed investigation made into “remote” allowances for teachers, not only on the amount to be paid, but regarding the areas in which those teachers serve. As a result of that approval, the Secretary of the Education Department has recently submitted a most voluminous and comprehensive report to the Director, who is at present considering it, and in due course he will confer with the Public Service Commissioner. As soon as I have anything further to report I shall let the honourable member and the House know.

STUD ROOSTERS.

Mr. LAUCKE—My question refers to the possibility of establishing a special section of the Parafield poultry station to be given over to the breeding of stud roosters for distribution to the poultry industry in this State. This is a serious matter, as there is no source of supply of numbers of roosters which, being bred from heavy-laying strains, could increase productivity in this industry. With the increased cost of feed and with more competitive overseas markets, the productivity must be increased. It has been suggested to me by poultry organizations that if Parafield were to go out of its way to obtain and breed these roosters of proven heavy-laying blood-lines, it would undoubtedly assist the industry. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether consideration will be given to the setting up of this stud section at Parafield?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—The production of stud animals and birds is normally left in the hands of private enterprise, and I think that in most cases the demand for stud animals is satisfactorily catered for and dealt with by these means. However, as the honourable member has raised the question and wishes the matter to be considered, I have no objection to doing so, and I will let him have a reply later on.

UNAUTHORIZED BAILIFF'S CHARGES.

Mr. RALSTON—On July 26 last a licensed bailiff, accompanied by an associate of some sort, called at a house at Mount Gambier and said that he was authorized to repossess a refrigerator which was subject to a hire-purchase agreement with the Finance Corporation of Australia Limited. The sum of £11 6s. was demanded, being a supposedly overdue payment of £5 6s. plus £6 bailiff's charges, and the threat was made that if the amount were not paid the refrigerator would be repossessed forthwith. The householder refused to pay and produced receipts which proved that no payment was overdue; in fact, the next payment was not due until the following day, July 27. Despite this proof, the bailiff and his associate still demanded £6 bailiff's charges, and they became very aggressive and threatening, so the householder's wife, who was ill in bed at the time, came to the door and said that she had £3 in cash. This amount was taken and the two men then left. There was clearly no right to repossess on the grounds of overdue payments, and no repossession occurred, but the money was demanded and obtained by threats to repossess. I think that honourable members will agree that this is duress of the worst type. My inquiries disclosed that the bailiff referred to is one of four licensed bailiffs who operate under the registered business name of "Westmorlan Services." I point out that in this case a bank at Mount Gambier was nominated by the finance company as an approved place to receive money on behalf of the finance company, and a card was issued by the company to that effect. The cost of the transmission of moneys paid was debited by the bank concerned to the account of the finance company, the method of payment being that the hirer deposited the cash in the name of the finance company and the deposit slip was a record of payment, in other words, a receipt. In this case the money was deposited on July 15 and the next payment was not due until July 27. The repossession order was issued in Adelaide on July 18, three days after payment had been made in Mount Gambier. The finance company knew on July 19 that payment had been made, but made no effort to withdraw the repossession order it had issued. Will the Premier refer this question to the Attorney-General to see whether a bailiff can demand and obtain money for bailiff's charges in the circumstances I have mentioned, and if he cannot, what action will be taken in the matter?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes.

LOXTON COURTHOUSE.

Mr. STOTT—I understand that some time ago approval was given for the erection of a courthouse at Loxton, but that, following that approval, the Magistrate who would ordinarily sit in that courthouse perused the plans and rejected them on the grounds that he would have to enter by the same door as the prisoners. I understand that the plan has been referred back to the department, which will mean a delay of probably three or six months while other plans and specifications are prepared. Has the Minister of Works any knowledge of this matter? If not, will he call for a report and let me know whether it is possible to approach the Magistrates or others concerned to see whether they cannot be a little more democratic in their outlook and refrain from increasing the cost to the taxpayer of such buildings?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I will inquire of the Director of Public Buildings as to where this matter rests at present, and advise the honourable member.

OIL PRICES.

Mr. McKEE—Has the Treasurer a reply to my recent question on price-cutting by oil companies?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Prices Commissioner reports:—

A few months ago due to the initial action of one company, which compelled other companies to meet the position, price-cutting on petrol, kerosene and distillate became evident in a number of localities. The position has stabilized itself, however, as the oil industry realized that the margin allowed by the Prices Commissioner was not sufficient to permit extensive price cuts for any length of time.

I understand from Mr. Murphy's information that there has been price-cutting by some oil companies in a number of localities but, as the Prices Commissioner only fixes a maximum price, anyone is at liberty, if he so desires, to shave his margin and sell below the fixed price.

PAINTING OF BRIDGE AT MURRAY BRIDGE.

Mr. BYWATERS—Last year I asked a question of the Minister of Roads suggesting that the painting of the road bridge over the Murray at Murray Bridge was long overdue. The reply I received then was that it would be done this financial year. Will the Premier ascertain from the Commissioner of Highways when this work is likely to commence?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will look at that matter.

MILLICENT WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. CORCORAN—My question concerns the proposed water supply for the township of Millicent. The District Clerk has told me that the general feeling of those looking forward to the establishment of that supply is one of dissatisfaction with the progress made. It appears, whether or not the impression is justified, that much time must be taken up on the preliminary work. Can the Minister of Works comment on the progress being made there? It was thought that the work might be completed by the end of this financial year but we realize from the amount provided on the Loan Estimates that this will not happen.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Two very cogent factors govern the development of water supply throughout the State. One is the amount of funds available *in toto* for doing this work, and the other is the physical ability of the department concerned to cope with the departmental planning and the eventual construction work involved in any scheme. On the first point, it might be useful to remind the House and the public that South Australia carries a heavy burden in respect of water supply generally because of its physical disabilities. We have only limited sources of supply and a very large area of the State requires reticulation. That factor applies to South Australia possibly more forcefully than it does to most other countries. Indeed, over the years we have spent about £80,000,000 on water supplies in this State, which is in itself a material burden on the State's economy. The honourable member is correct when he says that some time has elapsed, but it is obviously no use the department's spending its energies on preparing a plan when there is not the finance available to implement it at the time.

Therefore, that has governed the speed with which the Millicent supply can be implemented. However, there is a substantial amount on the Estimates this year and, although it will not complete the scheme, it will enable the department to make some useful progress on it. I am just as anxious as he is to see this matter finalized. Contingent upon the urgent demands for water supply throughout the State, every effort is being made, and I am not at all dissatisfied with the work the department does. Rather would I compliment the department on the amount of planning and work it is able to do. It is not a simple matter to provide a water scheme for any place, and it is essential that, before the department commits the Government to a costly scheme,

it makes sure that its sources of supply are adequate to meet immediate requirements and to provide some margin of safety for future development. Those things are being taken care of. The preliminary work on the scheme is well in hand, and the amount provided on this year's Estimates will make a useful contribution to the completion of the scheme.

ADULT EDUCATION.

Mr. RYAN—Will the Minister of Education advise me whether separate accounts are kept for receipts and expenditure relating to adult evening class education and, if so, will he indicate the state of these accounts during the last financial year?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Yes.

CLARE AND BURRA HIGH SCHOOLS.

Mr. QUIRKE—Has the Minister of Education details of the proposed new high schools for Clare and Burra, particularly in relation to the purchase of land for the school at Burra?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—As the honourable member knows, the Education Department has purchased a site of 20 acres for a new high school at Clare. There is an enrolment of 240 students at present at this school and it is expected that this will increase to 250 next year. Full consideration will be given to the provision of a new high school building on the new site when the Loan Programme for 1961-62 is being prepared. The Burra high school has an enrolment of 120 students and it is expected to increase to 130 next year. Efforts are being made to obtain a new and larger site for the school which at present is housed in the same building as the primary school. An area of land has been referred to the Director of Public Buildings for inspection as to suitability. It will subsequently be necessary to refer it to the Land Board and then, if considered desirable, to Cabinet for approval of purchase. Consideration will then be given to the matter of the provision of the new high school.

SEALING OF MAIN ROADS.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—For some years it has been the practice of the Highways Department to seal main roads where they pass through country towns, and much work, which is greatly appreciated by the residents of these towns and districts, has been accomplished. There are four towns in my electorate—Carrieton, Cradock, Copley and Marree—which have not been so treated. Can the Premier say whether

consideration will be given to having the roads that pass through those towns sealed as opportunity offers?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will examine that matter for the Leader.

COUNTRY ELECTRICITY EXTENSIONS.

