

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, September 6, 1961.

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: DIESEL-ELECTRIC LOCOMOTIVES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Mr. Speaker, a report in this morning's *Advertiser* is headed "South Australia Rejects Rail Offer" and I desire to make a personal statement on this matter.

The SPEAKER: A personal explanation?

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Yes, Sir.

Leave granted.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Yesterday I directed a question to the Premier concerning the acceptance of finance for diesel-electric locomotives as proposed by the Commonwealth Government. His reply indicated that this important matter had become a political football. He did not inform the House of his secret meeting with Commonwealth Parliamentary members of the Liberal and Country League over this issue before submitting his statement to this Parliament, and it appears to me and the members of my Party that he has become, either consciously or unconsciously, a party to formulating a face-saving policy on this issue. The Parliamentary Labor Party is vitally concerned—

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER: Order! I asked the honourable member whether this was a personal explanation. The honourable member can appeal to the House to make a personal explanation.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I have almost concluded my remarks. If I am permitted to continue—

The SPEAKER: It is not a personal explanation.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: It is a statement, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition can make a personal explanation with the leave of the House. Leave was granted, but I think his statement is something beyond a personal explanation.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I asked leave to make a statement, which I have prepared, concerning a question I asked—

The SPEAKER: Standing Orders provide for a member to make a personal explanation. A Minister can, with the leave of the House, make a Ministerial statement.

Mr. Jennings: Make it a Ministerial statement.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I was granted certain leave, Mr. Speaker, but objection has been taken. I ask you to reconsider the matter. The remainder of my statement does not implicate the Government in any way. If I can conclude my statement it will at least safeguard me.

The SPEAKER: I asked the honourable member whether he sought leave to make a personal explanation. Firstly, he said he sought leave to make a statement. Standing Orders enable him to make a personal explanation with the leave of the House, and I put the question that the honourable member have leave to make a personal explanation and that leave was granted. I rule that his words go beyond what is a personal explanation.

QUESTIONS.**STRATHALBYN WATER SUPPLY.**

Mr. JENKINS: Having regard to the light rains that have fallen during the winter and the lack of an adequate flow of water into our reservoirs this year, can the Minister of Works say whether he has in mind pumping from the bores in the Macclesfield area to supplement the reservoir supply at Strathalbyn?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The bores that were sunk, I think last year or the year before, in that area were for the purpose of meeting an emergency should one arise. From time to time various schemes have been in operation in that area. With the co-operation of private owners we have obtained water and, speaking from memory, we sank three bores that could be used at any time should the need arise. I have not had occasion to discuss the matter with the Engineer-in-Chief recently, but the honourable member can be assured that as soon as it is necessary to draw on the bores we shall do so in order to safeguard the town supply at Strathalbyn.

TAXATION ALLOWANCES.

Mr. McKEE: The following is an extract from a letter I have received from the secretary of the Port Pirie District Committee of the Australian Labor Party (South Australian Branch):

It has been brought to the attention of my committee that a person resident outside the limits of Adelaide and suburbs is at a serious financial disadvantage, compared to his metropolitan counterpart, in the matter of seeking medical assistance from an Adelaide medical specialist when referred to same by a "local"

practitioner. The non-Adelaide resident incurs travelling expenses and, in the case of treatment necessitating his attendance for more than one day, accommodation expenses and loss of earnings. In comparison a metropolitan resident is obviously more fortunate. My committee feels that the expenses of a non-Adelaide resident in such cases should be an allowable deduction from earnings as "medical expenses" for taxation purposes. My committee also feels that the expenses incurred by a taxpayer for the employment of a housekeeper, during a period in which his spouse is confined to bed for medical reasons, should be an allowable deduction from earnings as "medical expenses" for taxation purposes.

I realize that both these matters come within the province of the Commonwealth Government, but can the South Australian Government assist the non-Adelaide resident referred to an Adelaide medical specialist by granting some form of travel concession, and will the Premier take up with the Commonwealth Government the matter of these expenses being allowable deductions from earnings as "medical expenses" for taxation purposes?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Off-hand, I could not give an assurance that the Government could agree to the honourable member's first question. I do not know how much is involved in it and what are the implications. Obviously there would be a considerable amount of administration. However, I will have the matter examined. Regarding the second question, I shall certainly forward the request on to the Commonwealth Treasurer to see if it can be acceded to.

HILLS ROAD HAZARD.

