

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, October 5, 1960.

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

QUESTIONS.**STATE'S PROGRESS.**

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Many times in the House we have listened to glowing accounts of the remarkable development of South Australia under the guidance of the present Government, and the prospects are also presented as being just as rosy for the future. I have two examples of statements by the Premier along these lines, and I could give many more. Firstly, when presenting the Budget this year, he said:—

The progress over the post-war years, which followed a war effort of which we were justly proud, has been quite unparalled in Australian history.

Secondly, when visiting Commercial Motor Vehicles Limited, of Richmond, he is recorded in the *Advertiser* of September 23 as saying:—

South Australia is on the verge of the biggest industrial advance in its history.

Will the Premier state whether the industrial development of South Australia has been better or worse than the development in the other States of Australia in the last seven years?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The answer to the Leader's question is "Yes, the development in South Australia percentage-wise has been much greater than that of any other State." If members would like some statistics to prove that, they could prove it simply in two or three ways. For example, they could take the increase in population, which has been more rapid percentage-wise in South Australia than in any other State. They could take the number of children in our State schools, which is far greater than that of any other State. The fact that so many people are coming from other States to this State to take up occupation here clearly establishes that the opportunities here are greater than in the States they leave. If still another criterion is required to establish that fact, I suggest to the Leader that he study the relative statistics concerning the capital cities of Brisbane and Adelaide. Brisbane has been larger than Adelaide and has been the third city in Australia but, by the end of this year, Adelaide will be the third city. The answer to the Leader's question is undeniably "Yes."

Mr. FRED WALSH—Yesterday, before the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission at present sitting in Adelaide, Mr. Robinson, representing the employers, said:—

Since 1953, the Court has granted four flat rate increases amounting to £2 and we say that South Australia in this period, while progressing, has not progressed as rapidly as the larger and better endowed States . . . and . . . the rate of progress has slowed down in comparison with the larger eastern States.

That statement perturbed me and others. Does the Premier still maintain that South Australia, under the guidance of his Government, is progressing as rapidly and as favourably as he would have the people of this State believe?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes. I point out to the honourable member that it has never been claimed (indeed, it would be extremely foolish to claim) that the rate of progress in South Australia is as great as the rate of progress in Victoria and New South Wales, which have infinitely larger populations.

Mr. Fred Walsh—I meant in comparison.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The comparative increased rate of progress is borne out by many comparisons that one could make. For instance, more migrants have come to South Australia, percentage-wise, than to any other State. As a matter of interest, although the population of South Australia is only about nine per cent of the total population of Australia it has regularly been taking 15 per cent of the migrants. That gives an example of the great development that has taken place here. I do not know the basis of the statement that has been made, or whether it has been taken out of its context, but if in fact that is the evidence submitted to the Arbitration Court and it is in accordance with the context, then I can only say quite frankly that I do not agree with it. I do not believe it to be a supportable fact.

DEAN RANGE.

Mr. HEASLIP—Before the recent adjournment of the House I witnessed the final of the Queen's shoot at the Dean Range at Port Adelaide and while I was there many questions were asked regarding the future of the range. I understand that the Greater Port Adelaide Plan will shortly require this area. Between 5,000 and 6,000 riflemen are involved in the movement, and there is no doubt about the wonderful record they established during the war as riflemen and soldiers. Can the Premier give information regarding a future location

for a range when Dean Range is required for the Greater Port Adelaide Plan?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The honourable member is correct: it is desirable that Dean Range should be shifted. It is beginning to hamper the development of the area adjacent to Port Adelaide and, as the range belongs to the Commonwealth Government, negotiations have been proceeding with the Commonwealth for a considerable time with the object of acquiring the range and using the area for the rapid expansion in that part of the State, as in other parts. The Commonwealth Government has been reasonable; it realizes that the range is now unhappily situated. It has said that provided that the South Australian Government provides an alternative range it is willing to transfer the ownership to the State. Negotiations which have been proceeding for some time have now reached the stage where submissions will be made to Cabinet, I believe next Monday, by the Minister of Works. I assure the honourable member that, in the planning to shift the range, careful and sympathetic consideration will be given to all the interests at present established on it. I give that assurance because the Government, like others, realizes that this range has played and is playing an important part. In fact, that assurance is perhaps not necessary because everyone knows Sir Lyell McEwin is a leading authority in this matter and has been associated with rifle-shooting all his life; so he will see that ample care is taken to ensure that the rifle clubs' interests are protected. That the ownership of the present range should be transferred to the Harbors Board is necessary for development, and I think this will be achieved soon.

EMPRESS ELECTRICS.

Mr. COUMBE—My question concerns the activities of a television company in Adelaide named "Empress Electrics," about which a question was asked recently, I think by the member for Hindmarsh. I have received complaints from constituents concerning the activities of this company, which telephones a person at home and states that if that person answers three simple questions correctly he or she will win £50 which will be used as a deposit on a television set. Upon the questions being answered correctly and the £50 being confirmed as sufficient deposit, a set is often ordered; but upon receiving delivery of the set the person concerned is confronted with a demand for a further £20 deposit, otherwise the set will not be delivered. This has been

reported to me as occurring on a number of occasions and it has caused considerable distress, especially to elderly folk. Will the Minister of Education ask his colleague, the Attorney-General, to inquire into the activities of this company and see whether this procedure amounts to misrepresentation and whether any action can be taken to prevent this racket from being foisted upon the unsuspecting public in future?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Yes. The Attorney-General supplied me with a report and an opinion from the Crown Solicitor in reply to a specific and rather limited question some time ago. Speaking from memory, I think that the Crown Solicitor said that the action of the company did not constitute a breach of the law. The honourable member's question envisages a larger aspect, and I shall be only too pleased to take it up and bring down a reply.

ASSISTANCE TO LIBRARIES.

Mr. HUTCHENS—My question arises as a result of the tabling yesterday of the report of the Libraries Board of South Australia, and an article that appeared in this morning's *Advertiser*. What concerned me was that the report indicated that there was great difficulty in retaining adequate staff to enable our libraries to function effectively. It seems to me, therefore, that the people of South Australia are denied a very valuable educational facility. Does the Premier know whether this is so, and if it is, will the Government consider recommending to the Public Service Commissioner the payment of salaries that will encourage qualified people to take up a calling in the Libraries Department in order to provide this effective and necessary service?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Libraries Board has given valuable assistance to country libraries in the establishment of new libraries. From time to time staff have been lent to enable new libraries to be established in the country under proper conditions. The Libraries Board, therefore, has been exercising functions in excess of its normal functions, and with the rapid expansion of libraries that in itself will throw strain upon the organization concerned. I do not know whether that is the full explanation of the shortage, but that would be one reason why we are shorter of library staff than we normally would be. Regarding the second part of the question, the Public Service Board has been established by Parliament to determine salaries, and the Government normally

does not interfere with the board or with the Public Service Commissioner in the exercise of those functions. True, if we offered a high inducement we would probably be able to pull people out of the Education Department, for instance, to go into the Libraries Department, but I consider that to be highly undesirable because those people are urgently needed where they are and the offer of an inducement to attract officers from one department to another is something the Government does not normally encourage.

SALT EVAPORATION PROJECT.

Mr. McKEE—In August I asked the Premier a question about his statement regarding the establishment of a salt evaporation project at Port Pirie. The Premier said that a large international company applied for the right to take up salt pan leases adjacent to Port Pirie, that the right to take up leases had been agreed to, and that further investigations were being made. I hope that this company is still interested in coming to Port Pirie, and I should be grateful if the Premier would contact this company and encourage it to come to that town, if the lease is suitable. Can the Premier say what stage the investigations have reached?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Government does from day to day, as a matter of course, contact any prospective company that it believes would be interested in coming to this State. Regarding the first part of the question, as far as I know the leases are still held in the name of the company that took them up. I am not entirely conversant with the extent to which the investigations have been made, but I received a letter one day last week from the gentleman who was instrumental in having the leases taken up. That person said he would be coming to South Australia soon. I am not able to say at this stage just what that means, but I assure the honourable member that any action the Government can take to further this activity will be taken.

MURRAY RIVER LEVELS.

Mr. KING—I believe the Minister of Works has an answer to the query raised yesterday by the member for Stirling (Mr. Jenkins) and me concerning the Murray River levels.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I requested a report from the Engineer-in-Chief on the probable heights of the river at various times. As honourable members know, there have been heavy rains in the watersheds of the Murray and its tributaries, which will result in one peak flow in the river, and this will be followed by

a second peak when the normal snow melting occurs and the water comes down a little later. Mr. Dridan reports as follows:—

Heavy rain fell in the watersheds of the Upper Murray, Murrumbidgee and the Victorian tributaries during the first half of August and as a result of these rains the river is expected to reach a peak of approximately 21ft. 5in. at Renmark on October 16. This is slightly lower than previously expected as the weir at Lock No. 5 has been entirely removed. Very heavy snowfalls have occurred on the alpine portions of the watershed this year and the further heavy rain which fell 10 days ago coupled with the melting snow will cause a second peak at Renmark. Although it is too early to make a reliable forecast, present indications are that the second peak will attain a height of 23ft. at Renmark during the last week in November. Mr. W. W. Jenkins, M.P., asked a question in regard to likely levels in the lower reaches of the Murray. These can of course be greatly influenced by wind, but neglecting this factor it is expected that a first peak of R.L. 111 (18in. above normal) will reach Murray Bridge on November 1, and a second peak of R.L. 111.75 (2ft. 3in. above normal) will reach that town on or about December 10.

METROPOLITAN MILK BOARD.

Mr. BYWATERS—Yesterday there was tabled in the House a report by the Metropolitan Milk Board stating that it had purchased property at 33 Hutt Street for the erection of buildings and other facilities for the board. I understand that money is available at the moment through the funds contributed by the treatment plants and the producers. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the cost of the building will be subsidized by the Government and whether any of the money now provided will be set aside for any future developments and for the advertising and promotion generally of the sales of milk?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—The Metropolitan Milk Board intends to build premises on the property it has acquired and will then for the first time have its laboratories and offices in the one place. It will be a satisfactory move from its point of view. It is at present making financial arrangements for this building, the details of which I could not give the honourable member at the moment, but it has a large sum available and is at present completing arrangements for the building. The honourable member also asked me about advertising, which is a different problem altogether. The cost of advertising has not been worked out, either as to how much would be required for advertising or as to who would pay for any advertising done. There are at least two methods of financing an advertising

scheme, and much discussion is going on now about that. Not enough people in the milk industry appreciate the tremendous sums that would be involved in advertising, but in any case at present the board has no power to advertise milk, nor has it asked for it. That problem is being considered at present from the point of view of not only the Milk Board but other sections of the industry.

ROAD CONSTRUCTION.

Mr. QUIRKE.—Has the Premier a report on the method of construction of the road between Smithfield and Gawler by which enormous quantities of sand have been placed on the surface and metal superimposed on that? I think I understand the reason for it but I asked the question previously for reasons of public interest.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Commissioner of Highways reports that the spreading of sand or similar low cost material as a sub-base, where such is required, is orthodox procedure for road construction in most countries in the world. It has been standard practice in this State for many years. Because the soils of this area have low bearing strength, a pavement thickness of 17in. is necessary. In order to conserve crushed stone, which is relatively expensive, sand is used in the lower portion of the pavement. It also serves a two-fold purpose, permitting the pavement to be raised higher to facilitate the laying of cross-drainage pipes.

NOOGOORA BURR.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—My question follows that of the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) yesterday. I have received a letter from the district council of Peterborough about Noogoora Burr, which states:—

Members of my council view with great concern the indiscriminate entry into South Australia of sheep from areas infested with Noogoora Burr. They feel that the most stringent precautions should be taken to ensure that this dangerous weed is not spread throughout South Australia through the medium of infected sheep. As a means of preventing the weed becoming established in the State, it is recommended that consideration be given to the introduction of legislation which will require that all sheep be inspected and certified free of Noogoora Burr before being permitted to enter South Australia.

That letter is signed by the district clerk. I have also received representations from people concerned with stock being transported on the Broken Hill side of Peterborough. If I hand this letter to the Minister of Agriculture, will he consider the request made by the district clerk of Peterborough?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I replied to a question about Noogoora Burr yesterday and do not think I can add any more to what I said then; but I ask the honourable Leader to give me the letter from the district council so that I can check its statements and get a report from the Director of Agriculture. I shall then be able to give the honourable member a considered reply and may be able to add to what I have already said. The department has been most concerned to exercise the utmost vigilance. It will welcome any report of Noogoora Burr infestations on sheep and particularly factual reports of stock carrying it. It will take the most energetic measures to deal with it. That is about as far as I can take the matter now.

MELROSE WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. HEASLIP—Recently the Government approved a water supply for Melrose, but whilst I have seen some activity on the Caltowie to Booleroo scheme I have not seen any at Melrose. The local residents are somewhat concerned. Can the Minister of Works say whether the work is proceeding according to schedule and whether landholders whose properties abut the main will be able to secure water?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I am not sure what physical progress is being made at Melrose, but the extension from Caltowie to Booleroo is actively in hand and progressing well. The route to Melrose has been defined, plans for the reticulation of the township have been completed, a tank site has been selected, and I should think that, as it is not a big scheme in terms of the mileage to be laid, it could well be finished before the Booleroo scheme or at the same time. The department plans to make as much progress as possible on both schemes during this financial year. Landholders abutting the rising main from Dickson's Bore to the township will be able to get a supply from the main as it passes their properties. I understand the route of the main is along the road that runs north and north-east from Melrose.

STIRLING DISTRICT COUNCIL BY-LAW: DWELLINGHOUSES.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga) I move—
That By-law No. 31 of the District Council of Stirling in respect of the size of dwelling-houses, made on February 17, 1960, and laid on the table of this House on August 9, 1960, be disallowed.

In moving this motion I am not being obstructive. I have resided in the Stirling District

Council area for over 32 years and on Saturday, when I was conducted by the council on its annual tour of inspection, I was proud to represent the area. It is a small district council, but the mileage and standard of roads compares most favourably with roads in other areas. I am in no way critical of the council. On the contrary, I consulted the council about these two by-laws that I am asking the House to disallow. I thought that would be courteous, although it was not a courtesy call. I discussed them with the clerk (Mr. Murray Paech), the chairman (Mr. Biddiss), and the proposer of the by-laws (Councillor Roy Finlayson), who is a land agent and well-informed on this matter. I do not think there is any doubt that I proved that these by-laws would not achieve the goal at which they aim. Incidentally, I whole-heartedly favour the attempt to keep the hills as pleasurable as possible from the viewpoint of their desirability for dwellings.

This by-law relates to the size of dwelling-houses and provides that they shall be not less than 1,000 square feet in area. I should explain that many years ago the whole of the area came under the Building Act, which was a wise decision of the council. I have discussed the provision of a minimum size with people who are familiar with buyers who would want building blocks in the hills. These people include Walker & Son of Stirling, Lou Brew of Aldgate, and Matters & Company which has a big interest in Bridgewater where it owns land that has been subdivided for sale. None sees any virtue in this restriction. Indeed, it is suggested that many persons seeking to reside in the hills are retired persons (frequently elderly couples whose families have married) who regard the area as desirable. The hills are now provided with adequate public transport services and are becoming more popular with this type of purchaser. Consequently, the price of land is constantly increasing and subdividers, faced with competition, are busy seeking suitable land.

One of the council's objects is to ensure that small cottages are not built in localities where large and expensive houses already exist, because such a practice would reduce the value of surrounding properties. Although I admit that that is desirable I do not think it will work that way, because people who want to build houses of between 600 and 700 square feet will not want to pay £2,000 for blocks of land on which to build them. If they wanted to build in that locality and intended to pay £2,000 for land, although they might build

a small house they would probably add to its exterior such architectural features that it would fit into its surroundings and they would not look like poor neighbours. The first consideration, the economy of the matter, will probably be the deciding factor. I think the price of the land will deter the small house builder from building in the better residential areas in the hills.

I thought it would be wise to get information about the sizes of the houses, so I rang the Chief Architect of the Housing Trust (Mr. Phillips), who was good enough to give me not only the actual squares in the small homes but the dimensions of the rooms. From this information members can see what the trust is providing for the type of people whom I seek to protect and who wish to come into my area. I understand that Mr. Murray Paech (the District Clerk) made great play before the Subordinate Legislation Committee of the discretionary powers of this by-law that enable the council to waive it either in part or in whole. Is there any real merit in this by-law if the council is able to say that Tom Smith can build a house of 600 square feet because that is all he can afford but that Bill Jones must build a house of 1,000 square feet? That is what the escape clauses provide, and that is making fish of one and fowl of the other. I do not favour that. The council itself has other protections already established by by-laws which in my opinion adequately protect it from having undesirable and cheap cottages built in good residential areas.

Mr. Phillips provided figures relating to semi-detached three bedroom houses (which, after all, are sizable family homes) that can be built in an area of less than 1,000 sq. ft. The houses now being constructed by the trust for single persons—mainly pensioners, widows or widowers who want to live by themselves—consist of a bed-sittingroom, bathroom-lavatory off the sittingroom, small kitchen and porch. The total area is 356 sq. ft. and, although that is too small to be relevant to this argument, the next type of unit I shall mention appears to be the type that would apply to the type of single people I imagine would want to come to the Adelaide hills to live. These small units contain a bedroom 12ft. 7in. x 9ft. 6in., with a bathroom and lavatory off that bedroom, a livingroom 12ft. 6in. x 10ft., a kitchen 10ft. 6in. x 6ft. 6in., a small store 5ft. 4in. x 4ft., and two porches 8ft. x 3ft. 6in., one at the front and one at the back. The total floor area, including the

porches, is 473 sq. ft. Such units could provide ample accommodation for elderly married couples who could not get any help in the home but wanted a comfortable, simple house. If the Stirling District Council gets this provision of 1,000 sq. ft. as a guiding point, I cannot imagine that it will agree to a house of this nature, yet I think it is desirable that accommodation should be provided for this type of person and his wife if they wish to live in the hills.