Mr. NICHOLSON—Until about 18 months ago the Electricity Trust's usual procedure in providing extensions in country districts was to use the three-phase system, but within the last year the trust has evolved a new scheme known as the single-wire system. Users of the three-phase system were involved in a high surcharge. The single-wire system reduces the charge by 25 per cent in some instances and by half in others. In some districts these two systems operate almost side by side and there is dissatisfaction among the users of the three-phase system. Will the Premier inquire of the trust whether the charges on the three-phase system can be reduced to bring them into line with the charges on the single-wire system?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The three-phase system gives an infinitely better supply than the single-wire system, which can only provide a limited service and which would not be recommended where any heavy load was required or under other circumstances where it would be inadvisable. I will submit the question to the trust, but I point out that the trust is already making a big subsidy towards the establishment of country electricity services. It assumes a much heavier obligation for such services than it does for services in towns or in the metropolitan area.

Mr. BYWATERS—As my district adjoins yours, Mr. Speaker, you know that both you and I have been approached in relation to a supply of electricity for the Marne Valley, a very important primary producing district whose residents are anxious to obtain an electricity supply. When I asked the Premier previously when this work would commence it was then thought that it might commence this financial year, but some constituents have since been told that it will not, and they are naturally sorry. Will the Premier take up this matter with the General Manager of the Electricity Trust to see how soon a supply of electricity can be provided for the Marne Valley?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I understand that this year the Electricity Trust is concentrating on a large extension in the nearby Mannum-Blanchetown area and, because of the shortage of steel and the unsuitability of overseas steel for the trust's purposes, any alteration in the programme can be made only

at the expense of the Mannum-Blanchetown reticulation, which I do not think the honourable member would require. Under those circumstances, I fancy that there is not much possibility of carrying out his suggestion, but I will have the matter examined.

GURNEY STREET (EDWARDSTOWN) MAIN.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Will the Minister of Works obtain a report from the Engineer-in-Chief on the possibility of providing an enlarged water main in Gurney Street, Edwardstown? Last summer the residents were short of water, and I believe that the additional number of homes erected there justifies an enlarged main.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I shall be pleased to do that.

KANGAROO MEAT.

Mr. RICHES—Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether kangaroo meat, which is being sold for human consumption, is subjected to any kind of inspection before sale? All other meat is required to be killed at the abattoirs and is inspected to ensure that it is fit for human consumption. I have been advised that if people saw the conditions under which some kangaroos are killed and the meat handled they would become vegetarians. I understand the matter was considered by the Public Health Department, but I have not heard whether action is proposed by the Central Board of Health or the Public Health Department. If an inspection is not made, will the Minister call for a report on the advisability of providing some form of control?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—There is no provision in the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Act for an inspection of kangaroo meat either at the point of killing or subsequently. The only control is in the normal inspection of butchers' shops to determine whether they comply with health requirements. That inspection would reveal offensive meat that could be injurious to health. I do not eat kangaroo meat, and I do not intend to. It would have to be well disguised before I ate it unawares.

COOPER PEDY SCHOOL.

Mr. LOVEDAY—When the Cooper Pedy primary school was opened the new community hall was used to accommodate the children. Since then the enrolment has increased to 39 and, I believe, is likely to increase further.

The existing accommodation is overtaxed. Will the Minister of Education examine this matter with a view to favourably considering providing two rooms soon to accommodate present scholars and to encourage aboriginal children to attend the school? If the aboriginal children attended the school they would receive an education and their parents would be more likely to remain permanently on the opal field.

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I shall be pleased to do that. I have much sympathy for the people in that area and for the students who attend and will attend the school. The use of the hall was only a temporary expedient. I will take up this matter with the Superintendent of Rural Schools (Mr. Whitburn), who is familiar with the position, and in due course will receive a report and recommendation from the Director of Education. If necessary, I shall be pleased to confer with the honourable member, who is also familiar with the situation.

PORT PIRIE TO BROKEN HILL RAILWAY LINE.

Mr. STOTT—Last night in the Commonwealth Treasurer's Budget Speech there was no mention of proceeding with the agreement for the broadening of the Port Pirie to Broken Hill railway line and no provision was made in the Budget to enable a start on this work. Can the Treasurer outline the present position and indicate when the Commonwealth Government intends complying with the agreement?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The last communication I had from the Prime Minister was that he would place the matter before the Federal Cabinet.

Mr. Stott—How long ago was that?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—A long time, and since then the Minister for Transport, Mr. Opperman, has been to this State and has inspected all of the lines. I think he spent six or eight days examining the lines in the Peterborough division, which is the next step proposed in carrying out the agreement. I have not yet had a chance to analyse the Commonwealth Budget in detail. I heard the broadcast last night, but there was no indication in that. Indeed, from what I gathered from the report I heard, it appeared that the main reductions in the Commonwealth Budget were in the works part of the programme. For instance, the Snowy River scheme had a reduction of £10,000,000, and the Victorian railways a reduction of £1,000,000 this

year under the agreement on the Melbourne to Albury line. However, I hope to get more information in the near future.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: WOOL PRICES.

Mr. TAPPING—I seek leave of the House to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. TAPPING—Today's *Advertiser* contains a report of a speech I made last night. Under the heading "Land Prices," the following appears:—

Mr. Tapping advocated the introduction of controls as the only remedy in restricting the "fictitious" prices being asked for land. He added that "extortionate prices" had been paid in the acquisition of land for farms. Some of the buyers were now regretting having done so because there had been an increase in wool prices.

What I said was that there had been no increase in wool prices.

TRAVELLING STOCK WAYBILLS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

DECENTRALIZATION.

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

(For wording of motion, see page 554.)

(Continued from August 10. Page 560.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—This matter is not a new one in this House; it has been debated on a number of occasions and has, I think, commanded considerable attention, not only in this Parliament but in other Parliaments in Australia and overseas. It is a matter of some general concern to many countries that there is an uneven distribution of the population because there is a large percentage in the metropolitan area or the capital city. Even during the war, or immediately after, the Federal Government took up this matter and promoted in the States regional planning in the hope that it would be possible, by having regional plans prepared, to have industries established on a regional basis whereas it might not be possible to have them established on an individual basis. Every State at that time agreed to prepare regional plans for its respective areas, and considerable work was done in South Australia.

If I remember correctly, the Leader last week mentioned that useful work had been done on regional planning. However, that work did not lead to any great advantage in any State in solving the problem. No State was able to use its regional plan effectively after it had been prepared. One State Parliament carried legislation designed directly to establish industries in country areas and, rather significantly, that State, according to the last figures produced by the Commonwealth in this matter, showed the biggest percentage increase in the metropolitan area compared with the country.

Mr. O'Halloran—Which State?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Victoria, where it was stated that five-sixths of the people coming into the State had settled in the metropolitan area. This problem is not easy of solution; I think the Leader himself realizes that, as he has to a certain extent shifted his ground.

Mr. O'Halloran—Not at all; all I have asked for is an inquiry, the same as I asked for last time.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—If the Leader looks at the suggestions he has placed before this House he will see that there is some shifting of ground, not in relation to objective but as far as the method is concerned, as this motion does not contain any suggestion of being able to direct industries to the country. There is no suggestion that it would be possible to send to the country an industry that did not desire to go there. In the past some members opposite have had at the back of their minds that it would be possible to say to an industry "You must go here," or "You must go there." The New South Wales Government set out to direct industries to go to the country.

Mr. O'Halloran—It made provision at the same time.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—It made provision and directed industries to go to the country. For example, it directed Philips Electrical Industries, which was situated in Sydney but which was not happily housed in its factories there, to go to the country, but this firm said that it was not very interested in going to the country, and it came to South Australia instead. That is a very good example to indicate that you cannot push industries around by telling them where to go.

Mr. Jenkins—How many people is that firm employing here now?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I think it employs between 2,000 and 3,000. It is a big and important industry and I only hope that some other States take it into their heads to take this short and quick way to get industry into the country by directing it to go there. I can imagine nothing that would be more conducive to the extension of industry in South Australia. However, I do not believe that will happen, because I think every State Government in Australia realizes now that there is no method whereby effective direction can be given as far as an industry is concerned.

Mr. O'Halloran—There is nothing in the motion about that.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I am complimenting the Leader on the development of his mental processes in this matter. As I say, there was a time when some of my friends opposite used to talk about sending industries to the country. We cannot send an industry to the country, and I compliment the Leader because for the first time, I think, one of his motions on this matter does not contain a specific provision for sending industries to the country. The terms of the Leader's motion on this occasion, and the method in which he presented the matter before the House, were, I thought, a distinct improvement on what we have ever previously had.