Mr. SHANNON: Last week I asked the Minister of Works to ascertain if there were any powers under the Highways Act to deal with a problem created by people selling fruit in parking bays in the hills. Last Sunday I went along the South Road and discovered that conditions there were perhaps even worse than in my area. Has the Minister ascertained from the Minister of Roads whether the Commissioner of Highways has power to deal with this problem and, if he has not, what is the appropriate method to deal with it?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have received a report from the Minister of Roads, who advises that the recent increase of itinerant fruit and mushroom salesmen on main highways leading out of the city has already occasioned his department some concern. Whilst it might be possible to take action under section 58 of the Police Offences Act or by regulation under the Road Traffic Bill, he states that the power to control the sale of goods on roads or road

reserves within a municipality already exists under by-laws promulgated by them. On Mount Barker Road below Eagle-on-the-Hill, such sales can be controlled by both the Burnside and Mitcham Corporations. Outside the metropolitan area the power is vested in the District Council of Stirling, which can apply a regulation covering any township within its district, but he is uncertain at the moment what areas of Stirling have been proclaimed as townships. He will advise the honourable member later. Regarding the main South Road, where the greatest hazard is being created, steps are already being taken to request the councils concerned to bring the problem under control.

COUNTRY DIESEL RAILCARS.

Mr. RICHES: Has the Minister of Works obtained the report he promised to obtain from the Minister of Railways during the debate on the Loan Estimates regarding the provision of additional diesel railcars on country passenger services?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Minister of Railways reports that he has been informed by the Railways Commissioner that it is not intended at present to provide additional diesel railcars for country passenger services.

FRANCES TRUCKING YARDS.

Mr. HARDING: My question relates to the railway trucking yards at Frances, about which many complaints have been made. Will the Minister of Works ascertain from the Minister of Railways whether any improvements have been made to those yards to facilitate the loading of sheep, lambs, and cattle into railway trucks?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will ask my colleague, the Minister of Railways, for a report.

BIRKENHEAD BRIDGE.

Mr. TAPPING: In 1958 the then Commissioner of Highways (Mr. Richmond) suggested that, because of progress on LeFevre Peninsula, it would be necessary to duplicate the Birkenhead bridge. In view of the progress made on the peninsula, particularly in the last five or six years, will the Chairman of the Public Works Committee say whether his committee has considered the possibility of duplicating the bridge?

Mr. SHANNON (Chairman, Public Works Standing Committee): Duplication of the Birkenhead bridge has not been referred to the Public Works Standing Committee as a project. I do not know whether or not the

committee is to get such a project before it, but it has recommended some relief for traffic for LeFevre Peninsula, and it understands that the Government is proceeding with its recommendation for a low level crossing of the Port River near Ethelton.

HACKNEY BRIDGE.

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Roads in another place, a reply to the question I asked recently about the removal of the existing traffic hazard on the Hackney bridge where it crosses the River Torrens?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, informs me that the Highways Department rebuilt Hackney bridge some years ago, and has since assumed responsibility for its maintenance. A survey of the bridge and approaches has recently been completed, and an investigation into its widening and/or realignment will shortly be commenced.

WATER MAIN IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. HUGHES: Last week, when speaking on the Loan Estimates, I sought information from the Minister of Works about the provision of £10,000 for a water main in the hundreds of Hall and Wallaroo. Has the Minister any further information to give?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: When the honourable member asked his question I told him I believed that the amount of £10,000 would cover the work he had in mind and I am now able to advise him officially that the provision covers the following work: (a) The replacement and enlargement of the old 2in. main in the hundred of Hall; and (b) the replacement and enlargement of approximately two miles of the feeding main between Paskeville and Moonta in the hundred of Wallaroo. Both of these works are being carried out to give improved supplies in the areas fed by these two mains.

SOUTH-EAST SLEEPER ACCOMMODATION.

Mr. RALSTON: Has the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Railways, a reply to the question I asked on August 23 regarding South-East sleeper accommodation?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have received the following report from my colleague, the Minister of Railways:

The Railways Commissioner advises that his department has two sleeping cars available for the night trains between Adelaide and Mount Gambier. The two sleeping cars are attached to the train leaving Adelaide each Sunday

night. If not required, one of these cars is retained at Mount Gambier until the return movement leaving that station on Friday night. It is only on rare occasions that the single sleeping car on the intermediate movements is fully booked. It is presumed that the honourable member's complaint concerns the train leaving Adelaide on Thursday, August 17. On that occasion, after one sleeping car had been fully booked, three passengers applied for sleeping berths—one on Wednesday, August 16, and the others on Thursday, August 17. To provide a sleeping car for these three passengers, it would have been necessary to haul an empty sleeping car and conductor from Adelaide to Mount Gambier. It was considered that to do this would be extremely uneconomical. It is understood that the three passengers concerned all travelled in the first class sitting-up car.