Mr. Phillips assured me that these houses are eagerly sought, not only because there is (and has been ever since the war) a heavy demand for houses but because people want these small units as they have only themselves and their wives to accommodate. Why should we prevent such people from coming to live in the Adelaide hills? I am all in favour of their coming. Because of the regulations the council has power to enforce, I do not agree that unseemly happenings similar to those that occurred after the first world war, when a shanty town was built in my district almost on my front doorstep, will occur. By-law 20 (2), under the heading "zoning", provides:—

No person shall erect or construct any building or structure of which the walls are made, constructed or composed of materials other than stone, brick or concrete upon any land within a township in the area of the district council of Stirling.

When I was in the Stirling District Council office on Monday the assistant clerk showed me a plan of the whole of the area, with the township areas shaded. Practically three-quarters of the whole area has been proclaimed as township areas to which the by-law can be applied, so the council is taking very little, if any, risk in making certain that the types of houses that purchasers of land in the hills erect will be anything other than an asset, not only to the hills but to the people who erect them. I discussed this with the council, which is still worried that small houses will creep into what are called "desirable localities." I am not sure that I will be a party to admitting that I agree with that attitude. On the contrary, I feel that if a person who needs only a small house wants to build next door to me I might be happy to have him as a neighbour. He might be a jolly fine fellow. It is the man who lives in the house that I am interested in and concerned about, much more so than his house or property. In any case, I think that snobbery is probably what is at the bottom of

this matter, and it is one of the drawbacks of the early history of Mount Lofty. In the early days Mount Lofty was looked upon as a place where wealthy people could have a summer home, and they constructed these homes and lived in them for only the few summer months. No-one else could afford to do it: only the wealthy people had this so-called amenity, if amenity it was.

I am not a bit in sympathy with that attitude. I know very well from my life-time of experience that a small home can be as well cared for and with the garden surrounding it can be as beautiful as many larger homes, and the amenities in the neighbourhood will not suffer if the owner of the home is the type of owner which I hope and think will come to live in the Adelaide hills. I have that type of neighbour across the road; he almost puts me to shame when I look at his garden, which, although it is not as big as mine, is always meticulously kept. Every inch of his ground is worked, and any part of it that is planted is always weeded. That type of individual does not have an expensive home, for he could not afford it, but his home is always neat and tidy and generally well looked after. I doubt whether the size of this home would be the required 1,000 sq. feet. My friends will say, and they have said already, that there is an escape provision, and that the full 1,000 sq. feet would not be demanded in certain cases where it was thought not to be warranted. I do not think the provision is warranted at all, for I think that point is covered by the Building Act. I intend making certain suggestions for another by-law to be framed by this council concerning another matter.

Mr. Jennings—Why haven't you suggested it?

Mr. SHANNON—It did not come to my knowledge until recently. I am not a lawyer, but I have ideas that could be legally framed. Those ideas could be put in proper legal terms; I think they would be effective, and I intend to put them forward. The by-law deals with the size of the house, and I point out that section 9a of the Act provides for power to disapprove of plans. The relevant part of that section is as follows:—

If the council . . . is of opinion that it is undesirable that the building be erected or constructed on the land upon which it is proposed to be erected or constructed or, as the case may be, it is undesirable that the building be added to or altered, the council may give notice in writing to the owner of its intention to refer the plans, drawings, and specifications to the referees. The council may thereupon in manner provided by Part VIII and in

accordance with the provisions of the said part refer the matter to the referees. If the referees are satisfied that the erection, construction, addition to, or alteration of the building is undesirable by reason of the effect it would have upon the development, health, or amenities of the neighbourhood, they may declare that the council may disapprove of the plans, drawings, and specifications and the council may disapprove the same accordingly.

Development, health, and amenities are three very wide terms. The "development" could include such features as the desirability of having a house built upon a certain section of that land; for instance, it may be considered desirable to conform with an established building line. Certainly, if the referees thought it desirable they could instruct the builder or owner to put his house on a certain site. Under "health", the effluent from a septic tank or domestic drainage could and should be a factor to be considered. The third term is "amenities", and that can mean many things.

These are existing powers which, in my opinion, the council can exercise, and they provide the council with ample opportunities to see that the district is maintained, as I think it should be maintained, as a place desirable in the eyes of the intending home builder. That is all I am seeking to do. I am not asking the House to deny the Stirling District Council the right to make its own laws arbitrarily. I am merely asking the House to agree with me that what has been proposed in this field is not in the best interests of Stirling, as the council has not sufficiently investigated the matter before promulgating this by-law. I do not think the council thoroughly understood that the by-law could work to the detriment of the area rather than for the betterment of it.

Mr. RICHES secured the adjournment of the debate.

STIRLING DISTRICT COUNCIL BY-LAW: BUILDING ALIGNMENT.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga)—I move—

That By-law No. 32 of the District Council of Stirling in respect of building alignment, made on March 16, 1960, and laid on the table of this House on August 9, 1960, be disallowed.

This important by-law has much more far-reaching effects than the one I previously dealt with. The by-law, in effect, sets a building line in the District Council of Stirling which must be observed; it provides that a building shall not be erected closer than 25ft. to the street alignment. That sounds fair and

reasonable. In most cases one would say that 25ft. is close enough to the street, but there are certain geographical and topographical features, well-known to people who know the hills and who have lived in them, which will deny some block owners the opportunity to comply with this proposed by-law other than at great expense.

I raise two objections to the by-law. Firstly, I have seen a glaring example of the injustice that can be caused. A widow applied to the Stirling District Council for permission to build a small home on her block of land measuring 65ft. by about 600ft. deep—and "deep" is the word; the further one goes back the deeper one gets, and in fact the back of the block is the bottom of a gully. That woman was seeking a permit to build a home, and the only place on which she could build it without exorbitant foundation costs was almost on the road itself, because the only little bit of level land on which she could hope to build a house was the piece right up against the road. We saw that on our tour of inspection. It was pointed out to me as one of the problems facing the Stirling Council. I said, "Here is one of your by-laws that has to be waived." They said, "It will be waived." I guaranteed to take them near my home down on the Vimy Ridge side of Bridgewater and show them not one, or even 10, but scores of similar blocks. Sometimes the slope is the opposite way, the road being at the top instead of the bottom end of the slope. That happens in these subdivisions and creates great problems.

In my view, this arbitrary blanket form of by-law that fixes the building line at not less than 25ft. leads to difficulties. How shall we get on if an applicant who wants to erect a house in the Stirling Council area shows that he is 25ft. from the street and then, upon inspection, the building surveyor, acting on behalf of the council, notices that it is a steeply falling block to the roadside? There are many such blocks in the Adelaide hills where not only all the effluent but all the surplus rainwater from the roof of a house and household waste have only one way to go—out to the street. The septic tank effluent can be gathered into a soakage pit in the first instance, but any member present who knows anything about that type of country knows where it will seep to finally; obviously it will go downhill towards the front of the house—it cannot go elsewhere. That is an obvious example of a case where the building surveyor should recommend that that house

should be stepped back perhaps 50ft. or 80ft. from the road, depending on the nature of the road, in order that no obnoxious effluent should get into the street from the house when erected. Under the by-law there is no power to make such an applicant put his house back more than 25ft. The council can waive the 25ft. and say, "You can come within 10ft. because it is impracticable for you to build elsewhere," but it cannot say, "Oh yes, in the circumstances the 25ft. is wrong. We can see that now; you have to go back 50ft." Under this by-law that power is not vested in the council. That, in my opinion, is the crux of the effectiveness or otherwise of the attempt by the council to achieve what I think is a desirable objective. The goal is proper but it is not attempting it in the right way.

Mr. Biddiss, the recently appointed chairman of the council, is not, I believe, a councillor of long standing; he may have been a councillor for four or six years; he is not one of the old-timers. I say that because I do not want him to think that I am criticizing him for not knowing the by-laws that existed in the Stirling District Council. It has two zoning by-laws dealing with this very topic. The first is excellent because attached to it is a series of plans. In these plans the streets and roads are shown, and by a broken line on these plans after they have been properly surveyed a building line is shown nearer than which to the road one may not build. The area of Stirling runs from the top of Crafers down past Stirling proper (Stirling West, as it is frequently called). That area has been properly surveyed and there is a by-law laying down in detail the position of the building line, and where one can or cannot build on his own land. Nothing could be more effective than that approach. I admit that there is a disability on any local authority in the country attempting to do this on a wide scale, for the cost of having a survey made would be prohibitive. A survey would involve taking levels in the various areas to decide what would be an appropriate building line in relation to the roads and particular blocks of land. It would be expensive and time-absorbing to do that over a large area, so I shall not suggest that line of approach.

A simpler way, which would be just as effective and achieve the same result of keeping the area properly developed from the point of view of the amenities, health and, generally speaking, goodwill of the people who want to live in the hills—and that is what I am

interested in—is that under section 8 of the Building Act anybody seeking a permit to build a house has to show—

the position of the buildings and appurtenances on the land immediately adjoining the land first-mentioned in this subsection . . . showing the width of all streets and ways adjoining the said first-mentioned land and building and the relative level of the lowest floor of the said building with respect to all of such streets and ways—

"ways", of course, meaning "streets" in that sense. So that under the Building Act there is provision to secure the type of information that I want before the council comes to consider whether or not it shall grant a permit to build on a block on a certain site. I suggest that, in considering the blocks under this heading of alignment, where the house shall stand in relation to the block itself and the street, the council shall have regard to the following facts: (1) the topography of the site in relation to the disposal of water from the house roof, household wastes and septic tank effluent; (2) the proposed siting of the house on the allotment in relation to established house alignments if the area is already established. I want that for this reason. There are areas in the hills where some houses have been built, and there are large blocks dotted around amongst these houses already established with nice front gardens set back normally 40ft. or 50ft. from the road in order that they shall be good ones. I do not want a purchaser to come along and say, "Ah, a front garden—that is out! I shan't have a front garden. I should have to mow the lawn on Sunday instead of going to church; I could not go to a football match because I should have to plant annuals." There may be other reasons why he will not want a front garden, so he sites his house so that his back door is directly opposite the front door of the house of one of his neighbours. I should not like someone to build a house on a block adjoining my house so that his back door and my front door were almost on a level just across a fence. So I suggest that, where there is an established building alignment, the council should take that into account in deciding whether an owner could build on the site selected on his block. He should be made to conform to the amenities of the area in which he wants to live. The council should consider possible future widening of streets and roads facing the allotments concerned. Over the years we have seen many front fences demolished and pushed back on to the gardens, leaving the front garden a very narrow strip

because the Highways Department wanted another 7ft. or 10ft. of land for road-widening purposes. That is one thing that councils should always be anxious to observe. Under this 30ft. rule, the council has no power to consider that at all.

Mr. Corcoran—Are you speaking on behalf of the council?

Mr. SHANNON—These are my ideas.

Mr. Corcoran—I am at a loss to know.

Mr. SHANNON—I have discussed this in broad principle with the District Clerk (Mr. Murray Paech), with the chairman (Mr. Biddiss), and with the proposer of the two by-laws (Councillor Roy Finlayson). I have discussed with them my ideas about this and in this field the council is still a little worried about the size of the house, although I am not worried on that score. In the matter of the building alignment I think I have convinced them that my approaches will be much more effective in getting what we want regarding the building alignment in conformity with all the factors applying in undulating country. They realize now that they should frame another by-law to replace this one laying down the 25ft. restriction back from the street, which does not meet all the various conditions applying throughout the hills.

Mr. Corcoran—Has the committee that deals with this kind of thing dealt with this?

Mr. SHANNON—Yes.

Mr. Corcoran—And approved of it?

Mr. SHANNON—Yes. I have taken the bull by the horns and am fighting the world, a losing battle all of my own. I want to justify what the committee said in this regard. It called before it Mr. Murray Paech, the clerk of the council concerned with these by-laws. Mr. Murray Paech satisfied it on what the council was seeking to do, and he told me what it was seeking to do. Its solicitor had advised it that these by-laws would achieve their effect. I do not agree with the solicitor or with the council that accepted that advice: that the by-laws will achieve their goal. They cannot achieve their goal with this blanket 25ft. building line on blocks of this type. They cannot achieve their goal—I am convinced of that from my own line of approach to this problem. Every year I see most of these circumstances; there is little I do not see.

I must add this further point to complete the picture. A further consideration for the council to take into account in deciding whether to grant a permit to an applicant wishing to build on a particular site on a

block of land is this: it should take into account the amenities of that locality. There are certain localities in the hills that have a native charm, a natural charm provided by the good Lord in the early days, and not yet destroyed by man. We are all too prone to wipe out some of the natural beauties and put in their place some of the abortions that we say are "progress." I believe that we can do something to maintain our natural beauties, which are more interesting to visitors than to the local people, who do not seem to have a proper appreciation of their own worth. It is like the prophet in his own land. Visitors recognize the charm of our hills. I want to create a feeling in the council that it has something worth preserving, and I want the council to have power to preserve those features of our hills.

I know that the council had legal advice in drafting these by-laws; that the Crown Solicitor certifies that they are in conformity with the power granted to councils under the Building Act and the Local Government Act, or both; and that the Subordinate Legislation Committee, appointed by Parliament to investigate by-laws, decided that there was nothing objectionable in them after taking evidence from Mr. Paech, the district clerk. Even if my contentions are not sufficiently impressive for members, I believe that the council may take steps to withdraw this blanket provision of a 25ft. building line and adopt some other provision on lines similar to those I have suggested.

Mr. Corcoran—Did you have the opportunity of giving evidence to the Subordinate Legislation Committee?

Mr. SHANNON—I tendered evidence by way of letters on both by-laws, although I did not go into details as I have today. I was probably lulled into a sense of false security because I did not think that the committee would accept a provision relating to the size of dwellinghouses, and my letter merely stated that I did not agree with the limitation which I believed would not work in the best interests of the hills and would deny some people the right to build there. Some people may only want to build houses of 600 sq. ft. and if this limitation applies they will not even bother to look at land in the hills.

Mr. Clark—What was the council's purpose in making this provision?

Mr. SHANNON—To keep the hills as a most desirable residential area.

Mr. Clark—Could they be right?

Mr. SHANNON—I do not agree—

The SPEAKER—Order! The honourable member has dealt with that matter in his earlier motion.

Mr. SHANNON—I realize that the Chairman of the Subordinate Legislation Committee did not move for the disallowance of this by-law and that I have had the odious task of opposing my own council, but I have conferred with the council and it is generally recognized that I am anxious to assist the council in its objectives, but I do not agree with the provisions in the by-law.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart)—I am sure we listened with much interest to all that the honourable member said and we commend him for the interest he is taking in his district and for the help and advice that he has given to his council. However, as one called upon to vote on this motion, I feel that I cannot support it. I do not disagree with anything Mr. Shannon has said because his arguments are sound, but they are arguments for the District Council of Stirling rather than for this House. I am addressing myself to the principle that I feel is fundamental: either we believe in local government or we do not; either we believe that determining a building alignment in the street is a responsibility that we can trust councils to administer or we do not.

There is a growing tendency in Parliament to unnecessarily dictate to councils on matters which Parliament, in its wisdom in earlier years, held were rightly the responsibility of councils. We have given councils power to gazette their own by-laws and councillors have a knowledge of local conditions. They are answerable to the ratepayers and if they make a mistake then I do not know of any body that can be brought to account quicker or more effectively than a council that is at variance with its ratepayers. We have determined, by legislation, that these are matters for local government, but now we seek to arbitrarily decide these questions here. I am not prepared to do that.

Mr. Shannon referred repeatedly to the blanket provision of a 25ft. building alignment. The by-law does not confer any great power on the council: indeed, if I interpret Mr. Shannon correctly, he suggests that it does not confer sufficient power on the council. If that is so, the council can seek additional power later. This House generally takes exception to powers that councils seek to exercise, but all this by-law does is to say that a person

shall not erect any building closer than 25ft. to a roadway without council permission.

Mr. Shannon—They can build 25ft. away.

Mr. RICHES—Yes, that is what the by-law provides.

Mr. Shannon—In some cases that would be most undesirable.

Mr. RICHES—If the council requires additional powers it can amend the by-law. However, the council is not asking for the right to exercise any powers other than those provided in the by-law which seeks to prevent any building encroaching on land within 25ft. of a roadway without council permission. If circumstances make it desirable to vary that rule, an application can be made to the council. I am prepared to accept all that Mr. Shannon has said about his district, but I oppose the motion because this is a council matter and I am not going to oppose a by-law that has been properly prepared and carries the certificate of the Crown Solicitor that it is properly within the ambit of the Act and within the council's legal rights. This is a responsibility of local government which should be exercised freely without Parliamentary interference. I oppose the motion.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga)—I am not attempting to tell the council what it should do, because it is not my intention to interfere with council affairs. This motion is before us because all council by-laws are subject to revision by this House. We have not given councils *carte blanche* to act without reference to Parliament. All by-laws come before Parliament and if, upon consideration, it is considered that a by-law is not in the best interests of the council concerned we can and do disallow it. In fact, last week the Chairman of the Subordinate Legislation Committee moved for the disallowance of two by-laws.

Mr. Riches—Not with my support.

Mr. SHANNON—The honourable member is a member of that committee, but his chairman moved to disallow—

Mr. Riches—I am not a member of that committee.

Mr. SHANNON—I thought he was still a member.

Mr. Riches—I never was.