Mr. O'Halloran—We are making progress. How many years before you will support it?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Leader would be surprised. I thought he advanced the case on a much more reasonable basis than previously. I believe his motion contains some duplications, but on analysing it fairly and squarely I can see nothing that my Party would object to regarding the various heads it contains. Having said that, having complimented the Leader, and having gone that far with him, may I say now that I cannot go as far as he suggests I should go. I have seen Royal Commissions in many countries, and particularly in the Australian States, including South Australia, and from my own experience I do not believe that they are the best authority for determining issues. I say that with all respect to the Leader. I believe that on occasions a Royal Commission is extremely valuable in acquiring information, but that in a matter such as this the problem is more one of getting a solution. We know the issues; we are quite satisfied on what is the desirable objective, and it is therefore not a question so much

of getting information but rather a solution to the matters of which, I believe, we have a very wide knowledge.

Mr. O'Halloran—Isn't that precisely what I said?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes, I think it is, and that is why I say that in my opinion a Royal Commission is not the best authority to achieve a satisfactory result in this matter. However, the Government is not unsympathetic to the matters the Leader has placed before the House. I have some suggestions to make; I am prepared to amend the Leader's motion, and when the Leader has considered my amendments and agreed to them or disapproved of them we could then consider this matter properly and get some solution to it. With this in mind I move—

(1) To strike out "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," and insert in lieu thereof "this House requests the members of the Industries Development Committee, acting as a special committee;"

(2) To add the following paragraph:—

(f) Whether any, and if so, what, legislative action to encourage the establishment of industry in country areas is possible or desirable.

(3) At the end of the motion, to add the following paragraph:—

That, subject to the provision of moneys by Parliament for the purpose, each member of the special committee be paid a fee of three guineas in respect of each sitting of the committee attended by such member.

Members will then see that the motion, if my amendments are accepted, will state:—

That this House requests the members of the Industries Development Committee, acting as a special committee, 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 provision should be made to assist a programme of decentralization;

(e) what amenities, particularly sewerage schemes, are necessary to make country towns more attractive; and

(f) whether, and if so, what, legislative action to encourage the establishment of industry in country areas is possible or desirable.

That, subject to the provision of moneys by Parliament for the purpose, each member of the special committee be paid a fee of three guineas in respect of each sitting of the committee attended by such member.

The reason I move these amendments is that I doubt very much whether a Royal Commission is the best method of dealing with this matter. Such an authority would be appropriate to obtain information on intricate matters, but I believe this is a matter largely of political considerations, and as we have already appointed under Statute an authority that has had wide experience in this field I believe that giving this authority an opportunity of considering these matters, not as a specific reference of one industry which they have previously had, but in a broad way, would be a much more suitable method of properly considering the broad issues. The committee consists of two members nominated by the Government, two members nominated by the Opposition, and one Treasury officer. I compliment this committee upon its record of work. Since its inception this committee has inquired into and reported upon nearly 100 applications for financial assistance from industries covering a wide spread of activities in many localities. About one-third of these applications related to industries in the country. In addition, it has dealt with 12 applications for assistance in providing industrial premises pursuant to the 1958 amendment to the Act. The total assistance granted by way of guarantees, loans, and grants amounts to more than £3,500,000. Guarantees have amounted to £3,423,000 and loans and grants to £141,000, making a total of £3,564,000. One-half the guarantees given related to country industries, the amount of such guarantees being in excess of £1,500,000. Seven loans have been approved, of which five have been made in country districts. The amount of guarantees released to June 30, 1960, was £1,306,000, and repayment of the loans amounts to £101,000.

Those figures show the volume of assistance that has been given under this legislation. Let me give the other side of the picture. What has been the result from the financial point of view? The total losses experienced amount to £25,080, of which £22,416 represented the loss experienced in the failure of the refractory project at Wallaroo, to which I shall refer presently. The total guarantees given on the recommendation of the committee were, as I

have previously stated, £3,423,000, whereas Parliament has been asked to vote only £2,664 to make good losses in respect of two small industries. Honourable members will see that the results of the work of this committee, with the exception of the refractory project at Wallaroo, have been almost 100 per cent successful. Honourable members know that the refractory project was a special one. The Commonwealth Government sold the old distillery at Wallaroo to the State Government, subject to our trying to arrange for an industry to occupy it. It was purchased on favourable terms, and we took what was recognized at the time as the risk of a financial loss in establishing such an industry. We took a deliberate risk when we took that step. It did not involve the State in a loss, because the distillery was sold to the State on reasonable terms and the State recovered all its commitments on the overall project, although it did lose on the refractory project.

Mr. O'Halloran—You recovered your costs from various elements?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes, more than recovered. The State did not lose at all on the project. Indeed, the property at Wallaroo still belongs to the State.

Mr. O'Halloran—Did you recover the loss on the refractory industry as well?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes; the State did not lose. We have got the building and the property and we have completely recovered on all the amounts paid. I submit these figures with some reservations but, speaking from memory, Mr. Chifley sold the property to the State Government in the first place for £125,000. He asked to retain one boiler for some Commonwealth project and he reduced the price to £105,000. We sold the two boilers that were left and various equipment to the Electricity Trust. We sold equipment to Government departments to the extent of about £166,000. We lost £22,000 upon the project from the refractory. So we have the property completely clear of any cost and, in addition to that, there was some monetary gain. There was certainly no negligence on the part of the Industries Development Committee because the project was put to it as an attempt to establish an industry in rather difficult circumstances.

Mr. Riches—It could have been a success?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Probably. If the conditions that obtained at the time that the industry was established had continued to obtain, undoubtedly it would have

been a success; but there was a rapid alteration particularly in the availability of refractory bricks, as the honourable member knows. From being a commodity in very short supply, almost overnight the market was glutted with this product.

Mr. Riches—And insulators too?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes. The Industries Development Committee has been singularly successful in its work. It is a committee representative of both sides of the House and it could well examine and report upon these matters. The amounts paid normally to the members of the Industries Development Committee are, in my opinion, not sufficient to cover a special investigation of this description; they are comparatively small. As this would involve additional work, honourable members will appreciate that the amendments I have moved make the committee a special committee and provide that, subject to Parliament's passing the additional funds, members will be paid a sitting fee for each day they attend. I think the amount proposed there is not exorbitant: it would cover expenses. I have not made it a Select Committee, for the simple reason that a Select Committee, under our Standing Orders, can sit only while the House is in session, and I think much evidence sifting will be necessary before a report is available; so I have made it a special committee.

Mr. O'Halloran—It might even become a permanent committee?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—It may go on for a considerable time. The object here is to get some solutions rather than some hasty judgments. However that may be, I have indicated to the honourable Leader that, if he is willing to accept my amendments, I shall be pleased to provide in the forthcoming Estimates the necessary amounts for appropriations.

The Hon. Sir CECIL HINCKS—I second the amendments.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—On a point of order, I want to avoid a vote.

The SPEAKER—The amendments and the motion may be debated. The debate continues on the amendments and on the original motion. The Premier has no right of reply on the amendments.

Mr. MCKEE (Port Pirie)—The Leader spoke at some length on this matter last week, and what he had to say gave honourable members something to think about. The Premier has just spoken and I imagine that

he believes that he has just given me something to think about. It appears that if the amendments are not accepted we shall possibly get nothing. I think that the amendments will not alter things much from their present position. We have heard of the inconvenience caused to industries that go to the country but have heard nothing about the inconvenience caused to those who have to come to the city. The drift to the city in South Australia is more marked than anywhere else in the Commonwealth. As a country representative I am greatly concerned about decentralization. It could be rather embarrassing for several country members if it became known to the business people of their electorates that they opposed this motion. People everywhere today realize that with an increasing population such as we have here comes an urgent necessity for its most effective utilization. Our State's population is about 934,400, and Adelaide has a population of about 570,000. I doubt whether Saltbush Bill or Clancy of the Overflow, the well-known stockmen, could do a better job of mustering than the Government has in getting people into the metropolitan area. Port Pirie, the second largest city in the State, has a population of only 16,000. With the continued growth of our population, as I have pointed out previously, we should have plans for decentralization and that should be the purpose of any Government wishing to progress and develop the State as a whole.