The honourable member also asked a question about an accident at Mount Gambier recently, and I can inform him that that matter is still under investigation by the Railways Department and a report is not yet available.

GLOSSOP HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. KING: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked on August 31 regarding additions to the Glossop high school?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: Provision has been made in this year's Loan Estimates for a woodwork shop to be erected at the Glossop high school, but it is not possible to say when this work will be put in hand. Sketch plans are also being prepared for future additional solid construction accommodation at this school.

RECLASSIFICATION OF HIGH SCHOOLS.

Mr. BYWATERS: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked yesterday about the reclassification of high schools?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: The Education Regulations were amended early in July to provide for a reclassification of high schools. The reclassification, which will come into effect on January 1, 1962, is based on enrolments. The results of it will be as follows:

- (a) Two class I schools will become special class I making a total of 9 (in lieu of 7).
- (b) Six class II schools will become class I, making a total of 12 (in lieu of 8).
- (c) One class III school will become class II, making a total of 16 (in lieu of 21).
- (d) All other high schools will remain class III (making a total of 17).

At present it is not certain which actual schools will be reclassified. Murray Bridge is at present a class II school. It is anticipated, although not necessarily certain, that Murray Bridge will remain a class II school in 1962. Its 1962 enrolment is expected to be less than that of any other class I school in that year. However, it is possible that Murray Bridge will be a class I school in 1963 or thereafter.

HAWKER WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. CASEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question in reference to a survey made for a site at Hawker for a 2,000,000-gallon storage tank?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have received from the Engineer-in-Chief a long report, not merely on the question of the site for the tank, but on the whole question of a water supply for the township of Hawker. The District Engineer (Mr. Steele) in a report to the Engineer for Water Supply raises various possibilities in regard to an improved supply, but as yet it has not been possible to examine it to see which would be the best of the alternatives he suggests, or any combination of them. So, I am unable to give a firm undertaking on what may be done until the matter can be further examined. If the honourable member cares to see me during the afternoon, I can discuss the report with him. In summarizing the report of the District Engineer, the Engineer for Water Supply (Mr. Campbell) says:

The District Engineer has given a good deal of thought to improving the Hawker water supply and he has now submitted the enclosed comprehensive report in which he feels that possibly the best and most economical method of improving the supply would be the construction of a 1,000,000-gallon tank in conjunction with rehabilitation of the old reservoir with provision of a pumping plant to pump water from this old reservoir to the new reservoir, which is at a higher elevation.

That is the gist of the report from the District Engineer. The matter, as I have said, has not been fully examined and until it is examined I cannot say what will be done eventually, but the matter is under active consideration.

UNLEY X-RAYS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question concerning chest X-rays in the Unley Corporation area?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Director-General of Public Health reports:

Chest X-ray surveys, which have proved so valuable in the fight against tuberculosis, must go on throughout the year. The public and

the staff need toilet accommodation and shelter and the equipment needs shelter and security. These needs were all previously supplied by setting up the units in public halls. Much time was taken in dismantling, reassembling and testing units, and sums of up to £40 per week had to be paid for the hire of suitable halls for a single unit. For these reasons all X-ray survey units have now been mounted in caravans. These provide excellent conditions for the examination, but little space for shelter for those awaiting their turn. The caravans are therefore always situated as close as possible to a building with toilet accommodation for both sexes and shelter from the elements. Sometimes this is a hall, sometimes a school or institute, and sometimes a petrol service station. With the valuable equipment securely housed in its caravan, halls are needed only during sessions, and not round the clock as previously. A special check will be made to see that the type of shelter available is appropriate to the weather likely to be encountered. It has been shown many times that elderly persons have unwittingly spread tuberculosis, especially to children. For this reason, all persons, irrespective of age, are required to attend. It is realized that there are infirm people of all ages who cannot attend, and when such cases are brought to the attention of the department, either special arrangements are made or the requirement to be examined is waived.

ROAD REHABILITATION.

Mr. CUMBE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about road rehabilitation, particularly regarding reinstatement work following excavations for the lining of pipes on the Irish Harp Road at Prospect where a traffic hazard has existed?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The work involving the cement lining of the old 24in. water main in Irish Harp, Rakes, and Muller Roads has been completed and the holes made in the roadway have been refilled to road surface and the pavement restored with stone and rubble. The Engineer for Water Supply reports that the Highways Department has completed the reinstatement of the excavations in Rakes and Muller Roads. The work in the Irish Harp Road section will be carried out by the Prospect Corporation, whose town clerk has advised that the excavations have been made safe and that reinstatement of the bitumen seal will be made soon.