Mr. SHANNON—Then I apologize. The chairman of the committee secured the disallowance of two by-laws last week without this House dividing on his motions.

Mr. Riches—I did not call for a division then. I divided last year on the same principle.

Mr. SHANNON—I think I am right in saying that last week two disallowances were approved without divisions. In reviewing these matters Parliament is doing a duty it is called upon to do. The member for Stuart and the Stirling District Council cannot fault my arguments about this matter.

Mr. Coumbe—This by-law will not cost very much.

Mr. SHANNON—It will prevent the council from requiring a purchaser to build any further back than 25ft. from the road. Of course, the council will not make the owner of the block build on the 25ft. line, but the by-law says that he shall not build nearer than 25ft. without approval. If the block is steep the council could not tell the owner that he must go back 50ft.

Mr. Coumbe—There is nothing to stop it. The by-law only stops people from building closer than 25ft.

Mr. SHANNON—What good is the by-law? The honourable member is perhaps going to refer to the Building Act or zoning by-laws under which the council has certain powers, but I think if he looks at the by-law he will discover that it limits the council's power. Although on the surface it looks a good thing to have this power, I suggest that it is not enough. The council has already agreed with me in conversations that it would like to be able to say, "Certain aspects of your block demand that we should have your house in a certain site; otherwise you will cause a nuisance in the street in front of it." The house might be only 10ft., 20ft. or 50ft. back, but give them what they want to enable them to get rid of their drainage. That is the power the council is seeking, but it is not given under this by-law. I leave it to the House to use its discretion. We are not denying the council the right to govern itself; in fact, I have suggested to the chairman and the clerk that they can accomplish what they want in a much more effective and, in my opinion, sensible way by bringing forward another by-law and putting it before its solicitors.

The House divided on the motion:—

Ayes (19).—Messrs. Brookman, Coumbe, Dunnage, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Sir Cecil Hincks, Messrs. Jenkins, King, Laucke, Nankivell, Nicholson, Pattinson, Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, Mr. Shannon (teller), Mrs. Steele, and Messrs. Frank Walsh, and Fred Walsh.

Noes (14).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Bywaters, Clark, Dunstan, Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Quirke, Ralston, Riches (teller), and Ryan.

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.
Motion thus carried.

SCAFFOLDING INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 21. Page 1064.)

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh)—I support the Bill. I shall not take up the time of the House to any great extent because this is a simple Bill that was explained by the late Leader when he introduced it. The measure simply provides that the Scaffolding Inspection Act shall apply to the whole of the State. Mr. O'Halloran explained that it was the duty of Parliament to protect the people of this State, and that, simply, is the purpose of the Bill. Under the existing legislation the Act applies to areas specified by proclamation but we feel that does not go far enough, that it leads to much confusion, and that it provides an opportunity for unscrupulous people to force men to work on scaffolding in conditions that are dangerous to their limbs and lives.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—Have you the accident statistics?

Mr. HUTCHENS—The Minister is throwing in a red herring. As he knows, statistics are impossible to obtain, so his question is ridiculous and impossible to answer. Where there is no law there is no compulsion to keep statistics and no possibility of obtaining them. It is typical of the Minister that he should drag in a red herring at this stage.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—Have you heard of any accidents?

Mr. HUTCHENS—I was unfortunate enough to be involved in two accidents in such circumstances. In my younger days I used to carry my "writing desk" up a ladder and when I used to tell the people that I was a plasterer's labourer I led them (particularly the young ladies, who did not fall for it) to believe that I had some special qualifications. Due to faulty scaffolding and the hungry nature of an employer, twice scaffolding collapsed when I was working on it. On one occasion I suffered a broken ankle and on another a broken rib.

Mr. Jenkins—Not a neck?

Mr. HUTCHENS—No, I do not stick out my neck as do some others. There is no doubt that people will do these things if the

opportunity is there. I know that men are not compelled to accept any employment they can find, which they had to do when I was young: I had to earn a living and was obliged to accept employment where it was offered, and under those circumstances an employer could do what he liked and take advantage of the fact that he was not compelled to provide decent scaffolding. Strangely enough, on both occasions I had to fight hard to get compensation and in the latter accident I was not insured under workmen's compensation. That is what happens in some of these towns where no Industrial Code is in operation and the Scaffolding Act does not apply.

Some extraordinary things have been said during this debate. I thought the Premier dealt with the matter in a number of queer ways. He stated that he did not agree that this Act should apply to the entire country area. He went on to say that because of the height of buildings in the country there was no need for scaffolding, and there was little possibility of anyone being hurt. The present Leader, by interjection, asked whether the Premier would agree to extending the provisions of the Scaffolding Act to all buildings of solid construction, and the Premier replied, in effect, "No, I think that is foolish, because if a man fell from a timber-frame house he would be just as likely to hurt himself as if he fell from a solid construction house." That was a very definite contradiction in a matter of a few seconds.

The replies to the arguments put forward by members on this side of the House are very lame indeed and, in fact, will not hold water. We know that a man does not have to fall very far; in fact, he has to fall only from the level on which he is walking to hurt himself, so an argument such as that is astounding and quite unworthy of a member of this House. It has been said that we cannot produce statistics. On reading the Tasmanian newspapers recently I noticed that there was much dissatisfaction with the provisions of the Act as they operate there. The policing of the Act is vested in the local government authorities in that State. Evidence that was submitted proved that those authorities were not doing the job and the Act was not being policed. Statistics were gathered, and if those statistics are accurate—and they were not challenged in the Tasmanian Parliament—they disclose an amazing state of affairs. In effect, they did not have an Act in some areas. The central authority there now intends to take

over and police the Act in the interests of the people.

We agree, of course, that most mainland States have legislation similar to that operating in South Australia. The Premier made much of the fact that the New South Wales Act was similar to ours, and he went on to say that had there been any need for such an Act in the country New South Wales would have done something about it. I express my sincere appreciation to the honourable gentleman for the very fine compliment he has paid the New South Wales Government—the Labor Government that has been in office for 25 or 30 years. I hope that in future he will show that State the same respect regarding other industrial legislation, for if he does I am sure the people in South Australia will be in a much better position. However, the most amazing remark made by the Premier was that the Labor Party introduced this type of legislation when it had nothing better to do. Nothing better to do! With great respect to the Premier, I suggest that that is the most cynical remark I have ever heard in this House.

Mr. Jennings—And that is saying something.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Yes. I ask: is there anything more important in this world than life and limb, and could we have anything more important to do than protect life and limb? That is the purpose—and the only purpose—of this Bill. We have heard from certain gentlemen that this legislation would be most difficult to police. Of course, any law is difficult to police. I venture to say that thieving is difficult to police in some areas, and that other crimes are difficult to police, but is there any justification for saying that because a law cannot be policed effectively every minute and every second of the day it is an unnecessary law? The very fact that a law exists restrains some people from doing the wrong thing. If there were no law for thieving we would all steal. As there is no law regarding the inspection of scaffolding in certain parts of South Australia, I submit that certain people are robbing men of life and limb, and that it is no argument at all to say that because legislation could not be policed it is unnecessary.

The member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke), who is looking at me in his usual intelligent manner, made what to me was a most amazing statement. He said that if this law were to come into operation, every prefabricated shed

in every remote corner of the State would come within the Act. Of all the prefabricated sheds I have seen erected in the metropolitan area—and I have seen many, because I have recently gone into a new housing area where sheds are going up even on Sunday nights and Saturday mornings—never once have I seen any shed for which scaffolding would have been required. We see the sort of clouds and smokescreens that members opposite blow up in order to deprive the people of this State the right of protection of life and limb. If we sincerely desire to protect life and limb and to do justice to all people, this Bill must meet with our approval and warrant our most ardent support.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra)—It is proposed to invoke the whole Act to cover every set of circumstances that could obtain in the country in relation to building. The Bill provides:—

On and after the coming into operation of the Scaffolding Inspection Act Amendment Act, 1960, this Act shall apply and have effect in and throughout the whole of the State.

That means that the whole of the Act shall apply to every part of the State, whether it be Oodnadatta, Port Augusta, Clare, or any other place: wherever building is to be erected, the Act is to apply. Section 6 of the principal Act states:—

Any person intending to erect any scaffolding or hoisting appliance shall, at least twenty-four hours before commencing to erect the same, give notice in writing to the Chief Inspector of his intention and shall at the time of giving notice as aforesaid pay the prescribed fee. Notice as aforesaid shall be delivered at the office of the Chief Inspector.

Mr. Harding—Does that apply to a windmill?

Mr. QUIRKE—I should think not, but it would apply if a person put up scaffolding to erect a windmill. It would apply to any building anywhere in the State, including the farthest flung reaches of the West Coast and away in the Far North. Somebody said it would be difficult to police. I say it would be impossible to police, and I am one of those who thinks that if such an Act cannot be enforced it is bad to legislate in that way. Every Act of Parliament that becomes a part of the Statutes should be capable of being enforced. This Act could not be enforced. I do not wish it to be thought that I am in sympathy with people who would use jerrybuilt scaffolding. In any event, most of the building in the country is only single storey.

Mr. McKee—What about wheat silos?

Mr. QUIRKE—I should say that wheat silos could not be erected without first-class scaffolding. Most of the scaffolding used on even ordinary dwellinghouses in the country today is steel assembly scaffolding; that scaffolding can be hired, and most builders have access to it. On one occasion at the winery we wanted to build a 60ft. chimney-stack, and we decided that the scaffolding should be steel or nothing. We duly arranged to get the required amount of this material up from Adelaide on hire, and undertook to erect it ourselves. We got it about 20ft. off the ground and discovered that it was a skilled operation, about which one has to know a considerable amount in order to erect that scaffolding, and we found to our dismay that we had to send to Adelaide for a rigger to come and erect the scaffolding around the chimney-stack. It is not an easy job. The old stringy-bark rails and putlogs once used in scaffolding are gone. It is an expert's job to rig scaffolding, and if a person does not know how to go about it he cannot put up scaffolding.

My opposition to this Bill arises not because I oppose taking the utmost security measures to protect workmen and those who have to use scaffolding. This is a loose attempt at achieving an end, for it is just taking the whole Act and saying, "This shall apply anywhere." If one intends to erect scaffolding 300 miles away from Adelaide, is he under this Act allowed to use that scaffolding before it is inspected to see that it is safe, and who pays the prescribed fee? The thing is fundamentally impossible. I agree in principle to extending safety measures to the country if the conditions are such that they can be applied reasonably, without the exacting conditions that apply, and rightly so, to this scaffolding legislation. I do not disagree with those conditions, but they simply could not be applied to the whole of South Australia without considerable disability both to the contractors and the people for whom buildings were being erected. If a method of inspection different from the one contained in the Act can be found to apply more reasonably throughout the State I will agree to it, but I cannot see how the one proposed in the Bill can be properly used for the whole State. It is one thing to desire to protect people who work on scaffolding, but it is another to apply to the country what now applies in the metropolitan area. If the Opposition can produce another way to do what they want without putting country people to unnecessary trouble I will

consider it. Onerous conditions should not be imposed on country people by making the Act apply to them.

Mr. CLARK (Gawler)—I have some sympathy for the member for Burra because obviously he wants to support some form of protection for country people working on scaffolding, but his views are slightly different from ours. His remarks are different from those expressed by Government members, from whom we have had some astonishing statements. We see cropping up almost regularly the oddity of country members, in the guise of looking after their country electors, refusing to give them the protection that is available to metropolitan residents. As reported on page 606 of the 1959 *Hansard*, the Treasurer said, when discussing the motion moved by Mr. O'Halloran on electoral boundaries and representation:—

If any amenity is to be provided it is always provided in the metropolitan area first and later it may be extended to the country.

“May” is certainly the right word. When the Premier and his supporters have the opportunity to extend an amenity to country workers they will not agree to it. They do not look at the matter in the same way as Mr. Quirke does.

Mr. Quirke—Do you think the proposal in the Bill can be carried out?

Mr. CLARK—Yes; otherwise I would not support it. No Government member has given a satisfactory reason for his opposition to the Bill. When discussing it the Premier said:—

It would merely mean that some areas would be policed when there was no need to police them, and that it would be done at the expense of other areas where policing was necessary.

Mr. Laucke said:—

An army of inspectors would be needed to go to all these places.

These statements remind me of a statement by one Minister about driving tests. He said that he always favoured them but he did not think they were practicable because the machinery was not available to implement them. If that is the answer, the machinery should be made available.

Mr. Loveday—Out of our great prosperity.

Mr. CLARK—Yes, it would not be difficult to do it out of our great prosperity. We have been asked to supply statistics on this matter, but there would not be much validity in such an argument. If only one life were saved by passing the Bill it would be worth while. Statistics can mean anything or nothing. If the Bill is not passed it will mean

that country people will be denied protection under the guise that country builders do not have accidents amongst their employees, but that is nonsense. We never know when an accident will occur. Mr. Loveday made a statement on this Bill with which I do not agree, although usually I can agree with what he says. He said:—

The argument put forward by the Premier is surely the weakest we have heard from him on this matter.

It was a weak argument, but it was not the weakest the Premier has ever made on this matter. On October 1, 1947, when speaking on a similar Bill introduced by the reform Party in this House, the Premier said:—

I believe that in general principle the Bill may be desirable but I do not know of any reason why we should pass it.

Can you beat that? If that is not the acme of illogicality I do not know what is. We were told by the Premier in 1947 that in general principle the Bill might be desirable, but since that time he has changed his views slightly. Then, in general principle the Bill might be desirable, but, with the Premier, the position is now different. It looks as though he has grown less reasonable than he was then. Sometimes age mellows a person but apparently that has not happened to the Premier. I suggest to Government members that they find a logical reason why the Bill should not be applied to the whole State. The city of Port Pirie is covered by the Act, yet the area of the district council of Port Pirie is not. In other words, if a man steps over the line from an area that is covered he is in an area where he is not protected. In the interests of country people the Bill should be passed.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart)—I support the Bill. The late Leader of the Opposition put forward an excellent case for the measure. His argument was that the legislation should apply throughout the State. He pointed out that at present it applied to the municipalities mentioned in the Act and that the Governor could, by proclamation, extend the operation of the Act to another area. When it has been found necessary to cover another part of the State the necessary proclamation has been made. The late Leader set out the number of times on which such proclamations have been made, and mentioned Mount Gambier and Port Pirie. As a means of answering some of the criticism levelled against the Bill I want to refer to the last proclamation that was made. Under the

Act the municipality of Port Augusta is covered, but the Port Augusta power station, situated in the area of the district council of Kanyaka, is not covered. Chimney stacks 250ft. high have been built at the Port Augusta power station, and accidents have occurred there because of the absence of proper safeguards. It was not until March of this year that a proclamation was made extending the operation of the Act to an area inside a radius of 10 miles from the Port Augusta post office. It would have been a good thing if this legislation had been in operation in the area when the power station was first built and before the chimney stacks were erected. When the municipality of Port Augusta is covered and the power station is not, we have a situation that no-one can regard as sensible, yet that was the position until the proclamation was made in March last.

The late Leader of the Opposition explained that this patchwork business was in no way desirable and that if the Act applied generally throughout the State it would make for easier working, more safety for workmen, and provide a desirable practice. We now have the situation of men working on building operations in one county area being covered whilst men working on similar operations in other areas are not. The Premier said that the Act does not apply in River Murray districts, except at Murray Bridge. Some tall buildings have been erected at Renmark, Berri, and Barmera, and it seems necessary for the Act to apply in those towns in the same way as in other country municipalities. Surely no area has suffered disability because it has been covered by these provisions. Rather has it been found over the years that the operation of the Act has had to be extended by the gazetting of these various proclamations.

The Premier also mentioned that this Bill, or a similar one, had been introduced periodically for the last 15 years. He implied that the Labor Party was not greatly interested in it, that we brought it forward only when there were not more urgent matters to bring before the House. I assure Parliament that country members regard this measure as important, and that there has not been a Parliament for the last 15 years in which a measure of this kind has not been submitted. True, it has not been brought forward every year, but what is the sense of doing that when Parliament as constituted has expressed an opinion on such a measure? But every Parliament has been asked to agree to this measure.

The very fact that the Government by proclamation has had to include additional areas in the State shows that eventually what the Labor Party is asking for in this Bill will come to pass. No harm could be done. In fact, much good could accrue if the Government would agree to it right now.

We were also challenged to instance any case where an accident occurred because scaffolding was not subject to inspection. I have already mentioned that the Act was extended to operate over a radius of 10 miles from the General Post Office at Port Augusta as late as March of this year, following accidents. It was found necessary when the buildings had been almost completed. It would have been better had the House agreed to this measure when it was last before it. I support the Bill. I cannot find any concrete argument advanced against it that needs debate.

Mr. FRED WALSH (West Torrens)—I want to reply to some of the statements made by the members opposite, particularly by the member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke), who, as many other members opposite do when they oppose a proposal from this side of the House affecting country areas, introduced the question of farmers and used the old cry of "the city against the country". However, I do not think that his arguments on this Bill were logical. It is right that we should know that accidents have occurred because of the inoperation of the Scaffolding Act in some parts of the State. Indeed, there have been accidents in his own particular district that could be considered to arise from the state of the scaffolding. I refer to the wine industry, which he represents in the Barossa district. It would be well for me to point out to him that the farming community these days does not constitute the bulk of the country population. In fact, it does not form as great a part of the country population as it did a few years ago. As pointed out by the member for Stuart (Mr. Riches), with the exception of the recent extension of the Scaffolding Act to Port Augusta and the surrounding areas, brought about as a result of accidents, it is many years since there has been a proclamation extending the Scaffolding Act to certain country areas. In my opinion, that does not suggest that there is no need for it. On the other hand, we believe that any Act, no matter what it is, that is good enough to be placed on the Statute Book of this State should have State-wide application and not be confined to certain areas to be proclaimed from time to time by the Governor.