Most people born and bred in the country do not go to the city to live because they want to; they are not happy in the city, where they live under artificial conditions and in a state of tension unknown in country areas. I think the country members will agree with me in that. However, because of the mechanized farming methods and the introduction of automation into the existing country industries, these people have no alternative but to go to the city to seek employment. I know of several hundred members of the Australian Workers' Union who have been affected. I would not deny farmers the right to use modern methods, but it is only fair and reasonable that if we close one door to employment, we should open another. Many men who normally sheared sheep or handled wheat at harvest time at sidings where silos have now been located have become partly unemployed and have had to seek other employment. Often they have been forced to leave their homes without any possible hope of selling them. I know this has occurred in several

country towns and I am sure that other country members are aware of it. This must have a demoralizing effect upon people who have been uprooted and have had to leave a life's work behind them to rot away. They have to come to a strange city to make a fresh start in an endeavour to survive.

When working men are forced to leave their homes and seek work elsewhere, business people in small country towns are affected and as a result one sees many empty shops. I am sure that Mr. Hall appreciates the need for decentralization and that many of his constituents expect him to support a move having this as its object. I noticed in the press recently that two firms employing 50 men between them were keen to go to Mallala, but the Premier said that not many companies desired to go to the country. That is not true, because I know of several companies that are keen to go to Mallala. The Labor Party has suggested that such people should receive encouragement and not be forced to go to the country. I would be surprised if any country town objected to the establishment of an industry in its locality.

Mr. Bywaters—Many country towns have appointed committees to encourage the establishment of industries.

Mr. McKEE—That is so. It seems to me that in this State the order of the day is that people who desire to live in the country are just not allowed to do so; and to get full employment they are forced to live in Adelaide. Many small businesses that have sunk their life-savings in the country are forced to close down and go to the metropolitan area. We know that this is the result of the Government's failure to encourage or establish secondary industries in country towns. I believe the reason is that this would possibly upset its gerrymander system. We know, because of the pattern of events, that that could be true. People are beginning to realize that the only means to get a stable and permanent productive work force is by the establishment of secondary industries in the country, or by encouraging existing ones there. If manufacturing industries are not created and established in country towns South Australia cannot hope to develop and hold an adequate population for the consumption of its goods. Last year I asked the Premier a question regarding the position of our youth at Port Pirie and I quoted the following from the *Port Pirie Recorder* under the heading "Where will they go?":—

The influx of more than 250 school-leavers on to Pirie's labour market at the end of the

year will more than aggravate what is becoming a serious unemployment problem. Already, many young people are being forced to leave the city and gain employment in Adelaide. The problem, which has gained momentum over the past few years, is gradually reaching a peak. Although the city is far from falling back, the rate of expansion is not sufficient to cope with the normal increase in population. One Pirie man said yesterday that it was "heartbreaking" to see all the young people leaving the city on the Sunday afternoon train for Adelaide. "To see fathers and mothers waving goodbye to their young teen-age children each week end really gives me heartache," he said.

In his reply the Premier said, among other things:—

Some industries are at present negotiating to come here. I was privileged last week to be able to announce the coming of two industries, and there are several others that I believe we shall be able to secure.

They came all right, but did not get past Adelaide or Elizabeth. The position is that there is no work for young people in country towns, and we are fast reaching the stage where unless some positive action is taken Port Pirie and several other country towns will become a liability rather than the tremendous asset they should be to the rest of the State and the Commonwealth. I support the motion.

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray)—I also support the motion, and even if the Premier's amendments are agreed to, I consider it would be a step in the right direction. When I was a small boy my mother showed me a piece of petrified rock and I was told that originally it was a piece of wood and that the constant dripping of water had changed it to a solidified form. I am reminded of that because I feel that constant dripping has at last had some response. Similar motions have been put before the House from time to time. Over the years the Labor Party has consistently advocated the appointment of a committee or commission as now proposed by the Leader of the Opposition, but the Government, through the Premier, has consistently refused to grant us anything in this direction. However, on this occasion apparently constant dripping has produced some result, because the Premier is prepared to take a step in this direction. I understand that on three occasions a move has been made by the Leader of the Opposition for what is now suggested.

Mr. O'Halloran—And on another occasion by a former Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Richards.

Mr. BYWATERS—I thank the Leader for that interjection, but I will not be perturbed if we lose the motion and the Premier's amendments are carried. The Premier said that he thought a Royal Commission was not the right body to go into the matter. He quoted instances in other States and more or less implied that they related to a similar matter to this. I remind the Government that Royal Commissions were appointed to study similar matters on other occasions. One was in relation to the establishment of the Electricity Trust in place of the Adelaide Electricity Supply Company and the other to the establishment of the Port Augusta power house. I believe there is a need for a committee to go into the whole question covered by the motion because no honourable member of this House or any member of the community can say just what is required. This inquiry should be undertaken by the best brains available and they should go into every aspect of the establishment of industries in rural areas. If that were done only good could result. I am perfectly aware from what the Premier said this afternoon that this is a problem that applies not only to South Australia, but to every State, and also to other countries.

There seems to be a desire by some people to congregate in a particular area. It is only through a concentrated, planned attack that something can be done. The Murray Valley Development League has appointed a Mr. Hennessy as research officer to make an investigation particularly in relation to decentralization, and a booklet was prepared by him. He has stressed what a community needs to do to encourage the establishment of industries in particular areas. Any person who has been associated with committees established by country councils to investigate means of effecting decentralization will appreciate the difficulty of encouraging industries to country centres. The word "force" was used this afternoon, as it has been on previous occasions, but the Opposition does not seek to use force; it seeks to encourage and entice industries away from the city. Local committees have done much in collecting and collating evidence to submit to industries to encourage them to their towns.

Since I have been a member of this House I have approached numerous organizations in seeking the establishment of industries in my electorate, and I realize how difficult is the task. On one occasion I went to Sydney and approached the Renault company, which I had

heard was interested in coming to South Australia to start operations. That firm forwarded the information that had been compiled by a committee in my electorate to France and we received a courteous reply. I subsequently met representatives of that firm in Adelaide and had a long discussion with them, but unfortunately Murray Bridge had nothing to offer other than its natural advantages. On other occasions I have approached metropolitan industries, but they have pointed out that they have all the facilities that they require in the city and that they would have to overcome problems before they could go to the country. However, through the constant work of our local committee, and with the support I have been able to give, one or two industries have started in Murray Bridge. The cannery, which commenced a little late this season because of one or two problems, was able to can pears, peaches, and apples at the peak of the season and, although its production was heavy, it was able to sell it all because of the high quality. The Premier received a deputation from the cannery and he has offered some encouragement for expanding the cannery's activities. Although there are orchards close to Murray Bridge, a big area is being developed for vegetable growing and naturally the excess production will have to be processed. Today there is a move towards concentrating fruit juices, and oranges, lemons and grape fruit, instead of being put through the normal process of juicing, are being dehydrated into a concentrated form. With the addition of water the fruit can be reconstituted. This process has been in vogue in America for some time and it is developing here and many companies are entering this field of activity. It will not be long before this process occupies a prominent position in the use of fruit juices. Through concentrating, space is saved and much fruit, not suitable for marketing, can be used.

The Opposition has been concerned for some time at the constant drift of population to the metropolitan area. As the Leader pointed out, in 1939 54 per cent of the population resided in the city and 46 per cent in the country, but in 1959 61 per cent was in the metropolitan area and 39 per cent in the country. The Leader has predicted that by 1991 75 per cent will be in the metropolitan area and 25 per cent in the country if this drift is permitted to continue. Steps must be taken to overcome this alarming drift,

which must concern the Government as well as the Opposition. The Premier's present attitude is a change from his former attitude. In 1957 he opposed a similar motion and his followers voted with him, but that was a retrograde step. Had the motion been accepted then we would have been three years nearer overcoming this problem.

At a function at Gawler the Premier said that it would not be long before there were 1,000,000 people on the Adelaide plains, and in a broadcast on July 28 he forecast a population of 2,000,000 in South Australia. If the predictions of the Premier and the Leader are both realized we shall have 1,500,000 people in the metropolitan area. Investigations reveal that vice flourishes in big cities. There is more vice in Melbourne than in Adelaide, and the position is even worse in Sydney. I am sure that all members join me in sympathizing with the mother and father of the little boy who was so brutally murdered by his kidnappers. I do not think that one person in Australia, other than those who committed this dastardly cruel crime, would not be sympathetic to these people, and I know that everybody's heart bled on hearing of the finding of the little boy's body yesterday. These things happen in big cities. In America they have happened for many years because of the concentration of population in cities. People are concerned when they see the metropolitan area increasing so rapidly instead of the people being encouraged to country areas. In his booklet, Mr. Hennessy refers to the alarming drift of population from the country to the city and states:—

The city magnate has considerable pull on country resources, on its people and materials. Figures disclose that Sydney adds about 54,000, Melbourne 42,000 and Adelaide 15,000 people to its population each year. That means that each year these cities absorb six cities the size of Albury, New South Wales, or nine towns the size of Shepparton, Victoria, or 22 towns the size of Murray Bridge, South Australia.