TATIARA FLOODWATERS.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Some time ago at a meeting of the Tatiara Floodwaters Committee, a resolution was passed requesting that an investigation be made into the disposal of surplus waters in Tatiara Creek and Nalang Creek (which comes under the Tatiara Drainage

Trust) and also surplus waters around Keith which at present cause considerable problems to the people in those areas during winter. I believe the Minister of Works has some information on this matter.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As the honourable member appreciates, and as the scope of his question indicates, this question could become a very large one and involve much work. The matter was held up for some time because we did not have available the contour details of the area involved, but those maps have now come to hand and been examined. The matter has been referred to the chairman of the South-Eastern Drainage Board who, in turn, has recommended that certain funds be provided for a further detailed investigation. Cabinet has approved the provision of funds for that purpose, and the matter will go forward from that point.

SCHOOL WATER-COOLING SYSTEMS.

Mr. McKEE: My question relates to a request for the installation of water-cooling systems for schools throughout the State, and particularly the northern parts where the summer months become extremely hot. It is generally recognized throughout industry (and the principle is incorporated in most industrial agreements) that water-cooling facilities should be made available to employees. Children feel the heat as adults do and would appreciate a drink of cool water when coming in from the playing fields. I have also been approached by several parents about this. Will the Minister of Education consider this request?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: I have considered this request many times. Until recent years it was the policy of the department not to provide or subsidize water-cooling systems, but I think that Cabinet about three years ago decided that they would be subsidized in schools in areas approved by the Minister. I have approved the granting of subsidies to many schools in the hotter areas of the State, but no system has been provided wholly by the department.

DRIED FIG INDUSTRY.

Mr. KING: My question relates to the dried fig industry, which is peculiarly a South Australian industry. Since the removal of import licences, the Australian market has been flooded by imports of Turkish figs that can be sold at half the price of the Australian product, which is produced under Australian award conditions. Of the 60-odd growers 15 are returned soldiers from the First World War and nine are soldier

settlers returned from the Second World War, while the others are mainly people who have acquired blocks from returned soldiers. The Australian figs are practically unsaleable, and we have two years' stocks on hand with no hope of their being sold while Turkish figs can be imported at these prices. It affects our State finances because some growers will have great difficulty in meeting their commitments not only in water rates and other Government dues but also their war service land settlement commitments. Will the Premier take up this matter with the Commonwealth Government, as it is a peculiarly South Australian matter, to see what can be done to alleviate the distress that must follow the decision of the Commonwealth Government to adopt a recommendation of the Tariff Board that no further duty be imposed.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes; I shall be pleased to do that, and support the representations. However, I ask the industry to prepare for me information that will enable me to make effective representations. At present, the board has made certain assertions, and some information upon those assertions would be useful because it would enable the matter to be reviewed in the light of the objections of the industry.

ARSENICAL WEED KILLER.

Mr. STOTT: My question relates to the administration of the Food and Drugs Act by the Chief Secretary. I understand that recently some regulations have been proposed to be put into force concerning the prohibition of the selling of arsenical weed killer. The effect of that would be, as I understand it, that a permit would be needed from the appropriate Minister or department, and it would be issued only to those requiring arsenical weed killer in trade, which would mean a complete prohibition on many thousands of people who desired to spray soursobs and other weeds in their suburban gardens. Also, from personal experience, I know that people who take an interest in that part of the street immediately in front of their houses can get that type of weed killer from the councils to keep the streets in order. I realize that children may interfere with this weed killer. Can the Premier intimate whether my information is correct, and when it is proposed to enforce these regulations? Will the Government consider imposing some other form of control that might not be so rigid, as, for example, giving a permit to a shop to sell it rather than prohibiting its sale?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Government has been most concerned at the number of serious accidents, particularly to children, from arsenical weed killers, which are so deadly and the effects of which persist in their containers after use. The Government believes they should be strictly controlled and their use restricted to those persons who are thoroughly conversant with their danger. What is important, and will probably solve the honourable member's problem, is that many alternative weed killers are harmless to humans. Under the circumstances the Government believed it necessary to tighten up the regulations. I will get the precise information the honourable member wants. I believe the regulations come into force immediately, if they are not already in force.

PENSIONER COTTAGES.

Mr. LAUCKE: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked last week on the basis for allocating pensioners' cottages built in country areas under the provisions of the Country Housing Act?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes. When allotting houses built with grants provided under the Country Housing Act, the Housing Trust has regard to the following matters. Houses are allotted only to persons of limited means. These include age pensioner couples, invalid pensioners with families, incapacitated ex-servicemen and their families, widows or deserted wives and their families, and others of a similar kind. Consideration is given to whether the applicants live or have lived in the town where the houses are built, whilst the period of their residence there is a factor. The present living conditions of an applicant together with any resultant hardship are considered.