A strong point has been made about the number of inspectors that would be required for the policing of the Act were it given general application. The total number of inspectors in the Factories Department is wholly inadequate to do the work required of them today, even in the metropolitan area. It may be interesting to mention some duties required of these factory inspectors, covered by the Industrial Code—another measure that should have State-wide application. Section 227 (e) says that every inspector may—require the production of, and inspect, examine, and copy all pay-sheets or books wherein an account is kept of the actual wages (whether by piece or not) paid to any employee whose wages are fixed by a board.

I know that little attention is given to that duty unless an inspector's attention is drawn to it. Attention is drawn to alleged breaches of certain awards not necessarily by the factory inspector but mainly by union officials, of whom the Factories Department takes cognizance, with the necessary follow-up. If a breach is found to have occurred, then the necessary prosecutions take place. I suggest that the safety people whose advice the Factories Department acts upon in many instances could well be taken notice of with regard to the Scaffolding Act. We are not suggesting that a factory inspector be sent to certain remote parts of the State where perhaps a building may be in course of construction; we can rest assured that the union concerned would naturally be in attendance at some time or other during the construction of the building and, if there were a breach of the Scaffolding Act, naturally they would report it to the department, which could then inquire and, if the breach was proved, a prosecution would follow. I think that answers the question of sending factory inspectors all over the State, as some members opposite (particularly the member for Barossa, who is very human and would be just as much concerned with the safety of workers as anybody else would) suggest would be necessary. He fails to see our point. That is why I am drawing attention to these matters.

Much could be said about farms. We do not want to go from the sublime to the ridiculous but perhaps I should be wrong in saying that outhouses on farms were not inspected. If they are considered capable of bearing scaffolding of a worthwhile type, we feel it should be properly policed and there should be proper safeguards to protect the workmen and avoid any possibility of

accident. It was solely with that object in view that the late Leader of the Opposition brought forward this Bill, for the protection of workmen and not to pinprick anyone. Our aim is to protect the people forced by circumstances to work in the building industry. It may be said, "If they don't want to work on this or that particular job, they don't have to." But, particularly in the building industry, bricklayers, carpenters and the like who have passed through their apprenticeships have to accept whatever jobs are offered them. It is their trade—in fact, their livelihood. When all is said and done, they have no choice. They are the people we desire to protect. I support the Bill.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition)—I support the second reading. In his second reading speech, the Premier said:—

Perhaps this is the type of legislation that Opposition members indulge in when they have nothing of more importance to bring forward. That is a wrong approach. Each of my colleagues has stressed that this Bill involves the safety of the people engaged in building. The Premier also said:—

The Acts Interpretation Act says that all amending legislation should be based on the assumption that it remedies an evil.

What is "an evil" in this connection? If we use the term "evil," we mean evil that could be brought about by neglect, causing an accident. If we cause an accident because we are not prepared to extend the operation of this Act, we can expect further applications. Not only injury but loss of life may be involved. I agree with the member for West Torrens that this is a question of safety and not merely of inspectors policing the legislation in remote parts of the State. When the Premier was speaking I interjected, "Would you agree that the Act should apply wherever solid construction buildings are erected?" but he replied, in effect, that our proposals had no merit.

The legislation applies to the metropolitan area and to the municipalities of Gawler, Kadina, Moonta, Mount Gambier, Murray Bridge, Peterborough, Port Augusta, Port Pirie, Victor Harbour, and Wallaroo and to the district council district of Kadina. It could be extended to apply to other parts of the State by proclamation, but how are building contractors to know the extent of its application? Even if a contractor has a copy of the Act, how is he to know whether its application has been extended beyond the areas mentioned in the Act? He may take a team of building

operatives to Nuriootpa to erect a solid construction building, but, like myself, he probably does not know whether the municipality of Gawler extends that far. He is not in a position to know whether proclamations have been issued governing that or other areas.

The second schedule to the Act embraces regulations relating to scaffolding and gear used in connection therewith. Regulation 1 thereof states:—

In these regulations "scaffolding" means any structure or framework of timbers, planks, or other material used or intended to be used for the support of workmen in erecting, demolishing, altering, repairing, cleaning, painting . . .

Regulation 3, relating to scaffolding for masons, bricklayers, and other artisans and labourers, stipulates the standards to be observed. These standards ensure adequate protection to the men working on scaffolding. I realize that in the past, although all precautions have been taken, accidents have occurred because of wet weather when the masonry has been damp and walls have collapsed, but without these precautions the accidents could have been more serious.

The Government claims that it believes in safety in industry, yet the fundamental safety provisions contained in this legislation are not to apply throughout the State. I have seen petrol drums supporting ledgers, putlogs and scaffold boards, which would not comply with the regulations, and such structures are a positive danger. Tradesmen become accustomed to working on proper scaffolding and realize that they are secure, but they are endangered when they are asked to work in areas outside the ambit of the Act on scaffolding that does not comply with the regulations. If the regulations were to apply throughout the State then workmen would have a reasonable standard of safety and builders' labourers, who are competent to erect scaffolding, bricklayers, masons, plasterers and other operatives would be protected. The Government's support for this Bill is warranted.

I do not know how much revenue is derived from the fees payable pursuant to section 6 of the Act, but according to regulation 10, where the estimated cost does not exceed £1,000 the fee shall be £1 and where the estimated cost exceeds £1,000, the fee shall be £1 for the first £1,000 together with an additional fee of 10s. for each succeeding £1,000 or part thereof of the estimated cost. It is unusual for the Government to ignore the possibility of securing additional revenue, but perhaps it has sufficient revenue and that is

why it contends that it is not necessary to extend the provisions of this Act.

Many buildings erected outside the proclaimed areas warrant the erection of scaffolding comparable with that erected for buildings within the proclaimed areas, in the interests of those engaged thereon. I believe that some members who have opposed this Bill have not fully considered the regulations under the Act, nor have they appreciated the necessity of extending safety provisions throughout the State. On reflection, I believe they would support the second reading.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (15).—Messrs. Bywaters, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan, Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Halston, Riches, Ryan, Frank Walsh (teller), and Fred Walsh.

Noes (19).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Dunnage, Hall, Harding, and Heaslip, Sir Cecil Hincks, Messrs. Jenkins, King, Laucke, Nankivell, Nicholson, Pattinson, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke, and Shannon, and Mrs. Steele.

Pair.—Aye—Mr. Tapping. No—Mr. Millhouse.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Second reading thus negatived.

ASSEMBLY ELECTORATES.

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

That in the opinion of this House the Government should take steps to readjust the House of Assembly electoral zones and the boundaries of electorates to provide a more just system for electing the House, which the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford had moved to amend by leaving out all the words after the word "House" first appearing, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "any reduction in country Parliamentary representation must correspondingly increase the tendency towards centralization of population and industry."

(Continued from September 21. Page 1075.)

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla)—This motion was one of the last acts of our late Leader and all members will agree that it bears his hallmark, the hallmark of quality and reason and his sense of justice. All members have paid their tribute to those qualities; what a tribute it would be to his service in this House and to his memory if the House were to carry the motion. It is a motion to which surely

no-one can take any exception and even the Premier said it seemed to him that the Leader was being perfectly reasonable and only asking for a more just system than we have at present. I suggest it would be a marvellous tribute to our late Leader if that course were taken and I hope the House will approach it from that angle.

Unfortunately when we examine the speeches of members opposite we find that they are nothing but an attempt to twist the motion into something quite different, and they have made a great play upon the words "more just". The remarkable thing is that outside this Chamber they would understand quite clearly the meaning of those words and would not be quite so pedantic about them. As soon as they get on their feet in this Chamber they appear to lose all comprehension of the meaning of those words. Their understanding fails them.

Mr. Clark—The trouble was that there was so little to argue about that they had to find something.

Mr. LOVEDAY—That is true. The fact is that they found themselves in great difficulty over this motion and their conscience pricked them when they came to it.

Mr. Dunstan—I do not think that. I do not think they have any conscience.

Mr. LOVEDAY—I think some of them have a conscience. I have heard some members opposite use the words "more equitable". "Equitable" is synonymous with "just" and why they take such great exception to those two words passes all understanding.

Mr. Clark—Surely there are grains of justice in it?

Mr. LOVEDAY—Exactly! There certainly are grains of justice in it. The conception of justice varies greatly around the world and even the member for Mitcham would agree that some conceptions are more in keeping with what he thinks are equitable than others he knows of.

Mr. Clark—That would not make them very good.

Mr. LOVEDAY—Notwithstanding, I think we can say some ideas on justice are more equitable than others and as "equitable" is synonymous with "just" why should he and other members opposite be so critical of this and even of the two words "more just". Curiously enough the Premier seemed to understand what the motion was about because, as I said earlier when I was quoting him, he said the Leader was being perfectly reasonable and only asking for a more just system. The

Premier had no hesitation in using those words and why his followers should take exception to them is difficult to understand. At that part of his speech the Premier's conscience was pricking him, but after that he seemed to put his conscience into the background and read into the motion something which was never there.

I wish to comment on the speech of the member for Torrens and I regret that he is not in the Chamber now. When he dealt with this question he had a very bad attack of inability to comprehend and also suffered an attack of acute myopia. He became extremely short-sighted when quoting some of his authorities. Before I deal with his particular form of myopia I point out that the basic principle of democracy—and that is all we aim at—and the underlying reason for democratic forms of government is that the people should be able to have the Government they desire and the right to throw out a Government they do not wish to retain. Under the present South Australian system that seems to be almost impossible.

What do we find in South Australia? At the 1953 election the Australian Labor Party had a majority of 48,000 as 167,000 electors voted for the A.L.P. and only 119,000 for the L.C.L. At the next election the A.L.P. had a majority of 29,000, receiving 129,000 votes against 100,000 received by the L.C.L. On that occasion there were many uncontested seats, which accounted for the reduction in the total number of votes. At the 1959 election the A.L.P. had a majority of 42,000, having received 192,000 votes against 150,000 for the L.C.L.

Despite the fact that the people obviously wanted to change the Government they were unable to achieve that end. The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) chides Opposition members with being defeatists. He says that when we maintain that we won the election we did not win it by enough votes and that we are being defeatists. There is nothing defeatist in this. It is a plain statement of fact. He went on to say we could win if we had a policy acceptable to the people. Aren't the majorities of 1953, 1956 and 1959 proof that Labor did have a policy acceptable to the people? Isn't that clear proof of that fact? The L.C.L. members are the real defeatists when they refuse to accept the proposals contained in our motion because they are proposals to modify the present gerrymander.

Mr. Clark—You know why?

Mr. LOVEDAY—Yes, in effect they say they cannot win unless they keep this system as it is. They want a system weighted in their favour and they say, “Without that we cannot win”. Who are the defeatists? They are not the members on this side of the House. We have been fighting with one arm tied behind our backs for years. If Herb Elliott were asked to compete in a race against the world’s next best runner and were asked to run with one leg slung up behind the other, who would say he could win under those conditions? Would he be classed as a defeatist if he refused to run?

Mr. Clark—Under this system he would be compelled to run in that way.

Mr. LOVEDAY—Exactly! Members opposite say, “Without this weighted system we cannot win.” If they were confident of winning they would be prepared to have a more just system instituted. If the L.C.L. is so sure it has a policy that is acceptable to the majority of the electors, let it submit that policy to the electors in an equitable way. Let the people make the choice with some opportunity of expressing their will in a democratic manner. Let the L.C.L. be prepared to take the verdict of the people of this State. The A.L.P. policy has already been accepted by good majorities in the last three elections, but the people have simply been unable to change the Government as they desire.

It is sheer humbug to boast of numerical equality under the franchise when there is no real equality or a reasonable approach to it. I was interested to notice that the member for Torrens would not answer a question I put to him by way of interjection as to whether the present system was just. I said, “You think the present system is just, do you?” The honourable member said, “I did not say it was.” I said, “You could not say it is!” He said, “I said I did not say it was. I will get around to that in a moment.” That moment never arrived. Usually, if the conscience of the member for Torrens tells him that he is on a sound thing and something that is right, he has an immediate and prompt answer. He is one of the best debaters in this House and does not hesitate when he thinks he is on a good thing in an argument. Here he was hedging and would not say. The moment when he would say never arrived and I think we can draw the conclusion that he knew, in his own mind, that the present system was unjust.

We must not forget that speakers opposite have said that a thing is either just or unjust; that has been the tenor of all their remarks. If it is not just it must be unjust, according to them, but I submit that they are condemned out of their own mouths in this debate.

Mr. Clark—The member for Torrens was the member who quoted only half a sentence of Dr. Finer, wasn’t he?

Mr. LOVEDAY—Precisely, but, before dealing with that, I wish to deal with one of the classic statements made by the Premier in a previous debate on this subject. The late Leader of the Opposition quoted this statement, which was made by the Premier last year:—

I cannot accept the words “the principle of one vote one value” because I cannot find a principle along those lines ever having been established.

We are not asking for one vote one value in this motion; nevertheless, I think that this statement deserves special mention. If we were to substitute the words “Christian values” for the words “one vote one value”, the statement would then read:—

I cannot accept the words “the principle of Christian values” because I cannot find a principle of Christian values ever having been established.

That is precisely the same sort of statement as the Premier was making.

Mr. King—You are being a little presumptuous, aren’t you?

Mr. LOVEDAY—Transposing the words in that way shows the absurdity of the Premier’s statement. I am sure the Premier would not say that we should not attempt to get Christian values merely because they have never been established. An apposite remark appears in a book entitled *Elections and Electors* by J. F. S. Ross. At page 198 he said:—

To pay lip-service to principles, and then dodge their natural and proper consequences, is not the behaviour of really civilized people. The fact that when we have done our best we shall not have attained perfection, that achievement always falls short of inspiration, is no excuse for not doing our best.

That quotation is apposite to the Premier’s statement. During his quotations the member for Torrens was suffering from acute myopia, for he said:—

Another important thing to remember is that Dr. Finer said in his *Theory and Practice of Modern Government* that an electorate should not be so large as to prevent personal contact between the electors and the member.

I commend the honourable member for quoting Dr. Finer, whose book is a university text book

and is accepted as authoritative in these matters. However, let us see what Dr. Finer said in addition to this. He said:—

Convenience implies that the constituency should be not too large for the maintenance of personal contact between candidates and voters, and, of perhaps more importance, between the local party associations and their clientele in the neighbourhood. Equity implies that the constituencies shall be as nearly equalled in population as possible.

As those words are so near on the page to those that the honourable member quoted, it is remarkable that he happened to miss them.

Mr. Quirke—They rather defeat each other, don't they?

Mr. LOVEDAY—Not necessarily.

Mr. Quirke—We get one electorate of about 10,000 square miles and another with about one square mile.

Mr. LOVEDAY—Dr. Finer realizes that it is difficult to reach perfection in these matters, but states that we should endeavour to get as near as possible to perfection. He continues:—

When this principle is applied, not once and for all, but continuously as the distribution of population changes in times of mobility—when it is applied simply and without “management”—

we all know what that sort of management is—

—then it can be taken by the law of averages, and in the long run, there will be no undue advantage to any party and no disadvantage to any, by reason of this cause alone.

What a pity that that full quotation was not given before, but, of course, the rest did not suit the member for Torrens.

Mr. Clark—Did you notice that *Hansard* did not put the extract quoted by the member for Torrens in inverted commas, either?

Mr. LOVEDAY—Quite so. One of the remarkable things about the electoral system is that if we continue as we are going we shall reach an absurd position as the years go by. The present system was evolved in 1936, when, under an amendment to the Constitution, there were 13 metropolitan and 26 country seats. The first election under that system was in 1938. At that time metropolitan enrolments represented 58 per cent of the total and the country 42 per cent. The quota for a metropolitan electorate in those days was 16,300, and for a country electorate 5,900. In 1959 metropolitan enrolments represented 63 per cent of the total, with a quota of 24,100, and country electorates had a quota of about 7,000. In 1938 one country vote was worth 2.77 metropolitan votes; in 1959 a

country vote was worth 3.38 metropolitan votes.

The rate of increase in the metropolitan area's population has been two and a half times that of country areas and, if the present trend continues, by 1991 only 25 per cent of the population will be in the country, but 75 per cent in the metropolitan area. Assuming that the present unhappy state of affairs in our electoral system continues unaltered, by that time one country vote will equal 4.31 metropolitan votes. That needs to go on only a little longer and we shall have approached the conditions of the old rotten boroughs in England, where constituencies had hardly any constituents. No doubt it was argued then that it was necessary to have many country constituencies to keep the country going. This example shows where this system will lead if it is taken to its logical conclusion.

When I hear members talking about there being no established principle of one vote one value, I wonder what they think is the principle people try to follow at congresses, conferences, meetings and so on throughout the country. Is not the principle of one vote one value applied nowadays, no matter what meeting we attend? Although we admit that there are difficulties in regard to an electoral system in applying that exactly—and we are not asking for that—surely no-one can deny that that is a general principle towards which we should be aiming. It came to my notice recently that the L.C.L. issued a document that I believe was called “The Industrial Charter of the Liberal and Country League”. I was amazed to see that this Party, which insists on maintaining its present unjust electoral system, had the impudence to tell the trade union movement that it believed in the democratic control of trade unions by trade unionists.

Mr. Hutchens—What is this?

Mr. LOVEDAY—It told the trade union movement that it believed in democratic control of trade unions by trade unionists. That is part of the industrial charter.

Mr. Hutchens—I thought it was foreign to them.