I point out that 15,000 people absorbed from the country by the metropolitan area each year is equivalent to the population of three towns the size of Murray Bridge, and that is an alarming situation. This trend will continue unless some move is made to improve the position.

Not so long ago the Gallup Polls of Australia conducted a survey to ascertain whether people would rather live in the city or in big country towns. The findings, published under the heading "Town Life rather than City Life," reveal

that most Australians would prefer to live in a big country town. The article stated:—

In this Gallup Poll in December, 1700 men and women in the cities, towns and farming areas of all States were asked: "If you or your husband were offered two similar jobs, one in the State capital and the other in a big country town, and there were no difficulties about housing or schools, where would you prefer to live—in the capital city or in a big country town?"

Of people who live in country towns or on farms, eight out of 10 would prefer "town" life to "big city" life. City dwellers, however, are fifty-fifty about it. Altogether, people answered:

60 per cent would like to live in a big country town,

35 per cent would prefer their State capital, and

5 per cent are uncertain.

This preference for living in a big country town was found in all age groups and in all States except Western Australia. There, half of the people interviewed would prefer to live in Perth. Most people said country towns appealed because they were friendlier, slower, quieter and fresher. Cities appeal because of their amenities, opportunities and facilities for leisure.

I believe that all of the facilities that city residents are enjoying are found in country towns, most of which have good educational facilities, sporting facilities and social life. Golfing, tennis, cricket and football are enjoyed in country towns, and I think the community spirit is much greater than in the city. People get to know one another and enjoy the fellowship of getting together and consequently people naturally enjoy living in the country more than in the city, but they live in the city because employment opportunities are limited in the country. Each year children go to the city because of lack of work in their country towns and their parents are compelled to follow suit because of the need for exercising parental control. This situation is not peculiar to any one electorate, but is common to country districts throughout the State and Commonwealth.

This morning when I mentioned to some of my colleagues that Mr. Hennessy pointed out that the birthrate was much higher in the country they suggested that that may be a reason for people wanting to come to the city. Apparently in the city there are about 370 children per 1,000 women compared with 550 children to every 1,000 in the country. I would not want the Industries Development Committee to cover this matter in its investigations because increased population in the country is necessary. Mr. Quirke and others have mentioned the high prices that are being paid for land in the metropolitan area. He

said that in the Gepps Cross area it was estimated that £3,300 would have to be paid for school land of not very high quality.

Mr. Quirke—Not estimated, but paid.

Mr. BYWATERS—It is a high price to pay for 25 acres of samphire land for school purposes. Mr. Millhouse estimated that possibly £1,000 would be paid for a building block in the Greater Port Adelaide Plan area, but this is not a particularly high price when we remember that in some suburbs a building block costs as much as £3,000 to £4,000. The cost of land is causing difficulties to Government departments. Within the next two or three years the Loan Estimates will have to be trebled if we continue to settle more people in the metropolitan area. I am sorry that we did not have a committee to investigate this matter several years ago, but we know that it takes some time to get the Government to consider Opposition proposals, and even then things are done according to the way the Government wants them done. People associated with sporting bodies and local government wanting to obtain land for recreation areas cannot get it at reasonable prices. In most cases the Land Board is not prepared to accept the high prices. I commend Mr. Laucke for the excellent attitude he has adopted towards the provision of recreation areas. The people of tomorrow will always remember his efforts to provide these areas. It is estimated by people who know that for recreational purposes 12½ acres of land is needed for each 1,000 people. We are falling a long way short of that and if the drift to the city continues the position will become worse. That is another reason why industries should be established in the country.

The build-up of traffic in the metropolitan area has been terrific. The congestion on the Main North Road leading to and from the city has been referred to on many occasions. We now have a dual track there but it is not enough to cope with the traffic. On the Anzac Highway and the South Road there is similar trouble. In order to duplicate our highways more land is needed, which means greater expense for the Government. To overcome that difficulty more country development should take place. The Government has to provide water in the metropolitan area. We already have a pipeline from the River Murray and another pipeline is to be constructed. At least another five reservoirs are needed. This all means increased Government expenditure. I think the money could be spent more wisely

if benefits and encouragement were provided for people and industry to go to the country.

When I prepared this speech it was different from what I have delivered. This is the result of the change in circumstances on the Treasurer's remarks. I was happy to alter my prepared speech because there is a genuine desire to do the best for South Australia. Opposition members are as anxious to do that for the people as the Government is. We have endeavoured to inform the Government of the facts. We have done it for several years and it is pleasing that at last the Government has taken notice of the Opposition's genuine desire to do the right thing for future generations. I like to think that future generations will not point the finger of scorn at present members of Parliament for not doing something in this matter. If I thought they would I would hang my head in shame because I had not done more in the matter. There is a need for heavy and other industries to be established in areas with natural advantages.

Since becoming a member of this place I have been concerned about the railways position in my electorate. At Tailem Bend there are many railway employees. Some have been connected with locomotive running, but because of dieselization it has been necessary to retrench a number of them. I do not want to interfere with dieselization but I think something should be done to replace what has been taken away. Because of the retrenchments Tailem Bend now has a number of empty houses. Workshops at places like Tailem Bend and Peterborough should be built up to retain the employees in those areas rather than have them drift to the city. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 10. Page 563.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—This matter has been raised previously and rejected. I can find nothing in the latest proposal to cause me to change my previous view on the matter. Opposition to the proposal has come from many parts of the community and I think it would be unwise for Parliament to proceed with something that has proved detrimental in other parts of the world.

The honourable member said there were all sorts of safeguards in this legislation, and I believe he has set them out fairly. However, if members examine similar legislation in other countries and in other States that has gone wrong, and badly wrong, they will find the same safeguards have been inserted and the same hopes expressed.

Mr. Jennings—There is no similar legislation.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—No, I do not think there is anything on earth similar to this legislation. Similar in effect is what I meant rather than similar in so many words, however. I have fully expressed my views on this matter previously. I do not support the Bill. I do not believe it would give any advantage in any way whatever to the State; in fact, I believe it would be detrimental. I know it would cause considerable concern to many people who are opposed to this type of legislation, particularly as it is posed on the ground that it is charitable in its disposition. It is not charitable in its disposition, of course, but will result in heavy expense out of the funds collected. I have spoken to the Chief Secretary, who administers charitable collections in this State, and I assure members that he also opposes it. We have tried to put charitable collections in this State on a good basis, and I believe that the committee appointed in pursuance of this State's legislation has done a good job. It has had a difficult task, but I believe it has prevented many excesses that have occurred in the collection and disposition of charitable funds in other States. I do not support the measure, and I hope it will not be accepted by the House.

Mr. TAPPING (Semaphore)—I support this Bill with a certain reluctance and reservation. The member for Edwardstown was most sincere in putting his case and had every desire to assist the organizations he referred to, such as football clubs, school committees and similar bodies, but I believe that to adopt the Bill as framed would be a retrograde step. I believe it would be hard to find another member who has had as much experience as I have had with junior football and swimming clubs in South Australia—and I believe that the Deputy Leader's idea in introducing this measure was to help these small clubs rather than major organizations, such as the National Football League, which obtain much money each week as gate money.

Clause 3 provides that an application shall be made to the Chief Secretary for a permit to conduct a lottery, but if a football club or other organization charges admittance it would not qualify for a permit. I could name four or five ovals near Adelaide where a charge of 2s. is made for admission on Saturday afternoons but, as only 80 to 100 people attend, very little money is raised from that source. These organizations would not qualify for a permit under this Bill. Would a football club that makes a collection on Saturdays also be deprived of a permit? If the Bill becomes law any organization will be able to obtain only one permit a year. That would be a retrograde step, as most youth organizations, such as football and swimming clubs, now conduct five or six competitions a year. If they were restricted to holding one they would not be able to carry on their normal functions, and I assure the House that with the high price of footballs and jerseys and the charges for hiring ovals it costs about £1,000 a year to conduct a football club in a business-like manner. Restricting these clubs to holding one lottery a year would, I think, do them a certain amount of harm. If the second reading of this Bill is carried, I will move certain amendments but, for the time being, although I do not give the measure my whole-hearted support, I support its second reading.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide)—I support the Bill, and make no apology for my support. I feel there is nothing wrong with the measure. I would appreciate a little more: for instance, a State lottery to raise money for our hospitals, but that is not the matter before the House. This Bill refers to very small lotteries, and is a minor matter. I should like firstly to reply to the very few words of opposition by the Premier. In about five minutes this afternoon he opposed the Bill, and firstly said that a similar Bill had been before the House previously but had been rejected by Parliament. That is perfectly true, but it is not a reason for rejecting this Bill. The decentralization motion we have just been discussing as Order of the Day No. 1 has been before this House on a number of occasions and has been rejected, but on this occasion the Premier has moved an amendment.