Finally, the desirability of the applicant as a tenant is taken into account. When a widow or deserted wife or other family with children is allotted one of these houses it sometimes occurs that the house is too small to accommodate all the children. In such a case the trust provides a portable sleep-out which can accommodate two children of the appropriate age and sex. When the sleep-out becomes unnecessary at the particular house it can be used elsewhere. So far about 160 houses have been built in 36 country towns.

MOTOR REGISTRATIONS.

Mr. HARDING: Today's radio news reported a marked recovery in motor vehicle registrations in Victoria for August: they

were 20 per cent higher than during July. I believe there has been a marked increase in registrations in South Australia in August, but will the Minister of Works ascertain whether that is so and how the position compares with July?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Registrar of Motor Vehicles, from whom this information can be obtained, is actually under the control of the Treasurer, but I will endeavour to get the information for the honourable member.

SALISBURY BY-LAW: ZONING.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Millhouse:

That by-law No. 40 of the District Council of Salisbury in respect of zoning, made on July 13, 1959, and the amendment of by-law No. 40 of the District Council of Salisbury in respect of zoning, made on December 15, 1959, and both laid on the table of this House on June 20, 1961, be disallowed.

(Continued from August 30. Page 645.)

Mr. CLARK (Gawler): I oppose the disallowance of this by-law. I am reluctant to do so because, as members know, I had a long experience as a member of the Subordinate Legislation Committee and know that that committee does not normally act without due deliberation. That is not intended as an obvious compliment, because I know that from my own experience. However, on this occasion I suggest that its deliberations, no matter how well meant, have brought the wrong decision. To amplify my remarks I shall outline briefly the history of this by-law. To do so I must first read portion of a letter that I received from the District Clerk of the Salisbury District Council dated January 25, 1961. It reads:

The council has been most concerned regarding the prolonged delay of certain very important amendments to the council's zoning by-law No. 40. I was directed to approach you respectfully requesting that you inquire on the council's behalf as to whether consideration of these by-law amendments could be expedited. The amendments were forwarded to the Highways and Local Government Department by the council's solicitor on January 13, 1960, and several recent inquiries to that department indicated that as yet the by-law amendments had not been returned from the Crown Solicitor.

The council in this district is expending considerable finance, time and effort to administer, to the best of its ability, reasonable zoning provisions. The only authority for these is the by-laws made under the Building Act, and at least a number of the amendments referred to above are vital to the future administration. Because of the rapid change of status of the area and the use of the land it has become necessary to amend the by-law,

and certain of the amendments proposed are considered imperative. Please find a copy enclosed of the amendments referred to.

Following the receipt of this letter I made inquiries and found that the amended by-law had not, at that time, been received from the Crown Solicitor's office. Eventually it was laid on the table of this House on June 20, 1961. According to the Notice Paper the by-law was made on July 13, 1959. The council forwarded it to the Highways and Local Government Department on January 13, 1960, and it was tabled on June 20, 1961, which means that it has taken from December 15, 1959 (when the amendment was made by the council) to June 20, 1961, to reach this Chamber—a delay of over 18 months. Last week I asked the Minister representing the Attorney-General for the reason for the long delay in the Crown Solicitor's Department. I was pleased to hear the Treasurer say yesterday in his Budget speech that the department is to have additional personnel. At times long delays occur in it. The Salisbury District Council is awaiting the ratification of by-laws urgently needed in its area.

After the council has waited some time we now have a motion for the disallowance of by-law No. 40 on zoning, merely because two or three of its provisions are considered unsatisfactory. If Parliament disallows the by-law all its provisions will go by the board. I assure members that the by-laws I have mentioned are urgently required. This is a rapidly growing area and during the last few years a complete change has occurred. There has been much subdivision—in my humble opinion, too much. Many houses have been built and there has been a complete change from agricultural land to land for housing and manufacturing purposes. This has brought about many difficulties, and zoning by-laws are considered by the council, and by me, to be essential for orderly development in the area. When the chairman of the Subordinate Legislation Committee (Mr. Millhouse) moved for the disallowance of by-law No. 40 he claimed that the disallowance should be granted mainly for the following four reasons:

- (1) Too much land has been set aside as an industrial area.
- (2) That the wrong land has been set aside.
- (3) That some of the land in question is subject to height restrictions because it is in close proximity to the Parafield aerodrome, and that the limitation would render the land unfit for industrial purposes.
- (4) That the minimum area of 950 square feet was too large for an area like Elizabeth.