Mr. LOVEDAY—I am amazed that people who are in glass houses on this question can feel that they can afford to throw these stones. It is about time for a little honest thinking to be done on this matter. We are not asking for our policy to be put into operation *in toto*. All we are seeking is a more just system and all that we have thrown up

at us is a so-called amendment which, as amendments go, scraped in by the very skin of its teeth. It only just came within the definition of "amendment". When one looks at it one wonders what connection it has with the motion. It only draws a red herring across the trail, suggesting that we are interested in a reduction in the number of members from country districts. However, we are not interested in reducing the number of country members. The idea has been brought forward from the other side that the development of country districts depends on the number of country members, but that is palpably false, because we have had many country members for many years yet the population of the country has steadily declined.

Only recently, after many long battles, we got members of the Government to agree to a proposal that recognized the need for more efforts to obtain decentralization and to get more industries into the country. That shows that, although it is desirable not to reduce the number of country members, the country needs something more than that to make it progress and to make country people feel they are getting what they should from the State's activities. I believe that this motion should and could receive the full support of the House if all members obeyed their consciences. They must all know that the present system is unjust and that it is a "managed" system to give the Party opposite the added weight without which it could not go happily to the electors. I ask them to let their consciences speak loudly and overcome all their other feelings on the matter if they really feel anything for democratic principles. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa)—In his opening remarks the member for Whyalla made a plea that we should adopt the original motion out of respect for the memory of the late Leader of the Opposition, basing his wish on his assertion that a just system of electoral boundaries is sought in the motion and that to accept it would be the right thing as well as paying due respect to the late Leader's memory.

Mr. Bywaters—Don't you believe in justice?

Mr. LAUCKE—I certainly do. I am as keenly interested in electoral boundaries as are the sponsors of the motion, but to ensure justice to all areas and all the people of this State it is essential that country districts have adequate representation in this House.

Mr. Bywaters—I agree with that.

Mr. Dunstan—So you think the metropolitan area should have inadequate representation?

Mr. LAUCKE—No.

Mr. Dunstan—That is what the present system does.

Mr. LAUCKE—I think the Premier deduced certain points regarding the Labor Party's policy from replies given to his interjections. This is what he said:—

What members opposite are asking us to consider is the abolition of the Legislative Council, the establishment of a House of 56 members, which represents a reduction of three in the present number of members of Parliament, with each electoral district having approximately the same number of electors.

Mr. Bywaters—But the motion is specific.

Mr. LAUCKE—The Premier also said:—

At present the country districts are represented in Parliament by 38 members—26 in the House of Assembly and 12 in the Legislative Council. If we accept the Leader's proposition that representation decreases to 21, because there would be 35 metropolitan members and 21 country members in the new House. We would not even retain the country's present representation in this Chamber!

That is based on replies given to interjections by the late Leader of the Opposition. I emphasize the need for a just system that will give country areas the necessary representation they require to ensure ultimately great decentralization of industry because of the activities of members representing country interests and districts.

Mr. Clark—That means that you will support the motion?

Mr. LAUCKE—I will not support it. The present system of electoral districts was, as Mr. Loveday said, instituted in 1936 as a result of an amendment of the Constitution which provided that in the House of Assembly the metropolitan area should have 13 districts and the remainder of the State 26.

Mr. Bywaters—A commission set that up.

Mr. LAUCKE—Yes, and it was acted upon at the 1938 elections. This system gives credence to the premises of area and diversity of interests associated with Parliamentary representation in country areas. I am concerned that there should be retention of the present representation from the country, and in considering electoral boundaries thought must be given to the question of area and diversity of interests. The area of South Australia is 380,070 square miles and the area of the metropolitan section is only 161 square miles and the latter area contains 13 electoral districts. Admittedly, the bulk of the State's population is centred in this area

and the community of interests both commercial and industrial renders representation in this area somewhat casier than would reasonably be expected for a country representative who shares with 25 others the responsibility of the adequate representation of an area of 380,070 square miles that has a widely dispersed population with divergent interests. I have in mind the electorate of my friend, Mr. Clark.

I have the honour to represent in my district a large portion of the area previously included in the Gawler district. In the Gawler River area we have dairying, vegetable growing, fat lamb raising, wool, hay and oats; at Willaston we have cereal crops, pigs and dairy farming; and towards Williamstown we have vineyards, a variety of fruits, and timber. Much of the honourable member's time would be spent in becoming conversant with the various problems arising from the industries I have mentioned and he would have much more work than if he represented twice the number of electors in a compact set-up within his present electorate. He has a huge number of electors in his present district to whom he is responsible, but there is a common interest among many of those electors, such as the problem of roads, transport, power and water supplies. I feel that a member could more easily represent a great number of people with common interests in a compact area than he could represent a fraction of that number in a rural district with diverse interests.

Mr. Dunstan—What you are saying is that these people should have less voice in Parliament than the few people in rural areas?

Mr. LAUCKE—We want a balanced view of the whole of the State's resources. It does not come down to one vote one value.

Mr. Dunstan—You deny these people a voice in the future of this country.

Mr. LAUCKE—I cannot see how one vote one value could ever achieve that.

Mr. Dunstan—At least they would get the decent facilities they require. You deny rights to people in this area.

Mr. LAUCKE—We deny nothing.

Mr. Dunstan—Not much, you don't!

Mr. LAUCKE—The wealth of the State comes from the soil in the first instance. The rural areas should have sufficient representation to ensure that the basis of our economy will be built up. When the late Leader of the Opposition said that there would be 35 metropolitan members and 21 country members—

Mr. Dunstan—That is pure assumption. It is not in the motion at all.

Mr. LAUCKE—For the 11 months to the end of May the total value of our exports amounted to £83,000,000 and no less than £62,500,000 of that came from the products of the land. Wool accounted for £29,000,000, wheat and barley for £18,000,000, meat and other produce £15,500,000 and the balance of £20,500,000 came from minerals, metals and miscellaneous manufactures. Predominantly, our overseas credits come from the soil. It is our bounden duty at all times to see that the rural economy is retained as the foundation of our economy. Believing as I do in the necessity for the intimate representation of the country by members who know the requirements of a given area, I fear that the stability of our State would be endangered if we had centralization of power in the metropolitan area to the exclusion of power in the country.

Mr. Dunstan—Who said that we would exclude power from the country?

Mr. LAUCKE—I do not suggest complete exclusion.

Mr. Dunstan—All that we are asking for is what the Liberal Party has advocated elsewhere.

Mr. LAUCKE—In my district I find that there are four major requirements: (1) water; (2) power; (3) roads; and (4) systems of transport. They are basic to our welfare and have resulted in the establishment of industries in many parts of the State. When I hear condemnatory remarks concerning what has been achieved already in decentralization I am indeed surprised. Where natural resources could be exploited effectively, economically and profitably, it has been done, founded on the provision in the first instance of water, power, roads and transport. Honourable members continually bring before the Government the need for water reticulation, the extension of electricity, the improvement of a road or the provision of a new road and improved railway services that would help the prosperity of a specified rural community. Wherever natural resources have been found they have in every instance to my knowledge been exploited and with no ulterior purpose.

Mr. Loveday—If you had ten country members in the area near Hawker which we saw recently it would not make much difference to it.

Mr. LAUCKE—I would not want ten country members in that area. I emphasize that we must have adequate representation of country areas in this House. The Leigh Creek coalfield is one example of the usage of natural resources in a country area. Other examples

are the uranium mine at Radium Hill; pyrites at Nairne; gypsum on Kangaroo Island; barytes at Quorn; brickworks at Nuriootpa, Port Augusta and Littlehampton; electric power stations at Port Augusta, Port Lincoln and Mount Gambier; uranium treatment plant at Port Pirie; South-Eastern forest mills, including the magnificent Mount Gambier mill; the extensions to paper industries in the South-East; sulphuric acid manufacture at Port Pirie; butter, cheese and milk processing plants scattered throughout the country; fruit packing and wineries in the river areas, the non-irrigated areas of the Barossa Valley, and south of Adelaide; machinery manufacturing plants at Mannum and Murray Bridge; fishing and canning industries at Port Lincoln; and salt works at Port Augusta.

All these industries are on a State-wide basis. Where there are natural resources or a situation conducive to the economic setting-up of business, industries have been established, but many industries had their origin in the suggestion of the local member to the Government that it consider setting up an industry at a given point. In that way there has been a raising of our general economy through the activities of members from rural areas who know the immediate requirements of their area, its potentialities and so on; those members referred to those potentialities in this House, with the result that the Government acted upon that advice, following investigations, and industry has been developed in those areas.

Mr. Fred Walsh—It is not suggested that representation be denied.

Mr. LAUCKE—I attach so much importance to the factors of area and sparse population that I cannot reconcile the principle of one vote one value with the necessity of those rural interests to be fully and adequately developed in the interests of the nation.

Mr. Loveday—Where is one vote one value mentioned in the motion?

Mr. LAUCKE—We can only make deductions from the comments of the late Mr. O'Halloran in reply to queries.

Mr. Loveday—You have been consorting with Sherlock Holmes.

Mr. LAUCKE—I have no doubt at all that any move that tends to reduce country representation must inevitably accentuate centralization of population, and I therefore oppose the motion and support the Premier's amendment.

Mr. CLARK (Gawler)—The speech we have just heard from the member for Barossa was

something that I did not expect and, to be quite honest, it saddened me. I think it demonstrated forcibly what a tangle an honest man can get into trying to support something that is dishonest. I have always tried to believe that no just cause is hopeless, but when we hear a person we know to be honest speaking the way he did, as though he really believed what he was saying, we realize that it makes our task of convincing other members all the more difficult.

Mr. McKee—When you are on a good thing, stick to it!

Mr. CLARK—Yes. Even if we only succeed bit by bit, we must eventually get electoral justice in this State. I was rather surprised that the member for Barossa spoke as he did. I think I should read what the motion says, for it contains nothing, either said or implied, about one vote one value and nothing about cutting down the number of country members in this State. The motion states:—

That in the opinion of this House the Government should take steps to readjust the House of Assembly electoral zones and the boundaries of electorates to provide a more just system for electing the House.

We have heard much from members, for the sake of trying to find some arguments, about the meaning of the words "more just." For the moment I was thinking that it was the member for Light who had had something to say on this topic, but in fact he has not yet spoken. He seems to be the strong, silent type. The member for Onkaparinga had much to say.

Mr. Dunstan—No-one could call him a strong, silent man.

Mr. CLARK—He may be strong, but I do not think anyone would ever do him the injustice of saying he was silent. The members for Onkaparinga and Torrens grabbed hold of the words "more just" as a drowning man would grab at a straw, in order to find some little thing to quibble about, and one of those members tried to tell us that if a thing is "just" it is perfect and cannot be more just. If honourable members go to the trouble of looking up certain authorities that are readily available they will find that there is every basis for thinking that a thing can be "more just" or even "juster". We know, as the member for Whyalla pointed out, that there is certainly grave injustice. I was reminded, on hearing these comparisons, of a rather funny incident that happened years ago when I was a schoolmaster. I was giving a lesson on comparisons of adverbs and adjectives, and, for a joke, I quickly shot at one

young fellow who was sitting there more or less asleep, "Compare the word 'bull'", and he did, with interesting results: "Bull, little bull, big bull". That is a true story. The last words he used probably described aptly the type of argument used by the members for Onkaparinga and Torrens.

We should try to get back to the basis of fact in this matter and to find just what this motion seeks. It is not hard to find. The Premier often seems to try to cloud the issue when he speaks, and this he did once again on this occasion, though I suggest never more unsuccessfully. He said it was really a question of what the Leader meant by "a more just system". That is just not true, because under the present system it would not matter one bit, as the numbers under this system are with the Government and will remain with the Government even if this motion is carried. It therefore would not matter one bit just what the Leader meant by "a more just system". What the motion really did was to pose for the consideration of members the question whether the present system is just, or, if you like, perfect, and, if not, whether the House agrees that it is about time we did something to make it more just.

As I have already said, it does not matter a scrap under the present system what we of the Labor Party think is the best way to do it. We have our policy on this question, and the late Leader, in reply to an interjection by the Premier, stated what that policy was. It is not included in this motion, and I think no member of this House would be naive or optimistic enough to expect this Government to adopt the Opposition's policy on electoral reform completely. Can anyone imagine that Opposition members would be so optimistic? We know better than that, yet some speakers, including the Premier, have assumed that this motion, in which we ask the Government to do a certain thing, means that immediately the motion is carried the Government will set to work and implement Labor policy on electoral reform.

Mr. Riches—They cannot think of a more just policy.

Mr. CLARK—Nobody would imagine that such a thing would be likely. All we wanted was to obtain agreement amongst members of this House—and the objective is stated clearly in the motion—that the system could be justly improved. Again according to the words of the motion, we want the Government to take steps to do something about it, not to implement our policy, much as we would like

to see that done. Surely, to prove whether it is just or unjust we need find only one instance of injustice in our present electoral system.

Mr. Lawn—That's all it needs.

Mr. CLARK—Without going far from home I would not have much difficulty in supplying that one example. I was rather surprised to hear the member for Barossa, who I think has some knowledge of my activities and the work I do, suggesting that possibly my old district in which I was happy would have entailed more work than the district I now represent. Let me say that I have never worked so hard in my life as I have over the last year of so, consequent upon the unprecedented growth of population in the district I am fortunate enough to represent.

Let me give irrefutable evidence of one instance of injustice. Last year I cited the growth of population in my district and asked the Premier whether, because the number of electors in a country district was supposed to be about 7,000 and the number in my electorate was more than double that, he intended to do anything about it. The member for Adelaide spoke very aptly on this subject. On that occasion the Premier was kind enough to say that he thought he would have to wait until the position stabilized and that he was sure I was capable of representing the district, which of course I am. However, if we are to wait until that district stabilizes the time will come when I will be representing 60,000 people instead of the 16,119 persons I now represent.

Surely it is unjust that a district which is supposed to be a country district—at least it is included in the list of country districts—should have twice as many electors as any other country district. Let me say, for the benefit of members opposite in particular, that I am the last one in this House to want to see country representation decreased; I want it increased, and I want it increased soon, as do many people in my district. Not that I consider that my constituents have had enough of me, but justice is being denied them. This motion is not a move to put our policy into effect, as the Premier contended. It was moved with a view to improving our electoral system, which not even Mr. Shannon would say is perfect. Mr. Coumbe was not prepared to reply to Mr. Loveday's interjection about its being an unjust system, because he seemed to have some doubts about it. If the motion is carried the onus will be on the Government to

make the present system more just. In referring to the late Leader of the Opposition the Premier said:—

He knew that no-one on this side of the House would be opposed to a more just system.

Yet, he showed that he was opposed to it, and so has every Government member who has spoken so far. Obviously the Premier's remarks can be regarded as hypocritical nonsense. When that was obvious it was a waste of time to listen to his further remarks, but I had to because I intended to speak on the matter later. The Premier said the motion is ambiguous, but that is not so. It says plainly what is required. The Premier went on to speak about the Labor Party electoral policy. Government members will not agree with that policy, but it is not mentioned in the motion. We know that with the numbers as they are we cannot expect to have the policy adopted. Government members have been opposing something not even suggested in the motion, no matter how desirable we think it would be if the policy were adopted. We realize that we cannot do everything at once, but if we can remove only a small portion of the injustice inherent in the present electoral system we shall be a little further along the way.

The Premier's argument led to the moving of an amendment to the motion. I have some doubts whether it is an amendment to the matter under discussion. It depends on whether we read into it what it says, or whether it means what the Premier says it means. He said that the electoral set-up had an influence on decentralization: it has a terrific influence on that matter. The Premier conveniently forgot to mention that the present electoral system was the biggest single influence against decentralization, and the Premier knows that that is so. I do not think his speech on this motion was one of his best efforts, but his remarks will be accepted without question by Government members. They will be eager to follow his ridiculous assumptions on this issue. They will have to try to justify the electoral system the Premier supports, or perish. To some people necks are precious indeed. Unfortunately some Government members, whether they admit it or not, are forced to rally to the cause of this objectionable gerrymander, this odious thing that is poisoning our electoral life, because their political necks are involved. I know that it must go against the grain of some Govern-

ment members when they have to go to such lengths in order to remain here.

Our country electorates, except mine, grow slowly in population, whereas metropolitan electorates grow quickly, and the disparity is becoming greater every year. There would be some excuse for that if there were a benefit to the State, but figures show that is not so. Every time we bring this matter forward Government members try to find a fallacious argument in opposition to it. They oppose electoral justice. They do not have to be logical so long as the system keeps them safe and sound in their seats. They do this sort of thing consistently. The member for Murray referred to the Premier playing a card game. Most of us have played card games at one time or another, and always if we hold four aces we are not anxious to have a new deal. That is so, particularly if we are like the Premier, who wants four aces in his hand every time and who always wants to deal the cards. We have the red herring brought out that if this motion is carried it will harm the country, but it seeks to do good, and it does not reduce country representation. It only gives the State an opportunity to have decentralization which so far has been denied to it. Mr. Laucke read a long list of industries that have been established, but except in Labor-held districts not one large industry has been established. That is due to the desire to keep Labor voters from entering the wrong districts. I say that from the point of Government members.

We must all agree that there is a great need for decentralization in South Australia. Unfortunately the necks of Government members are at stake and apparently they are more valuable than the lifeblood of the State; otherwise, Government members could not lower themselves to support the present electoral system. There is no doubt that the present electoral injustice is the most effective barrier to decentralization in this State. Country people are supporting our side more and more, and that will be made obvious in the near future. However, that has little effect in South Australia. The member for Whyalla gave some figures showing that public opinion is denied a free voice in South Australia. The big majorities outside do not mean anything in this place. I am certain that some Government members do not like the idea of winning seats under false pretences, yet virtually that is what is being done. We seek for everybody the democratic right, and it is an elementary right after all, to elect

the Government he wants and dismiss the Government he does not want. This is something that South Australians have not been able to do for many years. In order to provide that elementary right the present electoral gerrymander must be got rid of in some way. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

THE BUDGET.