Mr. Shannon—Is one of your members going to move an amendment to this?

The SPEAKER—Order! Order of the Day No. 1 is not before the House for discussion.

Mr. LAWN—No, but the fact that something has been before the House before and rejected is no reason for rejecting this measure. Order of the Day No. 1 has been before the House on a number of occasions before and rejected simply because followers of the Premier have voted against it, and I suppose they will follow him in this matter. I can remember when the Leader introduced a Bill to provide for long service leave which the Premier said was one of the worst pieces of class legislation ever to be brought before the House, yet 12 months later he introduced a Bill of his own dealing with long service leave.

Mr. Shannon—What has that to do with lotteries?

Mr. LAWN—Nothing, but the Premier said that the previous rejection of this matter by Parliament was a reason why we should reject it again.

Mr. Fred Walsh—The Long Service Leave Act is a lottery, at any rate.

Mr. LAWN—As the honourable member says, the Act passed by the Playford Government on long service leave is a lottery. Everything in life is a lottery. I have an example of that every time I cross the road in front of my home in Marion Road. I have just written a letter to a constituent, who wrote to another member in error, who also pointed out the danger of crossing Marion Road. I have given the Police Department letters written by other residents in my district about crossing Fisher Terrace. People gamble on crossing that street, and they gamble on the Stock Exchange. We do not know whether we will be above the ground or not tomorrow; life is a gamble. We cannot reject this measure simply because it is gambling. We most certainly cannot reject it because similar Bills have previously been rejected by this Parliament. The Government introduced a Bill regarding the Marriage Act—

Mr. Jenkins—That is a lottery, too.

Mr. LAWN—As the honourable member says, that is a lottery. That Bill was rejected by this Parliament once, yet one or two years later the Government brought in another Bill that was passed. The Premier did not then get up and say, "We must reject this because it has been previously before the House and rejected."

Mr. Dunstan—It fixed a lottery upstairs in the meantime—in the Upper House.

Mr. LAWN—The Upper House has often had to be fixed before a Bill has gone through. However, many Bills have been before the

House and rejected, but that is no reason for opposing this Bill. If we investigated we would probably find many things that have been before the various Parliaments of the world on one occasion have been brought back a few years later and accepted by the same Parliament because of a change of circumstances. The Premier's theory could be applied to the medical profession. Doctors once told us that sugar caused sugar diabetes, but they tell us now that it does not. They once told us that we should not eat or do certain things or we would get ulcers, but they now tell us research has proved them wrong. They now advise other treatment for ulcers. That applies to many illnesses. Many things that doctors once said were incurable can now be cured by operation or medical treatment. Either doctors could not diagnose these things previously or their present diagnosis is wrong, because many illnesses or diseases they diagnose now as certain things used to be diagnosed as something else.

Mr. Millhouse—How do you link this with your argument on this Bill?

Mr. LAWN—My remarks are about the Premier's argument on the Bill. If the honourable member stayed awake all the time instead of attending partly to his correspondence he would follow me, but he has his ears on the ground today as he had yesterday. He is trying to do his correspondence and at the same time listen to me with his ears on the ground. He is trying to prepare his briefs. Tomorrow morning he will be at the courts, but he cannot do both. Had the honourable member been listening to me he would have known that the Premier said that, because this Bill had been rejected before, the House should reject it again. I was replying to that and I have not yet advanced my argument on the Bill. I was merely replying to the Premier's argument. I have heard the Premier sometimes do a good job in this House, although he and I always oppose each other, but this afternoon his effort was the worst I have ever heard from him. He said that wherever this legislation had been passed in all other parts of the world it had gone wrong, but he did not attempt to prove where it had gone wrong. To illustrate how his thoughts must have been travelling: when the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) pointed out that no similar legislation existed in any other part of the world, the Premier agreed that there was not one like this anywhere else. Did he think the members on this side of the House were a

lot of bunnies or did he think he was speaking to his own colleagues? Members on this side do listen to honourable members on the other side and analyse what is said. Indeed, we give credit for anything that is worthwhile, disregarding anything that is not worthwhile.

I ask the Premier whether, when he says things like that, he thinks I am a bunny. How can his supporters logically contend that their leader is opposed to this Bill this afternoon? They cannot honestly and conscientiously say that any of them has this afternoon advanced a case against this Bill. This is the Parliament of South Australia and it is discussing a most important matter although, admittedly, it is a minor matter. I thought that the Premier's effort was a very weak one and that effort came from a person I thought was about the only capable speaker on the other side of this House.

I now propose to deal with my case on the Bill and I have no hesitation in saying that I would support a Government Bill for a lottery, but I would not support a Bill that enabled organizations to run lotteries as they are conducted in the eastern States. I do not suggest that this Parliament should legislate to allow organizations to raffle palatial homes, race-horses and hotels as is done in the eastern States. We know that they are not all above board, but nobody has pointed the finger at a State-owned lottery in any other State and I challenge anybody in this House to point the finger at a State-controlled lottery in any other State. I admit that some of the other lotteries are not all that they should be.

What does this Bill provide? It merely provides in the first instance that clubs that play sport for their own benefit or without charge for the benefit of the public—that would include football, cricket, soccer and other sports in addition to sports played by girls, such as basketball—should have the right to conduct lotteries and I see no harm in granting those bodies the right to conduct lotteries under the conditions laid down in the Bill. They must first of all obtain a permit from the Chief Secretary's Department to conduct a lottery. The Chief Secretary has the right to gazette regulations controlling such lotteries which shall be for prizes which are articles and not money. I would not object to a cash prize but the Bill stipulates that the prize shall be an article.

School committees, religious institutions, hospitals and other organizations try to raise money for their organizations or to help the

sick, the aged, the needy, and the infirm, and it is intended that they should be allowed to conduct a lottery under certain prescribed conditions, one of which is that the prize shall be an article. Any association which is not carried on for profit and which, in the opinion of the Chief Secretary, is a charitable organization shall have similar rights. What is wrong with that?

In my district are certain organizations and recently I received a letter from a school committee that wished to raise £350 to buy uniforms for the school band. As I was asked for a donation I sent along a small donation but suggested to the committee that it would take many donations to raise that sum. I suggested that it run a Saturday afternoon fete. The same school also asked me for money as a contribution towards the installation of the *News and Mail* lights outside the front of the school. Those newspapers were to pay half the cost of the installation of the lights and the school was to pay the rest. Under the provisions of this Bill the school could run a lottery to raise money for those lights, which would ensure the safety of the children, and they could also use a lottery to raise money for school band uniforms.

Mr. Jennings—It will do that in any case.

Mr. LAWN—I do not know that it will do it in this case, but all honourable members know that has been done and I see no reason why these people should not be permitted to hold one lottery each year if the lottery is properly controlled. The lotteries at present conducted are not properly controlled.

We have experienced two world wars and we have been told that the Australian soldier has proved himself the best. We are also told that Australia is the most sporting nation in the world. I suggest that our soldiers' sporting activities in this country before they went overseas to those wars played a big part in the way they conducted themselves in the service of their country. We are now sending a large contingent of men and women to the Rome Olympic Games, and all those men and women have been participating in their various sporting spheres in Australia. In addition to running and swimming many other sports are represented. All these men and women participate in sport on Saturday afternoons or in the evenings and are helping to build up the physical condition and the mental outlook of our youth, because no man or woman can do all work and no play. Their activities give

something to the people who are no longer capable of indulging in sport themselves but who like to watch. I invite all members of this House to go to the south parklands in my district and see the hundreds of girls in their bright uniforms playing basketball. Many men take an active part in sport in their forties and even in their fifties.