I will deal with the fourth reason first, because it is of minor importance in the matter of the disallowance of the by-law. In fact, I am surprised that the committee bothered about it. I think it was said in evidence to the committee by the council that the Housing Trust would not be bound by the by-law. It made a rule that houses built by private builders should be at least 9½ squares in size. In the Elizabeth area the trust has wisely left some blocks of land vacant to give people the opportunity to build houses to their own requirements. That is an excellent idea because, although the trust has made every effort to vary the appearance and type of house, there is a sameness when all houses are built by trust contractors. As I pointed out, it was said that houses should not be less than 950 square feet in size. That cannot be considered too large. In the metropolitan area some councils fix a minimum of 10 squares. To suggest, as Mr. Millhouse did, no doubt acting on evidence submitted to the committee, that the Salisbury District Council did not know that the Housing Trust was building houses of a smaller size, is absurd. Although I am not certain, I believe that most of the councillors in that council live in trust homes, either renting them or purchasing them, and they are aware of the size. The council said that such figures from the Housing Trust had not been given to the council, and Mr. Millhouse based his remarks on that. That is different from saying that the council was not aware that the trust built houses of less than 950 square feet. Every councillor appreciates the position.

One council witness told the committee that the council was proud of the standard of buildings at Elizabeth, that it wanted to make certain that houses built privately were up to standard, and that it considered that some of the trust homes were rather small. It was said that it was rather awkward at times to pack furniture into some of them without overcrowding. The council said that it could not control the trust and that it aimed, as the local government authority, to control other buildings in the area. The councillors would certainly know that many of the trust houses were below that size. One cannot live in a trust house for long before realizing its size. The council must have a good knowledge of the position in its area. I do not know whether the committee inspected the area before coming to its decision. I doubt whether it did, because if it had (and I had the opportunity to inspect it recently during the annual council inspection, when the chairman, the district clerk

and most councillors were present) it would have realized that it takes all day to tour the area and consider the problems, which are not all related to zoning.

Many complex problems present themselves. If the committee had inspected the area I do not think it would have been so anxious to disallow the by-law. To be honest, I doubt whether it is anxious to disallow the by-law in any case. The Salisbury District Council is active, thoughtful and progressive, and all the councillors are regarded that way. If proof were needed that the council personnel is regarded highly, it was given recently at a conference held at Freeling by the Mid-North Local Government Association. Because of another engagement I could not attend, but I believe many of my Parliamentary colleagues were there. At that conference the former chairman (Mr. Harry Bowey) was elected president and the district clerk (Mr. Jack Bormann) was elected secretary. Members need not accept just my word that these men are good officers; that is apparently recognized by many other councils.

It is claimed by the mover of this motion that the area set aside for industrial purposes is too large. Surely in a rapidly developing area like this it is better to have a satisfactory margin of safety than too little. Obviously, this could be adjusted later, and the council could avoid some troubles already experienced by metropolitan councils regarding zoning. When I was a member of the Subordinate Legislation Committee it had to deal with a large and comprehensive zoning by-law of the West Torrens corporation, and I am sure the chairman of the committee would agree that that council, because it had not adopted a firm policy in the past, found that it was in a position from which it was almost impossible to get out. The Salisbury council is endeavouring to avoid making such a mistake by having a simple and careful plan, supported by the Town Planner, which will be upset if this motion is carried. Recently, the local district clerk (Mr. Jack Bormann) wrote me a letter about this by-law which answers to my satisfaction (and I hope to the satisfaction of members) the recommendations of the Subordinate Legislation Committee. He wrote:

At the present time, the District Council of Salisbury has before Parliament for its consideration amendments to its zoning by-law. Please find enclosed a copy of the amendments. The portions objected to, on which the chairman of the council (Councillor S. L. Gilchrist), the town planning officer (Mr. Milton) and myself gave evidence, were sections 3015, 3016,

3017, and 3018, hundred of Yatala, shown on the enclosed drawing, and the increase in the minimum size of dwellings which could be erected in Elizabeth to 950 sq. ft. from the standard which has been set for most of the rest of the district of 850 sq. ft. minimum. Adjoining the area proposed for inclusion among others in the second schedule in which buildings for manufacturing purposes are allowed to be built, there is an area which is in the existing by-law a manufacturing area. This area seems to be extremely well sited for the purpose of manufacturing, being adjacent to the Main North Road and Bridge Road, which is the next road east of the Main North Road, and astride the position of the Yorke Peninsula, Parafield, Clearview ring-route. The area is also close to residential areas at present developing, such as Para Hills, Pooraka and Para Vista, and is not very far from the Brahma Lodge subdivision near Salisbury.