In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from October 4. Page 1145.)

Grand Total, £85,516,029.

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray)—At the outset I want to pass my sincere sympathy on to the widow of the late Leader of the Opposition and to join with others in the sentiments expressed about the sad loss of one who was so dear to all members in this House. We have lost not only a Leader but a personal friend, and a sincere confidant to whom we could go for advice in time of need. I say this publicly as a token of respect to the late Mr. O'Halloran. I extend good wishes to our new Leader, Deputy Leader and Whip, and I assure them that they will be wholeheartedly supported by all members on this side.

[*Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.*]

Mr. BYWATERS—I congratulate all those concerned in the current primary schools music festival in Adelaide. All who attend cannot but be thrilled by the beautiful singing of the children assembled in the Adelaide Town Hall. The Education Department each year by putting on this music festival provides something of extreme value to the public of South Australia. Listening to it last night I was thrilled by the magnificent singing. Some individual items also were a treat. I look forward each year to this festival because it is getting better as the years go by. Last night was no exception. The sight of those 400 children singing in the Town Hall was an inspiration.

In addressing myself to the Budget I should like to mention one or two points. First, considerable mention has been made in the House recently of the effect of the increasing cost structure on the primary producer. As I represent a primary producing area, I realize that the farmers today are feeling the effects of the high costs of production. Last Thursday I had the privilege of attending a seminar in the Burnside Town Hall arranged by the Australian Institute of Agricultural Science, the subject under discussion being "The

farmer and the future". At that session the member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) spoke very well on how the farmer looked to the future; he put forward constructive ideas about some problems. I appreciated hearing him on a subject about which he knows much. He is a graduate of the Roseworthy Agricultural College, a practical farmer, and one who knows the difficulties of the man on the land. All who listened to him were pleased with the way he presented his case. Another good speaker was Professor Campbell, Professor of Agricultural Economics at the University of Melbourne. In the course of his talk he spoke of the need for scientific research. He made a statement that I was rather surprised to hear. He said that South Australia was spending less on agricultural research than any other State in the Commonwealth, and he hoped that this would not remain the case because he felt that research into agriculture today was important and something that we would need to step up in this State.

The whole tenor of the seminar seemed to centre on increasing costs, the "cost squeeze" as it is termed sometimes. Some constituents of mine from the northern end of my electorate have told me of rising costs, including the steep increase in the price of cornsacks, to which I referred yesterday in a question to the Premier. They were told also that it would not be long before woolsacks, being of jute, possibly increased in price. All these things tend to increase production costs, while the farmers are not receiving any more now than they were years ago. In fact, many are receiving less, particularly from wool production.

One of the main factors in the cost squeeze is the high cost of land today. Land values have risen so much that today it is costing a man much in interest alone on the value of his property. At the seminar one instance was cited of a man who had bought a dairy farm in my electorate. He had paid £20,000 for this 50-acre dairy farm on a "walk in walk out" basis. Some high land was attached to it but the main value was in the reclaimed swamp area. If worked out at the current bank interest rate of 6 per cent, the property cost him £1,200 a year in interest charges alone. As there are high wages costs today, for that £1,200 a year he would get at least another man working on the property, with all the other expenses attached. The interest charges are not doing anything to produce. The cost of production is increasing. For a man to have to find £24 a week on a dairy farm

before he starts at all is indeed a heavy burden for him to bear. Therefore, with the high values of land today and the high costs prevailing, it is becoming an increasingly heavier burden, with the interest charges.

One gentleman who spoke said that, if he were to sell out on his property today, he could not spend the income he would receive if he invested the proceeds of the sale in companies associated with hire-purchase at eight per cent. This is a sorry state of affairs when we realize that a man can make more money by investing at interest especially at some of the higher rates of interest offered by companies associated with hire-purchase. People are selling out who are good farmers, and they are investing their money in investments of the kind I have mentioned. This is not in the best interests of the country as a whole and we find such high interest charges eating up so much of the profits of the hard work of the man on the land. This will have to be looked at.

Only yesterday the Premier in reply to a question stated that he wanted to refute any thought of the Housing Trust bumping up land values, and his point was valid. There was another side to it which we do not at all times realize, when we find that a man in the metropolitan area has in the past sold land to the Housing Trust for a large figure. A figure was mentioned here yesterday by the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) in relation to an area in his district. Such people, in turn, can go to some other area and pay much more for land because they have the money they have received for their subdivided land. They compete with the person who wants to purchase land in the country today and they are able to offer more money because their money comes from selling land elsewhere at high prices. This is happening on the River Murray to which people are going from the metropolitan area and paying higher prices than normal for land. It is happening throughout the State.

One gentleman told me recently that he had sold land in the Mid-North for about £100 an acre and had come down to my electorate where he could purchase land more cheaply. He could sell in his own district and offer higher prices for land in my electorate. The man with the money can influence prices elsewhere. This happened considerably during the wool boom that we experienced in 1951 and 1952 when some woolgrowers came into areas and towns adjacent to their properties and were able to offer much higher prices for a

house than the working man could afford. This, in turn, forced prices up to an inflationary level as they could offer higher prices for houses, so the working man had to suffer. That is the problem we are facing today in relation to costs, and these interest charges are severe. It means that a man has to earn a lot for the investors before he can start doing anything for himself.

I refer now to the Metropolitan Milk Board because it affects some of my constituents. In my area we have a big dairying district, a great asset to our State. It is interesting to read the Auditor-General's report on the Metropolitan Milk Board and to see that that board is indeed in a good financial position. This year again we notice that the board has a surplus of £4,000. Prior to this, the accumulated funds from last year were £26,900, leaving current assets of £30,700. The object of this, apparently, is to build a property, something that the board will need. I am not against that. It will be an asset to the producers, the milk treatment plants, and all concerned with the board for it to have its own premises and adequate facilities in an area not so congested as its present site. So I have no objection to its building a property of its own. Because of this need for the building, however, I asked the Minister of Agriculture this afternoon whether it would be Government policy to provide some form of assistance to the Metropolitan Milk Board because, after all, it is a Government-constituted body, and it is not usual for Government bodies to build their own buildings at the expense of the producers and the others connected with the industry.

In this case it is apparent that this will be done. I do not object to that. I do not think it will do very much with the sum available—£30,700. It will need more money than that for building today, for such things as the cost of the site, demolishing the present buildings and erecting the building it desires. We look forward to an answer from the Minister as to the position of the Government in this matter.

It is interesting to note the sum contributed by the levy on the milk producers to the Metropolitan Milk Board this year: £18,782. This is made up by a levy of four-sixteenths of a penny a gallon of milk and pound of cream during that current year. So the dairymen are contributing a big percentage towards the Metropolitan Milk Board, which on the other hand is doing much for the dairymen. It has lifted the dairyman considerably in status

over recent years. Now the dairymen are at least enjoying a measure of comfort in their working conditions that they did not have at one time, so I think that the board has to a great extent helped the dairymen. This levy is considerable. I notice also that the treatment plants have contributed considerably to the board by providing £23,051. There is an accumulated surplus of £4,000, and last year the Auditor-General said he thought this four-sixteenths of a penny could be reduced, but that was not done. Although the profits are not quite so good this year as last year, they are still considerable. This afternoon I asked the Minister of Agriculture whether anything could be done to promote milk sales. Mr. Gale, the Chairman of the Milk Board, in his report which was tabled yesterday, suggested that our legislation should be amended to enable the promotion of milk sales in South Australia.

Mr. Shannon—"Eat more butter" would be another good move.

Mr. BYWATERS—Yes. If the price of butter were within the means of people they would eat more. It is far better for the producer if people drink more milk and he gets a bigger quota of whole milk. I heard recently that the board intends to admit milk from Narrung to the metropolitan area. It is good that people in other areas should enjoy the advantages of supplying milk to the metropolitan area. In the past it has been claimed that at times during the year it is difficult to get sufficient milk for the metropolitan area. That problem does not exist now because, according to Mr. Gale's report, milk production has increased considerably. The total quantity of milk produced on licensed dairies this year was 30,939,616 gallons, an increase of 38,025 gallons over last year's production.

In the past milk production in February, March, April, May and June has been low, but because of good farm management that production is increasing. Normally during autumn the whole milk quota, for which the dairymen receive more, reaches a high level, and in the past dairymen have received as much as 95 per cent whole milk, but this year they received only about 80 per cent. Although their production has increased, their receipts have not risen because the whole milk quota has been reduced through the increased supplies available. This situation will be aggravated when Meningie and Narrung are included in the Milk Board's area. I do not oppose their entry, but it will be necessary to increase milk consumption to enable the board to

promote milk sales in the metropolitan area and in adjacent districts. Many people do not fully realize the benefits that can be obtained from drinking milk, the presentation of which is far superior to what it was a few years ago.

Many of my constituents believe that there is a need for a research station in the Murray River reclaimed swamps; an area of great importance to the State and one of the most productive dairying areas in Australia. Indeed, there are few areas in the world that can compare with it for production. I understand that in England an area is flooded and then rapidly drained, and increased production has resulted. The purpose is to flood the pastures and remove the water rapidly to obviate salinity, and by this means good results are achieved. There are many questions associated with our reclaimed swamp area that need to be answered and research will play a prominent part. The dairy adviser at Murray Bridge is doing everything possible to supply information to the dairymen, but they believe that a research station is necessary to investigate production methods, soil management and drainage. At present there are 9,000 acres of Government reclaimed areas and 3,000 acres of privately reclaimed areas. The private areas are different from the Government areas in that those on the private areas must provide their own water, drainage and dewatering, whereas the Government swamps are maintained by Government employees. The areas are similar and there is much co-operation between the settlers on each because of their common interests. On these 12,000 acres are 16,000 head of cattle—about one and a half cows to the acre. This is estimated at one milking cow an acre and the half represents dry stock.

Although this is a fertile area the agricultural adviser believes it could produce far more with improved pastures and improved farming methods. During the autumn months the production from the Murray swamps supplies almost half the metropolitan area's requirements. In 1958-59, 7,660,000 gallons of milk were produced and in 1959-60, 8,200,000 gallons, an increase of seven per cent. The increased production was offset by a decrease in the whole milk quota and the dairy producers were no better off. It is essential to launch a sales campaign to bring in additional areas to the metropolitan area. With improved methods the production will increase in the near future and I urge the Minister to favourably consider the request for the establishment of a research station in the reclaimed swamp areas.

Members generally are interested in the after-care of prisoners released from our gaols, particularly in the need to reform them, and most are aware of the excellent work that is done by the Prisoners' Aid Society. This year the Government has granted £3,000 to that organization which, through its activities, is saving our taxpayers much. It has been estimated that it costs £10 a week to keep a prisoner in gaol and £10 a week to maintain his family while he is there—a total of almost £1,000 a year for each prisoner. If the Prisoners' Aid Society reforms three prisoners annually, and turns them from a life of crime, it is more than repaying the Government's grant which, obviously, is a good investment. The seventy-third report of the Prisoners' Aid Society for the year ended June 30, 1960, states that the number of cases handled for the year was 1,514. Many of the people dealt with have not gone back into prison because of the encouragement they have received. They are met at the gaol gates, provided with transport to their homes and in cases where they have nowhere to go accommodation has been provided. The society has gone out of its way to provide employment and an incentive to the prisoners to reform so that they may go out into the world and take their rightful place in society. Its effort is a noteworthy one.

We were fortunate to have the opportunity of visiting Cadell, where prisoners are rehabilitated. From Cadell the work is carried on by the Prisoners' Aid Society and it has contributed substantially to the State's finances. The report mentions a few cases and the results that have been achieved. Case No. 265 concerned a young man of good parentage who had 147 convictions, most of them for drunkenness. It was impossible to secure any accommodation for him because of his past behaviour. Representations were made for medical treatment at Northfield and, after four months, work was secured for the young man and he has not looked back. That is a case of a young man who, but for the Prisoners' Aid Society, would have been hopelessly lost and who would have soon gone back to prison at some cost to the Government.

Case No. 108 was that of a young man with a University degree who had 78 convictions and who was a confirmed alcoholic. On several occasions he had been given money, clothing and work, but he failed after the first pay. After treatment he contacted a religious group, obtained a good job at £20 a week and is now helping others in the same way that he has

been helped. I could quote other cases of that nature, so it pays the Government to make money available to the society and I suggest that the Government should consider enlarging the work of this powerful organization. The association works closely with church organizations and welfare people and is doing a fine job. Good work, in co-operation with the gaol chaplain, is being done to encourage people not to break the law again after being helped and, from a business point of view, the Government should further the work of the society. Many of the cases cited in the annual report are of true alcoholics. They have come under the eye of the police because of their failure in this regard and they have gone into gaol, which is not the best place for them. Representations have been made by members on this side of the Chamber for another institution, where they could have treatment. Last week the *Advertiser* published comments by Professor Norval Morris, who claimed it was necessary for alcoholics to be treated out of prison. In the last case I quoted it was found necessary to send the man for special treatment. He was not a bad person, but had an alcoholic complaint. Treatment was necessary before he recovered.

In Sydney recently a conference was held and several points were made on this matter. One cutting taken from the *Advertiser* is headed "Centres for Alcoholics Advocated" and the article states:—

The South Australian health services should make immediate plans to establish treatment centres for alcoholics separate from the present facilities in mental hospitals, the Rev. W. C. S. Johnson said today. Mr. Johnson is founder of Archway Port, and Rector of St. Paul's, Port Adelaide. He has just returned to Adelaide from the all-Australian Conference on Alcoholism held in Sydney. "In all other States the authorities are spending between £50,000 and £80,000 a year in coping with the grave problems of alcoholism," he said. He continued, "In South Australia, most of the work is on a voluntary basis, except for the limited facilities in established mental hospitals." Mr. Johnson said treatment facilities in South Australia should be established in a three-stage plan: primary out-patient treatment on the clinical level by teams comprising psychiatrists, physicians, social workers, almoners, and spiritual advisers. After treatment through a "half-way house" similar to Archway Port. Long-term treatment for the more difficult cases.

At the Sydney conference South Australian Professor Norval Morris said it was absurd to send people to prison for being alcoholics. The heading to the article was "Silly to Gaol Alcoholics".

The professor said, "It would be easy to stop this absurdity and we should do so." He was speaking at the first Australian conference on alcoholism being held at the University of Sydney. The press article continued:—

Almost half the annual commitments to Australian gaols and a quarter of the running costs of gaols came from sentences of a few days or a few weeks imposed for minor drunkenness charges. "Every prisoner serving such a brief time in gaol is proof of our failure to handle intelligently this difficult problem," Professor Morris claimed. "We should abandon the sentence of brief imprisonment and substitute for it more protracted incarceration in institutions," he said. Probably 50 per cent of those convicted of more serious crimes were, at the time of the commission of the crime, under the influence of alcohol sufficient to have had an appreciable effect on their inhibitions. There was a close relationship between crime and alcohol, he said. Australia seemed immune to emotional disturbance in response to the slaughter of hundreds of people each year on the roads. Evidence that drinking drivers cause between a third and a half of the fatalities was becoming very strong, he said.

The Reverend Mr. Johnson and Professor Norval Morris are two men who are experts and they are closely associated with work amongst alcoholics. They are advancing the plea that South Australia should follow the lead of the eastern States in providing facilities to overcome this disease, because it is costing the State Government much money to maintain such people in prison. I hope the Government will give earnest consideration to the question.

Last night, when speaking in the Budget debate, the member for Adelaide spoke of concession fares for pensioners and he said that they had been provided for pensioners in the metropolitan area on public transport systems. He spoke of the appreciation shown by the pensioners who had received cards entitling them to travel at half fare within 25 miles of Adelaide. He also said that a private bus proprietor was anxious to get some of this business because whereas previously some pensioners had travelled on his buses they were now travelling on public transport. This man was a big bus proprietor and he wanted to offer the same concession, but his association would not allow him to do so.

The Government has granted concession fares in Victoria for many years and members on this side of the House asked for the concession to be extended to our country areas. The members for Port Pirie, Wallaroo, Mount Gambier and Adelaide have consistently

advocated it and the member for Adelaide again advocated it last night and I have also asked for an extension of the concession to country people so that they may come to Adelaide, at least on public transport, in the hope that private bus owners will come into line in the future. There are many empty seats on the services running between Adelaide and the country and the railways would not suffer if concession fares were granted, and it would encourage further use of the railways. There are many seats available on the run from Murray Bridge to Adelaide and many people would travel to the city if it did not cost them so much. The Government is providing free transport for pensioners attending a public hospital and this is greatly appreciated because many of them would not otherwise be able to come to town.

This is another case where an anomaly is created if neither railway system nor public transport is provided. Last year I drew the attention of the Committee to a case at Palmer where a pensioner had to come to town on many occasions for treatment at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and he was required to pay the full bus fare because concession rates were not available to him on the bus. He thought it was an injustice and it caused him hardship. He had much difficulty in coming to Adelaide and eventually was able to find accommodation here, otherwise he would not have been able to continue his treatment. This anomaly could be corrected to the advantage of the country pensioner.