We are doing no harm in permitting these sporting organizations to conduct one legal lottery a year, for many must be conducting illegal lotteries. We know the trouble the Olympic Games organizers always have to raise money to send athletes to the games. In fact, they even appeal to the Government for a subsidy or donation of some sort. Australia is not losing by sending 100 or 200 athletes to Rome, nor is it losing by sending cricketers to England or inviting them here from all parts of the British Commonwealth. We have to encourage our athletes in their local activities before they can get the opportunity to reach international standard. I heartily support the Bill, because I know the trouble these organizations have in raising money to meet the enormous cost involved in sport today. I am willing to assist those organizations in the manner suggested in the Bill, which permits the holding of a lottery properly controlled by the Chief Secretary's Department. Such a lottery would be nothing compared with some held in the eastern States, about which I have spoken. It has been claimed in the press that much money collected by means of lotteries in the eastern States is not being used for the purposes for which the lotteries are conducted. I do not condone that, nor does the member for Edwardstown. I have attempted to put before the House this afternoon the reasons why I support the Bill. I do not ask the House to reject it because it has been rejected previously. I hope that members who support the Bill or who oppose it will give their reasons for so doing, and that its opponents will not give such reasons as were given by the Premier this afternoon.

I am prepared to support the Bill as it stands, but if members can convince me in Committee that it should be amended in some way I will be open to conviction that it may be improved. I support the Bill as it stands, and I ask the House to do likewise so that we can have a further look at it in the Committee stages.

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla)—I have much pleasure in supporting this Bill. First of all, I refer to the Premier's opposition, which

appeared to me to consist of a few vague generalities and somewhat contradictory arguments. He spoke for only a few minutes, and said that the experience elsewhere of this type of legislation had shown that provisions such as we have in this Bill had always been abused. He then went on to say that there never had been anything like this before—that it was something quite new. He was producing a contradictory argument in his opposition to the Bill. I am rather interested to notice that there is a lack of speakers on this measure, and I doubt very much whether we shall hear much vocal opposition to the Bill, although it appears that it will have a lot of opponents.

I wonder why that is? It seems that many opponents are not willing to talk about the real opposition to the measure. Why is it being opposed? We have here a Bill designed to prevent all the abuses that we know can take place with lotteries. I make it plain that I am not a supporter of lotteries unlimited, and I would strongly oppose many types of lottery that have been brought into being, but the type of lottery envisaged in the Bill could be more faithfully described as a raffle. The object is to provide small organizations with means of raising small amounts for very good purposes, and the provisions of the Bill will prevent any proceeds being diverted for purposes for which they are not intended. It provides that no person shall be engaged for hire or reward in the management or carrying on of a lottery, and no money prizes shall be distributed. The other provisions are safeguards to prevent any abuse in the conduct of a raffle or lottery of this description.

The objections usually made to lotteries are on moral grounds. It appears to me that we have people who would say that prohibition is useless and that it is rather ridiculous to attempt to apply it to the use of alcohol, yet they attempt to apply it to a lottery. I doubt very much whether many members in this House have not at some time or another bought tickets for raffles of the description to which this Bill applies. I worked for many years amongst factory workers who took part every week in this type of raffle. To my knowledge, all those people were careful men who budgeted carefully. They were particularly good citizens whose morals never suffered because of their putting in sixpence or a shilling from time to time for these competitions. It is natural and human for persons to make these small contributions towards an

association, and I am certain that when they make such a contribution they do not look for some great prize or reward. They have in mind that they are helping the organization in question by contributing a small amount and, if they win a small prize, it is cause for congratulation by their fellow workers.

Mr. Jennings—They often donate it back?

Mr. LOVEDAY—Exactly; yet honourable members sit here this afternoon opposing the measure without saying why. Surely, the right approach to this sort of question is a matter of self-discipline? There is nothing fundamentally wrong in a man doing what this Bill suggests he should be able to do. It is a natural thing to do. I have done it scores of times, and no doubt will do it again. If I opposed this Bill knowing that I had done these things, I should consider myself a hypocrite. It is amazing to me that we cannot approach these things from the point of view of self-discipline. The Premier dismissed the Bill in a few minutes. He was not game to say why he was opposing it. His real reason—

Mr. Ryan—He has not got any.

Mr. LOVEDAY—If he has, he kept it quiet. There is nothing wrong with this measure. It will only legalize something that is going on all the time and is doing much good for all the small organizations mentioned this afternoon. I know many locally that could not exist without this form of competition. They would have no means of getting the money they required for their purposes.

It is high time that all the reticence about this Bill was brushed aside and honourable members got up and said on what real fundamental grounds they opposed it. They are not voting for the lottery that enables people to indulge in all sorts of skulduggery. This deals with raffles; it is something to promote the benefit of small organizations needing money. I have indulged in this sort of thing, and so have all honourable members around me—to the harm of nobody. The citizens I am talking about are all good, with the best characters one could wish to meet anywhere. Why all the objection to this sort of thing? Let us be a little more honest about it. I hope honourable members will approach this from what I call a sensible angle and give this measure the proper support it needs and should have.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood)—I support this Bill. In fact, I do not think it goes far enough. The honourable member who explained

it in a fine speech limited its application, but it probably goes too far in its limitation because there are lotteries other than those he proposes to cover in this measure. However, I certainly intend to vote for its second reading. As the honourable member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) has rightly pointed out, there is far too much cant and hypocrisy in South Australia about lotteries. This place is absolutely riddled with raffles. I know in my own district there are very few sporting, social or educational organizations that are not running raffles. They are not just the competitions the honourable member for Semaphore (Mr. Tapping) talked about: they are raffles. There are few members in this House, as the honourable member for Whyalla has said, who have not bought tickets in raffles. I have done so myself. There are one or two members on this side of the House who have certain moral objections to lotteries and resolutely refuse to participate in them; they are not prepared to take part in them. That is a matter for their consciences, and I respect them for it. Unacquainted as I am with the consciences of honourable members opposite, I do not know whether any on that side are in the same category but, if they are, then they are in a very small minority in this House, for most members take part in lotteries. I am not opposed to lotteries of the kind covered by this proposal. I do not see any moral danger in them but I do see a moral danger in the continuance of larger and larger uncontrolled lotteries in South Australia which are policed in no way at all. The passing of this measure would not mean that there would be more lotteries in South Australia: it would mean fewer lotteries here but those authorized under the legislation would be properly supervised.

In fact, legislation of this kind is in force in other parts of the world. Perhaps they are a little far removed from the ken of the Premier, but I have practised law in a place where a measure similar to this happens to be in force. It does not go in for nearly as many lotteries as one finds littering the social organization of South Australia, but lotteries there are fair and above board and subject to such conditions that they can harm no-one. Is it not better that we legalize what is going on here and see that it is properly supervised rather than that we have what is possibly a growing social evil in South Australia in the number of card clubs and the like that are being run here today?

This measure can do much for the smaller organizations and I hope that all honourable

members will rise and say why they support or oppose this Bill. If they are prepared to oppose it, let them say whether in fact they are opposed to lotteries and whether they themselves have ever taken part in the kind of lottery that this Bill seeks to control. If honourable members in this House were honest about this measure, we should find that most would support it; but I am afraid that honourable members will pass silent votes on this Bill because they fear the reactions of certain church organizations on the subject. I say frankly to those members, "It is better to be honest with the church organizations." Those church organizations opposed to lotteries are, I believe, mistaken in their opposition to a measure such as this because, so far as they oppose it, they are not wiping out the kind of raffle that takes place in this State: they are simply allowing it to go on, a procedure that is broadly winked at by the authorities in South Australia today.

Mr. Millhouse—Can the honourable member explain how this Bill would wipe out that evil?

Mr. DUNSTAN—Yes. I think that there would be a considerable fear of lotteries, for the simple reason that the lotteries provision, as soon as licences for lotteries were given, would be much more strictly policed than it is today.

Mr. Millhouse—Why?

Mr. DUNSTAN—Because the authorities would then have to do something about over-seeing lotteries. At the moment, they simply wink their eye at them. Of course, when it is shoved under their nose they do something. For instance, some policemen walked into a football club with which I was associated. They walked up to the treasurer who had a pile of papers in front of him clearly marked with the word "Raffle." In that case they had to make inquiries but, apart from occasions like that, they do not inquire; they simply wink their eye at what takes place. Many members of the police force take tickets themselves in raffles. If they were required, as they are in Fiji, to oversee lotteries, then they would see to it that the terms of the licences were complied with and that only those people without licences were in fact charged. The remedy would be simply to make the police tighten their supervision of the present law. That remedy has been open to the administration for many years, but I see no sign of its doing anything about it. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

LOAN ESTIMATES.