Industrial concerns already evidently consider the site suitable for certain manufacturing purposes, as in the existing area two separate firms each concerned with the construction of reinforced concrete pipes have taken up land there and have commenced buildings: a fertilizer firm and a concrete and brick manufacturing company on the Main North Road have been there for some time. Officers of the Town Planner's Department advised the council on a number of occasions to try and ensure that this land was retained for manufacturing purposes.

I stress this, because I believe it is good that a council should take advantage of the knowledge of the Town Planner. The letter continues:

An objection has been raised by the owner and the South Australian Housing Trust, who as far as is known has no interest in the land at present, one of their objections being that the height restrictions from the Parafield aerodrome would make the area unsuitable. However, an examination of the Department of Civil Aviation's plans for height restrictions—I have checked the height restriction of the Civil Aviation Department.

—adjoining the Parafield aerodrome make it evident that buildings from 60 to 100ft. in height could be erected over the majority of the area—

That, in my opinion, is a reasonable height for a factory.

—and a very small proportion of the area was limited to buildings less than 20ft. in height, and the land referred to would not exceed one-twentieth of the whole. The remainder of the area is a transient area where buildings between 20ft. and 100ft. may be erected. It therefore seems unlikely that limitations would be exercised upon the majority of affected buildings. The area immediately north of Parafield aerodrome and comprising of sections 2223, 2224, 2210, 2199, part 2198 and 512 are also included in the amendments proposed in the council's by-law. However, as an objection has been made by the South

Australian Housing Trust that land they own, being the sections mentioned above, was proposed for industrial use, on consideration the council agreed to take the necessary action at the appropriate time to zone the proposed industrial area north of the aerodrome for residential purpose.

I have a feeling (although, frankly, it is only an assumption) that the council would at the appropriate time have been prepared to do the same for the land owned by the Leigh Trust or the Church of England. In any case, in a rapidly developing area such as this, who can say that the time may not come sooner than some expect when land zoned for industrial purposes may well be worth as much as residential land, or possibly even more?

The steps taken by the council were taken on the advice of the Town Planner, yet we are asked to disregard this advice. The Town Planner should have a good idea about these things; I should have thought his advice would be wise, and I do not think the council would have been prepared to follow his advice unless fully in accord with it. The council should know the situation in the area; I think it does. In this by-law it has aimed to protect the zoning of this area from the consequences of the extremely rapid and largely uncontrolled development that is occurring. The by-law resulted from much investigation by the council over two years, and the council is concerned that there should be no loss of essential industrial areas. I am happy to see the growth of industry in the area, although in the early days I had grave doubts that there would be so much of this development. The council realizes this and is concerned that it should not lose land which, it claims, will be the best in the area for essential industrial purposes. In spite of this the committee had evidence from Mr. Cartledge (Chairman of the Housing Trust) in which he had the temerity to suggest, when referring to the council, that "they ought to take it away, rub it out and start again." Those remarks were unjustified and almost offensive. They were made regarding a council that takes its duties seriously and that has been elected by the ratepayers.

If these by-laws are totally disallowed all the work and thought of the council, which acted on the advice and at the suggestion of the Town Planner, will have been completely wasted. I believe, in all fairness to the Subordinate Legislation Committee, that, under the present conditions, if the committee after due consideration decided, as it obviously did in this case, that some part of the by-laws should be disallowed, it could not but move for the

disallowance of the whole. No doubt serious damage will be done to the whole structure of zoning in this area if any further lengthy delay occurs before the question is reviewed by Parliament and that could happen because it has already taken a long time to reach members. The council could wait another two years.

I believe as other members of this House and some people in South Australia believe, that it would be patently unjust if the whole structure of the zoning provisions were to fall merely because one part of a by-law was not acceptable. That would apply even if only one minor provision in a long list of provisions was unacceptable. I do not quarrel with the committee for its actions because it is only right that Parliament, having delegated to councils the right to make by-laws, should have the final say after the by-laws have been studied by the committee and laid on the table of the House for acceptance or disallowance. No council is infallible: all councils make mistakes, but Parliament can make mistakes and occasionally it has to amend legislation in later sessions.

I was a member of the Subordinate Legislation Committee for about eight years and for a long time I thought that some means should be provided to avoid this situation. I seriously submit for consideration by the House, and particularly by the Premier, that the Government should consider amending Standing Orders so that one or both of the following alternatives might be adopted. Firstly, if the committee is concerned about certain provisions in a by-law it should have the right to communicate with the council suggesting that these provisions are unlikely to be accepted by the committee and that that section should be withdrawn or redrafted. At present the committee has not the right to do that although something similar is done occasionally. Secondly, I suggest that the committee should have the right to move for the disallowance of certain provisions or sections to which it objects, but that no action should be taken on the remaining provisions of the by-laws to which no objection is taken. Standing Orders should be amended also in that direction.