A matter of great interest to me is the need for growing vegetables along the Murray River. Every day market gardeners are leaving the metropolitan area because of the high land values there and increasing rates. The obvious place for them to go is near the water, so I have made representations to the Government on this matter and have received courteous treatment. The Government realizes that there is much merit in my ideas. I suggested that a subdivided area near Murray Bridge could be provided with water and asked the Minister of Works to consider this. Two officers of the Irrigation Branch of the Lands Department inspected the area. Today the Minister allowed me to read the report, which was, in the main, favourable to the suggestions I had put forward. However, other difficulties came into the matter which they pointed out but which I did not realize. Generally, however, the report showed that they all realized that there was much merit in the future of the

Murray areas for vegetable growing. I trust that something will be done about this. A Murray Bridge man with much knowledge of irrigation suggested that an area be set aside for future vegetable growing. Available land near the town and the river is being subdivided and, once that happens, it is beyond the control of any Government authority. Because of this, it is increasingly difficult to do anything with it but, if an area could be planned for future vegetable growing, I am sure that private investors would become interested the same as they did at Waikerie. This point has been noted by the Government and I believe it will be further considered.

This year a cannery to process vegetables and fruit was established at Murray Bridge. This alone can absorb most of the surplus that the Adelaide market cannot use, so we have the facilities to process the surplus. There is a big demand on the local market for vegetables. Many people have been asked to grow peas because of the heavy demand in this State for deep-frozen peas. Some are imported from America, but that is wrong as we have the facilities here to grow them. I trust that the powers that be will look a little further into the future and will plan so that people in the metropolitan area will not starve for the want of vegetables.

At Murray Bridge a small tannery has been established and is almost ready to go into production. The two men who established it came from Hungary with all their plant and did much work in establishing the tannery. They constructed a fine building with the aid of local capital and are waiting only for electricity to be supplied to get into production, using the knowledge they have brought from Europe. They have advanced ideas, judging from their talk and the samples I have seen. With them I visited several shoemakers, all of whom were impressed by the standard of the hides. I hope this will become an important industry, as we need industries closely allied to the district. As they are situated on the outskirts of the town, they are in an area where a standing charge for electricity is applied. Because of this they will pay a 38 per cent standing charge which, I believe, will be about £160 a year. That expense could be a burden to a new firm, as it will need all the money it can get. I believe an approach will be made to the trust about this soon. I support the Estimates, and shall have further comments to make when we are discussing the lines.

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla)—Firstly, I pay my respects to our late Leader and offer my condolences to Mrs. O'Halloran and our late Leader's relatives. With his passing we have come to the end of an era in Parliament and have lost a great friend and wise counsellor. Nevertheless, as a Party we stand firmly together behind our new Leader (whom we congratulate) and the others who have assumed new offices. We wish them well and assure them that we are united behind them. I compliment the member for Murray for once again mentioning concession fares for pensioners in country areas. Pensioners in my district are in a similar position to those in other country towns and would greatly appreciate an extension of the concessions granted in the metropolitan area as soon as possible. Many of these people, because of rising costs, rates and other charges, are finding it extremely costly to travel. Surely it is not too much to ask that they be given greater facilities to move around, particularly as they must come to the city from time to time for treatment of some type or another. I trust that our reiteration of this matter will soon bear fruit.

Much discussion has taken place during this debate, as on previous occasions, about the increasing public debt. The member for Burra again spoke about this matter, of which he has made a particular hobby. He referred to the tremendous debt on the railway system. One interesting point about the railways and other public facilities is that interest is still being paid on equipment and rolling stock worn out long ago. Physically, of course, it is impossible to pay interest on something that is worn out, as interest is something that arises out of production. Therefore, one can see that the financial system that demands that interest be paid on worn-out stock and equipment is out of order as it is physically impossible, although it may be financially possible by robbing something else to do it. The members for Barossa and Gouger, who, unfortunately, are not in the Chamber at the moment, were rather pained at the criticism made against orthodox finance. The member for Barossa said that State finances are really an extension of ordinary domestic finances: that there was very little difference in the last analysis. If he were referring to the allocation of money to various State departments I would not quarrel with him but, if he were dealing with the way in which finance is made available for the State and with the position of interest payments on public debt and the creation of public debt

itself, there ceases to be any similarity between that type of finance and domestic finance. The member for Gouger said:—

I do not think we should deride the financial system that has given us our present standard of living.

It is what the workers, not the financiers, have done that has given us our present standard of living. The member for Gouger seemed pained at the thought of orthodox ideas being criticized or derided, yet, as a matter of historical fact, the most famous men in history were unorthodox. The names of unorthodox people in history will live far longer than the orthodox. For example, Karl Marx, Leonardo da Vinci, the founders of the world's religions, and Einstein were all unorthodox people who derided orthodox thought in their day. There is nothing wrong in deriding a system if we think there is something radically wrong with it. That is the only way to get a change, and it usually takes a long time to get a change. We should all recognize—and most of us do—that nothing stands still, and that we will achieve a change only by criticizing the orthodox and examining the position to see whether we should not adopt more unorthodox ideas. I think this applies particularly to finance. Surely the position today cannot engender much confidence in financial institutions.

We now have a position where wage-earners have to mortgage their future wages to buy what they have already produced. Surely, when looked at from the point of view of pure physical fact, that is an illogical and absurd position, yet that has become accepted as an orthodox and proper way to conduct our affairs. Obviously, sooner or later saturation point must be reached because, as everyone is getting more and more gadgets through hire-purchase, under which they are mortgaging their future wages, the time must come, if they reserve a certain amount for necessities for which they must pay cash, when they cannot mortgage their futures any longer and some further method must be found to make this creaking system work. A leading financier once went before the Commonwealth Parliament and seriously told us that if we exported the least amount of gold that we held in our vaults the whole system would collapse about our ears. When it was exported a little later nothing of the sort happened, showing that the orthodox view is so often wrong even when it comes from alleged experts.

I appreciated the speech made by the member for Gouger. He admitted that he did not know very much about this subject, but he was a

little rash in taking on the member for Burra and trying to deal with his point of view. He admitted that he had read a small book on economics. We must all remember that the people who write books on economics frequently have two eyes on the jobs they are holding at the time. What they write in their books is undoubtedly affected by the direction of their eyes. I suppose we all look at our economic situation before we say something that will affect it, so we should not take every book on economics too seriously. After all, it has been said by some people that those who hold the power of issuing credit in the land are really the Government. There is tremendous power in the creation of credit and the control of money, so if a person is an economist employed by a company that relies upon the supply of finance from one of those institutions, that person naturally will be very guarded on the question of monetary reform because he does not want to attack something which is the most powerful element in the land. Although our trading banks have their creation of credit to a large extent controlled by the Commonwealth Bank, we now have a secondary banking institution growing up in the form of finance companies and hire-purchase organizations which are outside the control of the Commonwealth Bank, and they are becoming a tremendous power in the land. They are draining away enormous amounts of funds that could go into sources of production that could be of much more benefit to the country, but we have no control over them, and they are growing apace.

On the question of monetary reform, I did interject when Mr. Hall was speaking of the public debt. The honourable member said in relation to the railway debt, "It is a part of the State's public debt". Earlier he had made statements on the question of the public debt. He feels that it is something quite good and that without it we could not have adequate production in the State. I asked him if he had read a book by Viscount Vickers a former governor of the Bank of England and he asked whether it was a recent book. I think it can be considered recent in the sense of the monetary question. This book was published in 1941. Although it refers to the monetary situation in Great Britain, the problems are virtually the same here, and consequently the conclusions are appropriate to what is taking place in Australia. I purposely selected this book because it was written by someone who is eminently respectable, and I

am sure that the honourable member would like such a book. It was written by Vincent Cartwright Vickers, who was born on January 16, 1879, and educated at Eton and Magdalen College, Oxford. He was a Deputy Lieutenant of the City of London, a director of Vickers Limited for 22 years, one of the biggest armament and steel firms in Great Britain. He was a director of London Insurance, another influential firm in Great Britain, from which he retired in January, 1939. In 1910 he was made a governor of the Bank of England and resigned this appointment in 1919. Later, he became President of the Economic Reform Club and Institute.

I do not propose to give a large number of extracts of what he said, but what I shall give are relevant to the position here. As to the direction of future monetary policy he says:—

The main objectives, however, should include:—State control and State issue of currency and credit through a central organization managed and controlled by the State. . . . Any additional supply of money should be issued as a clear asset to the State; so that money will be spent into existence and not lent into existence.

That is very pertinent. He also said:—

The abolition of the debt system where all credit is created by the banks and hired out at interest to the country.

That meets the objections of honourable members opposite. There is no question regarding his authority in business, banking and insurance circles, where he was a man of great repute, not like an economist looking backwards to see what the boss was doing and tempering his book accordingly. Mr. Quirke made some criticism of honourable members on this side regarding monetary reform. I considered some of his remarks were far too sweeping and his generalizations far too wide. We are not Douglas social creditors on this side, nor do we believe that monetary reform will cure all the world's ills. We do not think there is some easy magic whereby we can solve all our economic problems, but we believe that monetary reform is necessary. There is a crying need for an examination of this problem. Some glaring anomalies exist in the present financial system, anomalies that show that money is no longer the servant of the people. There should be an examination to see what means can be adopted to rectify this position so as to make money the servant of the people so that it shall be controlled by our sovereign Parliament and to make money subservient to the national welfare and not continually to act in a manner

contrary to the national welfare. Many valuable measures could be implemented now by the Commonwealth Bank for public works and for it to compete with hire-purchase companies at the lowest possible interest rates. This could be attempted today and it would solve many of the Treasurer's problems when he comes to sort out his Budget. I have said before in this Chamber that the great problem today is not the distribution of money among the various departments, for the problem lies higher than that. I have instanced a case where the State has to pay interest on its own money which has been returned by the Commonwealth, money which has been collected from State residents in the form of taxation. Would we do that in the domestic circle? Of course not. The thing is preposterous when we look at it from a sane and commonsense point of view, but because it is orthodox, nothing must be said against it.

I shall now pass to another very important subject. In today's *Advertiser* is a report concerning the opening of the basic wage case, and it makes astonishing reading. We learn that there is a move on foot, and it is not the first time we have learnt of it, to reduce the basic wage in the metropolitan area and also in country areas by widening the differential between Sydney and Adelaide and the differential between Adelaide and country towns. I am amazed that this is supported by the State Government. We have the position of honourable members opposite agreeing recently to a motion whereby a committee would be set up to inquire into getting industries established in the country in order to arrive at some measure of decentralization; but here we have the Government supporting a move to reduce wages—first of all to widen the differential between Sydney and Adelaide and then to go a step further and widen the differential between the Adelaide rate and the country rate.

Let us consider a specific case, one with which I am familiar. At Whyalla we have a 5s. a week loading, which took many years to obtain. It was proved that the cost of living in Whyalla was at least 5s. a week more than in Adelaide, assessed on the C series index, which was confined to a limited number of things that people use. That 5s. does not reflect the whole range of commodities involved in the cost of living at Whyalla. This loading was obtained after a long struggle in the court with the Broken Hill Proprietary Company. At Whyalla there has been set up by the Boilermakers Society a prices committee, which

is very concerned at the cost of living. Members of the committee have spent much time interviewing business people and residents on this question, and people do not spend much of their private time without recompense unless there is some real reason behind it. They would sooner be at home enjoying themselves, instead of which they have been tramping the streets interviewing people because they are finding it difficult to make ends meet. This applies particularly to those with large families. Officers of the Prices Department on a recent visit could find very little wrong with prices in the town. That was their opinion. When one considers these two aspects, do they not indicate that if the prices officers are right there must have been some economic pressure on the people of the town to take all the trouble they did to do something about prices? In other words, they are feeling the pinch, yet we have an attempt being made to cut wages further.

Mr. Ralston—Would it mean that the basic wage in Whyalla would drop 17s. a week if the Government were successful?

Mr. LOVEDAY—The idea was to widen the differential from 3s. to 12s. a week. Presumably the men would lose 9s. after the State basic wage had been reduced because of the differential between Sydney and Adelaide. The idea is to reduce that first and then the other would go lower still. At Whyalla water and council rates have been increased, and electricity charges have been advanced, and yet it is suggested that the basic wage of the workers should be further reduced. I should think that the B.H.P. Company would be tickled to death over this proposal. It has gone to much trouble to try to get tradesmen from overseas in view of the establishment of steelworks. I think it was Mr. Shannon who said what a great thing these steelworks would be for the State and he mentioned that the effects would extend throughout the State like the ripples on a pond. I heartily agree with him, provided that we can get the people there. The B.H.P. Company has gone to tremendous lengths to get tradesmen from overseas and promised them houses and jobs immediately on their arrival; but despite that, quite a number of people, after having been there for a very short time, left the town. We have to rely largely on migrants to develop industries in this country. No one will deny that the Australian worker knows quite well the relative conditions that he can enjoy in the city compared with those in the average South Australian country town. He knows very well that there are only a few country towns where he can get any worthwhile

amenities. They could be counted on the fingers of one hand. We have to rely on migrants, most of whom come from big cities in Europe, and the fact is that when they come to our big country towns they find a tremendous change; many of them do not like it, and after a short time they leave and go down to the city. Yet there is a proposition that will make them leave these places even more quickly.

I am not exaggerating this position. In fact, the Broken Hill Proprietary Company is concerned about this tremendous labour turnover. It has even considered a project, costing many thousands of pounds, of putting up an enormous television pole so that the town could be served by television from the one pole. I do not think the company found that scheme practicable, but that illustrates the lengths to which it is prepared to go to try and retain its employees. Let us see what the President of the local Chamber of Commerce recently said at the annual meeting in Whyalla:—

I would like to record the alarming fact that a large proportion of new arrivals do not remain in the town for any length of time. This is most disturbing from a civic point of view, not to mention the industrial or commercial aspect. It is obvious that the turnover of labour is going to remain a problem which could retard development.

One gentleman in an important position in the town asked me recently what could be done to amend the liquor laws of this State in order that the hotels could at least resemble something of the English "pub," with all the social conveniences that go with it in the evening, in order to try and retain the labour. This is what the representative of the South Australian Housing Trust has had to say:—

There was a steady flow of completed houses coming to hand. However, since March 1 more than 30 newcomers to the town, who had been accommodated in trust premises, had vacated the houses and left the town. The same trend was noticeable in other industrial housing areas. In several instances the reason for departure appeared to be over-commitment with hire-purchase. In four cases, families walked out of their houses with all their personal possessions but leaving all the hire-purchase goods to be repossessed.

In face of this sort of thing I find it incredible that the State could be supporting this proposition to reduce wages in the country. I have been listening hard to hear somebody try to justify this utterly ridiculous attitude. We are having enough trouble now to keep people in the country towns without doing things to drive them away, yet we have

proposals to set up other industries in the country. After all, the people have to be there before we can get these industries. We have to attract them and hold them there, and they certainly will not come if they think the conditions are worse than they are in the city. The Treasurer has said that we expect to double our population, that we are making tremendous progress, and that industries are going to come here. If those things are true it means that there will be plenty of openings for labour in the city, and people will go to the city rather than to the country.

Mr. Ralston—There won't be many leaving Sydney.

Mr. LOVEDAY—That is certain. This action of the Government simply does not fit in with all its other protestations, and when Government members talk of protecting the country, whom are they protecting? Most people in the country work for a living; they are not all big landholders. It is amazing that this proposition should ever come forward when the working people in the B.H.P. Company find that, although the company is doing something in the directions I have mentioned to retain its workers, when it comes to really big things it is very difficult to get them done. For example, many things in the town could be done if the money were available, which would help to hold the people. I doubt whether they will be done. The working people there know that there has been a one for two bonus which was worth £100,000,000 on the market, yet the Combined Unions Council in Whyalla has not been able to get satisfaction on a paltry little bonus of about 25s. or 30s. a week. The bonus has not been uniform: some have been getting it and some have not, and promises have not been kept. These are things that are at the root of why the country is not going ahead in the manner it should, and the State Government by its action, in my opinion, is absolutely killing progress in the country towns.

I will mention some local matters in my electorate because this is the only opportunity members get to voice their feelings upon them. School accommodation in the town depends upon getting the population there, but nevertheless I have to assume that we will get more population despite the State Government's action. In Whyalla West, where all the new houses will be situated, it is intended to erect a new infants' school and two additional stone rooms for the primary department, making a total of 29 classrooms. The builders expect to complete these additions early next year, perhaps by the time the school opens

after the Christmas holidays. On present indications at least 800 children will be attending this school early next year, and the number appears certain to rise to 1,000 during the year. The 29 classrooms will be available for these enrolments, provided the work is completed in time for the school's reopening.

The Housing Trust representative estimates that 120 to 130 more houses will be filled by the end of this year, and that there will be 500 more houses built and occupied during 1961 and 1962. That means that by the end of 1962 about 1,120 more families may have moved into Whyalla. I emphasize the word 'may'. Those people will be in Whyalla West, and there will be a probable average enrolment of one child to each family. The 29 classrooms could accommodate this number of children at an average of about 40 for each classroom. It is clear that the next school which is to be built in Hincks Avenue should be available by the end of 1962 to avoid serious over-crowding. I raise this matter now so that attention may be given to it.

Another matter that needs close attention—and all these things, of course, arise because of the expansion of the town—is the widening of the bridge and the roadway to the shipyards. I have received a letter from the Combined Unions Council which draws attention to the necessity for the widening of this roadway and bridge. It states:—

Our members have expressed considerable concern with present traffic conditions, and the fact that both the bridge and the road to the shipyard and blast furnace are too narrow. These conditions are a potential source of danger, and the volume of traffic, prior to and after work has ceased at the blast furnace and shipyard, amply illustrates the fact that this roadway is incapable of carrying present traffic conditions with the normal and desirable margin of safety.

I have witnessed the terrific congestion on this bridge and roadway both before work and at knock-off times. Numerous chain accidents have occurred, and some cars have been forced off the road. At a launching several minor accidents occurred when there was a complete jam. The Town Commission is also concerned about this problem because it constitutes a danger. The bridge and the roadway right down to Parsons' works should be widened to make that strip of roadway safe for traffic.