In Committee.

(Continued from August 16. Page 633.)

Grand total, £30,772,000.

Mr. RALSTON (Mount Gambier)—In past years most honourable members welcomed this debate, but possibly for different reasons. Members opposite have seized the opportunity to laud the Government's efforts, but this year these paeans of praise are noticeably absent. However, members on this side welcome the debate even more than in other years because they are keenly interested in the omissions of certain items from the Estimates. I note with pleasure that £84,000 is included for expenditure by the Engineering and Water Supply Department at Mount Gambier to provide tanks, mains and pumping equipment. The Minister of Works yesterday made great play on the outstanding achievements of the past year. Water reticulation is of the utmost importance. Many of the existing mains which were laid 40 to 60 years ago no longer have sufficient carrying capacity to supply the needs of the district during the summer. I therefore welcome the provision of this amount to rectify the problem.

The reference to tanks raises some rather interesting issues and when the various lines are being considered I would appreciate an explanation of the position by the Minister of Works. I trust that he has noticed the extremely hostile reaction of people at Mount Gambier to the new water assessment, and particularly the water rate, and the very nominal amount by which it has been reduced in this water district. Two years ago an amount of £20,000 was provided on the Estimates for sewage treatment works at Mount Gambier. Last year that was reduced to £2,000 and this year there is no mention at all of any specified amount for this need. I do not suggest that it has gone the way of the suggested deep sea port in the South-East, the nuclear power station, or some other pipe dream. According to a line on page 10 there are to be some more preliminary investigations. These have been proceeding for three years and were started as far back as 1940. A former Premier of this State had a little to say about a deep sea port at Portland, and the people of the South-East noted his remarks with considerable interest. Many believed that he was instructed to have his little say. It certainly sounded the death knell of any deep sea port in the South-East.

The question of water rates is a matter of State revenue and I will deal with that at some length during the Budget debate. Undoubtedly, honourable members are well acquainted with the constant appeals by councils in the South-East, which are unanimous on this issue, and those councils have the unanimous support of honourable members who represent electors in that area. They have appealed constantly for modern railway sleeper accommodation. This year the Railways Department has provided a modern sleeper for this service during the months of July and August, subject to the permission of the Victorian Railways Department. South Australia has only a minor interest in the ownership of joint stock. Victoria has the major interest. The experiment could prove extremely interesting, because it could be conducted only during the quiet time of the year when the joint stock could be made available. At present a sleeper service is provided from Adelaide to Mount Gambier and return, but not from Mount Gambier to Adelaide and return. Once each week, on Wednesday nights, it is possible to travel to Adelaide in a modern sleeper, but the passenger must wait until the following week if he wishes to return using that accommodation. This trial period is being conducted at the worst possible time of the year, on what is generally regarded as the worst night of the week for passenger usage, and with a service operating in the reverse manner from what was requested. Despite this, the service has been well-patronized. The twinettes and roomettes are excellently appointed, well-insulated from noise, and provide a first-class modern service. They should have been available years ago. The Minister of Railways will find it difficult to persuade the South-Eastern people that the outmoded, noisy, and, by comparison, primitive sleepers are good enough to serve the South-East after this experiment with modern sleeper accommodation.

At present many business people and others use air transport from Mount Gambier rather than rail. What are the advantages of using air transport? Do the travellers save time? They save time in travelling, but not in terms of time available for business purposes. Is air transport cheaper? Certainly not! In fact it is much dearer. A person can leave Mount Gambier or any other South-Eastern station by train at such time as is appropriate to that station and arrive in Adelaide before eight o'clock the next morning. He can have a full

day in the city for business purposes, leave that night and be in Mount Gambier the next morning before eight o'clock at a cost of £7 17s. 6d., excluding the price of meals he has in the city. To obtain the same time for business purposes by air, a person must leave Mount Gambier by the evening plane and stay overnight. No plane leaves Mount Gambier in the morning for Adelaide. He can spend the next day in the city, but must again remain overnight because no plane leaves for Mount Gambier in the evening. He leaves next morning for Mount Gambier. The cost of the air fare, plus transport to and from the airports, is £14 12s., and the cost of overnight accommodation would be no less than £3—and probably nearer £4—so that to enjoy the same time in Adelaide it costs £17 12s by air as compared with £7 17s. 6d. by rail. There must be an answer to this because it is not the normal habit of businessmen or others to spend money in this manner. The only answer is found in the quality of the transport provided. Unless the South Australian Government provides a modern service to this valuable part of South Australia, the sooner it gets out of the business the better.

The South-Eastern pine forests are one of this State's most valuable assets. Members have had many opportunities to examine at first hand these magnificent forests and the modern mills that have been established by the Government to manufacture the many types of timber required by industry throughout Australia. Doubtless members have been suitably impressed by these monuments to State enterprise, but I remind members that there are other ways of processing a pine tree into valuable articles besides milling it into timber. Last week a Bill was introduced to permit Loan money to be used to enable the Government to exercise its right to take up notes and shares to be issued by Cellulose Limited to shareholders at par. The Treasurer said it would be culpable not to exercise this right. I agree, especially as Cellulose Limited £1 shares are quoted on the Stock Exchange today at £6 12s. buyer, and £6 15s. seller. The Government has a valuable interest in this enterprise. It has agreements with that company and with Apcel to supply timber from the State forests to enable the companies to operate. Water supplies have been made available and power is supplied by the Electricity Trust at a concession rate below any tariff published in the schedule of tariffs for zone I of the South-East. Even the new State mill does not obtain power at this reduced

rate. Nevertheless these agreements have been made in the name of the Government and unquestionably they must be honoured during the period in which they apply. It is estimated that the total amount of softwood to be made available annually by the Woods and Forests Department will not be required by these companies until full expansion is reached 10 years hence. It is right and proper that we should plan to use the assets of the people for the benefit of the people. It is time that the Government seriously considered the establishment of a wood pulp industry to be integrated with the other activities of the Woods and Forests Department. Such an establishment is the accepted practice in all other parts of the world where it is admitted that the profits from the pulp industry cover all the milling costs, with the timber produced being clear profit. Wood pulp production is recognized as the fastest growing industry in America. It is regarded as essential to any major soft wood mill, or to several smaller mills. Our Conservator of Forests told the Parliamentary Select Committee that investigated the Apcel proposal that there was no reason why the State should not establish a paper pulp industry in the same way, and undoubtedly with the same success, as it established the saw-milling industry in conjunction with our pine forests.

To see whether this would be a profitable venture or not let us look at the profits of the State mills and compare them with the profits of Cellulose Ltd., bearing in mind the quantity of soft wood in log form used by each enterprise during the financial year and the resultant profit. As profits from the State mills are not subject to income tax we should include the amount provided for income tax by Apcel, together with the net profit shown, in order to obtain a fair comparison with the net profits of the State mills. I have done that and I shall give the results obtained, according to information obtained from the Auditor-General's report and from the financial columns of the *Advertiser*. In 1957-58 the State mills processed 71,000,000ft. of wood and had a profit of £393,000. In 1958-59, 94,000,000ft. of log was processed and the profit was £426,264. The figures for 1959-60 are not yet available as the Auditor-General's report has not been presented to Parliament. In 1957-58 Cellulose Ltd. processed 6,000,000ft. of timber and made a profit of £238,511. In 1958-59, 7,000,000ft.

of log was processed at a profit of £293,642, and in 1959-60 after treating 7,000,000ft. of log the profit was £336,590. The profits in this industry are enormous when compared with those of the State mills. I point out that Cellulose Ltd. also used a substantial tonnage of waste paper in their products, as well as some imported paper. From the figures quoted it must be obvious that the real profit in the pine tree industry comes from paper pulp but we cannot afford to overlook any opportunity to use the State forests to the greatest benefit of the people who own them.

These Loan Estimates do not provide an amount for living quarters for the resident medical superintendent at the Mount Gambier hospital. Attention has been drawn to this matter previously with little result, but fortunately pressure of public opinion will resolve the issue, probably soon. There have been occasions when the need for a resident

medical superintendent has been clearly demonstrated. Government proposals regarding housing usually leave something to be desired and I doubt whether any of the country members, most of whom sit on the Government side, are happy to learn that this year country districts will get only 11 houses for people of limited means, but 194 cottage and villa flats will be provided in the metropolitan area. During this debate I should like other country members to express their feelings on the need for more housing for country people of limited means. I hope the views I have expressed will be regarded as constructive and not merely critical. I support the first line.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.29 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 18, at 2 p.m.