Attention has also been directed to the need for adequate lighting, both on the bridge and the road. I emphasize that this particular roadway is not under local government control

but under the control of the Highways Department, as it is outside the town boundary. It will be remembered that in the legislation regarding the steelworks indenture all land north of the Whyalla to Iron Knob tramline was placed forever outside local government control. I hope attention will be given to this matter before serious accidents occur on this roadway.

Earlier this session I mentioned houses built under the Country Housing Act. I hope that the Housing Trust will listen to the representations of the Town Commission on this matter, because we have pensioners and other people who are unable to pay an economic rent and who badly need these houses. I notice in the trust's report that 33 other towns have already had houses of this type built. We have a problem at Whyalla as some of these people live in an area which, because it is a business area, is highly rated. The rates on one or two houses occupied by pensioners and others with low incomes are more than £100 a year. It is obviously impossible for these people to pay; some are anxious to move out into places where the rent is within their means, and the Town Commission is taking steps to get suitable land made available for them.

I refer now to extensions to the Whyalla Hospital. I recently asked the Treasurer whether the town was to have a public or a subsidized hospital, and he indicated that Cabinet was still considering the matter and that in the event of the present hospital being declared a subsidized hospital there would be a subsidy of £2 for every £1 to pay for the proposed extensions costing £750,000. The Town Commission has said clearly and emphatically—and I point out that it represents both B.H.P. Company representatives and elected members—that it favours a public hospital being declared. It is utterly impossible for a town such as Whyalla to raise the required amount of £250,000 from the local residents in the event of the hospital being declared a subsidized hospital. Of course, it is a different proposition if the B.H.P. Company is prepared to come forward with £250,000, but nevertheless I am sure that the town as a whole would be much more satisfied to have a public hospital and to know precisely where it stood regarding management and finance. The main question in this, I think, is how finance is to be made available. I do not think anyone would contend that any substantial part of that £250,000 for these initial extensions—there may possibly be even bigger extensions to come later—should be raised from the general public of the town.

Earlier this session I raised the matter of "remote" allowances to teachers in outback places and the Minister of Education said he would have it reinvestigated as a result of the information I supplied and ascertain whether any of the alleged anomalies mentioned by me should be rectified. I pointed out that at Alice Springs the "remote" allowance for a single teacher was £120 a year and for a married man £200, whereas at Coober Pedy, for example, the amount was £39, irrespective of grade. Of the two places there is no doubt where any of us would rather live, and there is a great need for the "remote" allowances to be brought into line. People in outback areas in my electorate live under hard conditions. If my suggestion is carried out it will be long delayed justice indeed. The people concerned deserve the allowances being brought into line.

I was gratified to know that recently the Minister of Works examined the question of native welfare in my electorate. He made a comprehensive trip right up to the north-west corner where there is a native reserve. He took with him Mr. McDougall, an officer from Woomera, whose knowledge of natives is probably unexcelled. He has had a vast experience and can talk a number of native languages. I was pleased to know that the Minister had obtained as much information from him as was possible during the trip. The Minister said he was interested in the matter of cattle-raising in the north-west reserve. I think that would be a splendid proposition, but I hope that in any cattle-raising operations the natives will be given every opportunity not only to carry out the normal work of a cattle station but to act co-operatively as far as possible in the administrative work. Several instances of excellent native co-operation in the Northern Territory and elsewhere have shown that the native can succeed in a co-operative effort. It is only by educating them along these lines that we can get anywhere with native assimilation.

Our aim should be to encourage stability of occupation for adult natives under conditions that prevent as far as possible their exploitation by other people. Somebody said recently that one of the main problems of assimilation of Australian aborigines is the Australian himself, and there is no doubt about that. The problem is not just the difficulty of getting the aborigine to assimilate: it is more a question of his acceptance by Australians. If Australians were to examine themselves on this matter, the process of assimilation would proceed at a much faster pace. If we can encourage stability of occupation of adults the children will have some reasonable oppor-

tunities of education, provided always that there is a school within reasonably easy reach. On this matter I thank the Minister of Education for assuring me that he will favourably consider the erection of classrooms at Coober Pedy next year. That school has had a stabilizing effect on the adult natives. The number of native children attending the school has increased considerably and they are showing great promise in their studies. They are primitive and they have had no education whatever before. Much had to be done to get them to school in a condition where they could be accepted by the few white children there. The native people at Coober Pedy have been living in the most primitive conditions, more primitive than those at Andamooka. This move is proof that given the right approach, and the provision of education for the children, success can be achieved. At Coober Pedy the stability of occupation is there because many natives can get a useful living from opal gouging and fossicking on the surface. I hope everything will be done to encourage this policy in connection with native welfare.

I asked the Minister of Works recently whether anything could be done to improve the water supply at Coober Pedy and he said that investigations had been made regarding a site for a bore at Coober Pedy but there did not appear to be any site in the area which would yield a better quality or quantity of water than the Stuart Range bore. Unfortunately this is far from the opal field and the position is not satisfactory. The Minister also said that the cost of another underground tank, with necessary headworks and piping, would be about £30,000, and that such expenditure could not be justified. There is a tremendous tourist traffic through Coober Pedy at present, besides other traffic. The Ansett-Pioneer people have two buses operating each way each week, averaging 20 passengers a bus. These 80 passengers stay at Coober Pedy overnight during the months the buses are running. This is in addition to other travellers. During some months the shortage of water is a limiting factor, and at times there is only sufficient water for the miners on the field. The water supply there consists of an underground tank which when full carries 500,000 gallons. There is a surface catchment and at present the tank has only 4ft. of water in it. The level of the water has been down to 18in., but it has never gone out absolutely. When the water level gets fairly low members can imagine what it is like.

This is the picture in regard to the tourist trade, but in addition I was told by the pilot who conducts a parcel and mail air service

from Port Augusta to Coober Pedy that he carries several passengers on his run between the two places. On a previous occasion when I dealt with this matter the Treasurer said that the Treasury gets nothing out of the opal fields, so why spend money there? I have a table setting out the value of production of opals in South Australia. It has been taken from a report by the Director of Mines which sets out the years from 1949 when the value was £39,798. There has been a steady increase since then up to £422,000 for 1959. I ask permission to have this table incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

COMMONWEALTH EXPORTS OF OPAL.
Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics.

	£
1954-55	89,456
1955-56	139,116
1956-57	252,557
1957-58	297,852
1958-59	460,110
1959-60	941,919
1959-60 exports to:—	

	£
Ceylon	21,144
Other Commonwealth countries	29,184
West Germany	189,542
Japan	574,810
U.S.A.	99,998
Other countries (12)	27,241

Total 941,919

Mr. LOVEDAY—I should like to make this point clear: no distinction is made between cut and uncut opals in the exports statistics. Hence, the value quoted for exports is not on the same basis as that quoted for production. I turn to the question of Commonwealth exports, and these figures are taken from the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics. In 1954-55 Commonwealth exports of opals were £89,000-odd, but in 1959-60 they had risen to £941,919—nearly £1,000,000. Those exports went to Ceylon, other Commonwealth countries, West Germany, Japan (the biggest buyer, £574,000; over half the total), the United States, and other countries. The interesting thing about that is that South Australia is the great producer of opals. There is virtually no other opal production worth talking about in Australia.

This is the value of production from the various States. I emphasize that the value of production does not differentiate between cut and uncut, so we must compare these closely with the Commonwealth export values because no strict comparison can be made. These figures show that South Australia is the leading

producer. Queensland produces only about £1,000 worth, New South Wales £25,000 worth, and South Australia £189,000 worth. Another factor comes into this. The Mines Department gets its figures from a few buyers willing to give statistics, but there are many other buyers who, it is known, do not give full reports on their dealings. Many opals are secreted and taken out of the country without being reported anywhere. The Commonwealth exports recorded are nearly £1,000,000. We are crying out for exports, saying that we have to build them up. Surely £1,000,000 of exports is worth encouraging? When we think of £1,000,000 worth of exports plus the ever-increasing tourist traffic, perhaps the Minister will be prepared to reconsider the question of £30,000 for water supply to make the water supply safe for Coober Pedy. I ask permission to have this second table incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Comparison of Value of Production from the Various States.

	1956.	1957.	1958.
	£	£	£
Queensland	1,337	1,050	1,450
New South Wales	2,750	1,500	25,000
Victoria	—	—	—
Tasmania	—	—	—
South Australia	120,539	182,399	189,816

(From Australian Mineral Industry Review, 1958, Bureau of Mineral Resources.)

Mr. LOVEDAY—I draw the attention of the Treasurer to one further aspect of this matter. I suggest to him that something might be done about this question of encouraging the cutting and polishing of opals in this State. I point out that over £500,000 worth of opals is going to Japan. They go mainly in the rough state and are polished there and exported again, because obviously the Japanese people are not sufficiently wealthy, generally, to indulge in purchasing great numbers of polished opals. It is a remarkable thing that has come about by usage and habit that the buyers who go to the South Australian opal field come from Sydney and Melbourne. They take the stones back there and they all go through those channels. I cannot see why with the proper encouragement and investigation most of those opals could not be cut and polished in South Australia and exported as a finished article from here. If all the uncut and cut stones are worth £1,000,000—and most of them are uncut and obviously going to Japan—it would be interesting to visualize what the value of the exports would be if most of those stones were cut and polished in South Australia. That is worth investigating and encouraging.

I want to close on this note, that probably the most important thing for the State that

I have spoken about this evening is the question of some better control of finances which are at the moment outside of the State control but where, nevertheless, the Government could exert some influence in Commonwealth circles if it liked to say something along the lines I have referred to this evening. Also, I hope the State Government will withdraw its support of the employers in this basic wage case if it has any real consideration for the welfare of the country towns and the setting up of new industries in the country areas. I support the first line.

First line passed.

THE ESTIMATES.

THE LEGISLATURE.

Legislative Council, £12,150; House of Assembly, £18,268; Parliamentary Library, £8,050; Joint House Committee, £11,919; Electoral Department, £24,391; Government Reporting Department, £43,483; Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, £3,442; Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement, £2,495; Miscellaneous, £47,705—passed.

CHIEF SECRETARY AND MINISTER OF HEALTH.

State Governor's Establishment, £9,418; Chief Secretary's Department, £19,263; Statistical Department, £34,332; Audit Department, £70,802—passed.

Printing and Stationery Department, £313,402.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I understand that the Treasurer has considered the advisability of providing a new site for the establishment of a new printing office. The department is doing a splendid job and I believe the Treasurer recognizes that it is working under extreme difficulties. Does the Government intend to provide a new building for this important department?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—The Government is fully aware that the present building is completely unsatisfactory and uneconomic, and for some time has been trying to secure a three-acre site to enable the department to be housed on one floor. It is not satisfactory to operate heavy plant on upper floors as in the present structure. It is not easy to secure three acres of land close to the heart of the city, and members can appreciate that the Government Printing Office must be close to Parliament House. We have even examined the practicability of constructing a building for this department above the railway lines leading into the Adelaide station, but the Railways Commissioner reported that this would not be satisfactory as it would involve many problems and heavy expenditure. A

large area of land is becoming available for the Government at Islington and we considered siting the department there, but it is too far from Parliament House.

Mr. Shannon—Have you examined the possibility of transferring portion of the department to the Engineering and Water Supply Department's premises at Thebarton?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Under Treasurer is examining that proposal at present. The Government is conscious of the need to adequately accommodate this department and as soon as possible a project will be placed before the Public Works Committee.

Line passed.

Police Department, £2,592,395—passed.

Sheriff and Gaols and Prisons Department, £476,268.

Mr. DUNSTAN—I am interested to know what the Government intends to do about the problem of alcoholism. For years we have had protests at the constant procession of alcoholics into the Adelaide Police Court and other courts. Every day offenders with 60 to several hundred convictions for alcoholism are sent to gaol to dry out, but shortly after release they appear before the court for another offence. It is clear from the views of experts, including Dr. Salter, that many of these people are suffering from a disease and that the only way to cure them is in an institution where they can get proper care and treatment. I appreciate that the Treasurer has assisted the institution at Archway Port where the Rev. Mr. Johnson has done magnificent work on a shoestring budget in the Port Adelaide district. He has a series of old buildings and some volunteer help. He has saved a number of men from the appalling life of degradation to which so many alcoholics have been condemned.

For many years magistrates have protested that the Inebriates Act is completely ineffective because there is no institution to which they may commit alcoholics, many of whom will not take treatment voluntarily in the early stages of the disease. We need an institution to which they can be compulsorily sent for treatment and where they can be confined. On other occasions when I have raised this matter the Treasurer has said, in effect, "We had a try at an alcoholics' institution once before, but it was not successful." Medical knowledge of the treatment of this disease is far more advanced now than it was in the days when that institution operated. Can the Treasurer say whether the Government has yet come to any conclusion about this matter?

It is seven years since I first asked the question and I hope I get a more satisfactory answer now than I did then.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—This problem has been considered in almost every country, but so far as I know a satisfactory solution has not been obtained. Probably no country has spent more time and money on it than the United States, but alcoholism there is still assuming more devastating proportions annually, and their attempts have not been successful. It is not an easy problem. The honourable member has mentioned that the Government did subsidize an establishment at Port Adelaide which has been trying to do useful work in this connection. Many years ago the Government established Kuitpo Colony as a centre to which people could be released from gaol on probation and where they could get the best attention. I cannot deny saying that the Government could not commit itself to the establishment of a completely new institution in connection with this matter. The present laws of the land would have to be drastically revised to enable us to commit a normal drunk offender for an extended term in a particular institution. I do not speak with any assurance on this, but I believe that most of these cases are not committed to any institution at all. The Government is concerned and is investigating the problem, hoping to arrive at a satisfactory solution. I have no doubt that a solution will be found but it has not yet been found, as far as I know, in any other State or in any other country. There was a Government institution in this State but it was not a success and it was closed, later to be opened as a prison.

Mr. DUNSTAN—We have at the moment on the Statute Book the Inebriates Act, under which it is lawful for a judge or a special magistrate to commit to an institution declared under the Act and people may be kept in such an institution for an extensive period if necessary. There are all the powers on the Statute Book at the moment for this to be done and the Act was last amended in 1934. Magistrates from time to time have complained that with repeated offenders—not just the casual drunk, but the man who is coming up time and time again—an institution of this kind could do something, but the only thing the magistrate can do is to send them to the Adelaide gaol.

Mr. Shannon—What would be the special features in an institution?

Mr. DUNSTAN—It would be a home something of the kind that Mr. Johnson has at the

Archway Port at the moment, or a series of homes. I do not know whether the honourable member has seen the institution at Archway Port, but there is a home for the people who come in at the initial stage. They work together and do their own food-getting and co-operate in certain activities in that place. They are supervised from the soak stage to where they are interested in doing something. They are taken to the stage where they have some self-control and this can be induced when they have been supervised for a period. Then they are moved to another home a few streets away where they are able to get a job in the area and, again, there is a small group co-operating with one another to cope with their problem and they are overseen by a resident voluntary officer.

In some cases there is a certain amount of backsliding but there has been considerable success in this institution at Archway Port and many men have been put back on the right path and often successfully rehabilitated. The difficulty with many of the cases that come before the court is that they will not voluntarily go into an institution of this kind. The need is to have some institution where at the outset there is a certain compulsion about confinement until they can get away from the initial soak stage. Many officers of the Government and of the voluntary organizations working on alcoholism have recommended an institution of this kind. If the Government were to indicate its willingness to subsidize voluntary organizations in an institution of this kind and to declare such an institution under the Inebriates Act, church organizations in South Australia would be prepared to enter the field and raise money towards an institution. That would involve the Government in making a declaration, but obviously we must have some sort of subsidy. I agree with the Premier that to declare such an institution is not the whole answer to alcoholism. No-one would suggest that, but I suggest it will make a considerable difference to many people in South Australia and I ask honourable members who have not come directly in contact with this problem to go to the Adelaide Police Court any morning and see the pitiful procession of drunks. Among them are men with long lists of convictions, many running into hundreds, and all that can be done for them at the moment, so far as we are able to discover, as there is no institution under the Act, is to send them to the Adelaide Gaol for 14 days or a month and then they are back in no time.

Urgent consideration should be given to this matter. If the Treasurer does not feel the

Government can at this stage undertake an entirely new institution—I believe the old one was at Colebrook, which is now under the control of the Minister of Lands and leased to the United Aborigines Mission—I urgently ask the Government to consider offering a subsidy to any church or voluntary organization willing to undertake such an institution and to declare it under the Act. We can then start dealing with some of these people.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—What the honourable member has said would be attractive in a general way except for his wrong statement. I have watched the work done at Port Adelaide and we now provide a subsidy for it. We have watched the Kuitpo work over the last 30 years and it has received subsidies from the State in connection with this work, and it receives a subsidy today. The member is correct when he says if the institution gets somebody who is interested in helping himself it is well on the way to doing something for him, but the real hard cases do not have any responsibility at all and they require detention because they are not willing to make an effort themselves. The voluntary organization cannot undertake detention. The honourable member can see that the case he wants the Government to consider is the case where detention would be involved and where the institution at present being subsidized cannot with all its good work and good intentions solve the problem. Many years ago we had an institution of this kind and it was kept going for a considerable period but it was not successful. I do not know whether or not there has been an improvement in methods. We have established a prison farm on the Upper Murray and it may be possible to have there an adjunct to deal with this problem. That may be a solution. I think this matter involves detention over a considerable period, and the periods provided when we had the previous home were not long enough to bring about reform. I assure the honourable member that the Government is sincerely interested in this problem and has already made some move, but the problem is not easy to solve.

Line passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADMINISTRATION AND PROBATE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.44 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, October 6, at 2 p.m.