It is anomalous that a by-law covering voluminous pages should be disallowed merely because one provision is unacceptable. That happened recently in this House when an effort was made under a by-law to stop bicycles from being parked in a thoroughfare for long periods. A minor point of that nature or a little slip in drafting may result in

the whole by-law being disallowed and much work by the council being wasted. I seriously advance my suggestion to the House in the hope that Standing Orders may be widened on the lines I have suggested. That would avoid long delays and it would also save the committee from the criticism that it is now increasingly incurring only because its members act in accordance with Standing Orders which strictly only allow the committee to move that a by-law be disallowed or that no action be taken on it.

True, the actions of the committee are subject to discussion by Parliament, but Standing Orders should be widened to allow the committee more scope. Although I have no warrant to make this assertion I believe, unless the ideas of the committee have changed greatly during the last 12 months, that it would welcome such a move and I ask the Government to consider my idea seriously. If the Government is not prepared to do that I believe that a motion could come from some other section of the House. I must oppose the disallowance of the by-law because such disallowance would damage a large part of the district I represent and would allow things to happen in the area that members should be anxious to avoid.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (19).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Coumbe, Dunnage, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Jenkins, King, Laucke, Millhouse (teller), Nankivell, Nicholson, Pattinson, Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Shannon, Mrs. Steele and Mr. Stott.

Noes (11).—Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark (teller), Dunstan, Hughes, Loveday, McKee, Ralston, Ryan, Tapping and Frank Walsh.

Majority of 8 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

COUNTRY ELECTRICITY TARIFFS.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Frank Walsh:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should take steps to assist the decentralization of industry and help retain population in country areas by insisting that the Electricity Trust of South Australia institute a system whereby all country tariffs are reduced to the same as those now operating in the metropolitan area.

(Continued from August 30. Page 646.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): I presume that this motion arises from the fact that two or three honourable members on this side of the House during the debate on the Address in Reply

stated that they desired that as soon as possible there should be an equalization of electricity tariffs between the country and the metropolitan area. The Leader of the Opposition has desired to give them an opportunity to express this by way of a vote. I point out to him at the outset that what he is doing will not achieve that at all, and that in moving to reduce country tariffs to the level of city tariffs he is not proposing an equalization. If he were doing that, there might be, within limitations, something to be said for it; but what he is proposing is a reduction of country tariffs to those now operating in the city. That, of course, is an entirely different matter, because it takes away from the Electricity Trust a substantial amount of money that would inevitably be used for extensions of power lines in the country.

Mr. Shannon: And there are plenty of requests for that.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes. As all members know, the trust has at its disposal only limited amounts of finance, which come from a number of sources, which I should like to mention. Through the Loan Estimates the Government provides a limited amount and if honourable members look at this year's Estimates they will see that when it takes into account all its obligations it has only a limited sum to make available to the trust. The trust also gets a certain amount through semi-governmental borrowing, and, believe me, at present it is having the greatest difficulty in getting all its semi-governmental allocations filled. The most substantial part of its extensions are provided from internal funds—through the utilization of appreciation of assets and of any surpluses it may have in its own account.

If members want to limit, and severely limit, extensions of electricity into the country and completely disrupt the trust's chances of sending electricity to the country, the way to do that would be to carry the motion, because inevitably it would mean that the country, which ostensibly the Leader of the Opposition sets out to assist, would be most affected by restrictions in areas which require big extensions of electricity. If honourable members want to curtail the extension of electricity to the country, the surest way to do it is to carry the motion, because that undoubtedly would mean that this year the trust would have to revise every commitment it has to make room for a loss of probably £500,000, which would be involved in this particular matter. I do

not think that any honourable member would seriously suggest that the trust should be called upon to dishonour commitments it has given.

We have members, including members opposite, especially country members, clamouring for electricity to be extended to their areas, and yet it is proposed that we should take away from the trust a considerable sum. It is not a question of equalization and bringing the country tariff down to the city tariff, but what the Leader of the Opposition is proposing is to reduce country tariffs and not to alter city rates at all. Let me say, in case some honourable members have the erroneous idea that the trust has a wide discretion in fixing its charges, that as regards industrial expansion in this State, if we are to expand and retain our big industries and encourage new big industries, we can only do that on the basis that the costs of production in South Australia are no higher than those in similar industries in other States. Honourable members do not need to be reminded that one of the chief items in industrial cost is electricity. I know from my own personal knowledge that when an industry is deciding whether or not to come to South Australia, the first comparison it makes is that of industrial tariffs in South Australia with those in other States. Under those circumstances I can say quite definitely that if we wished to increase the number of unemployed and set back the industrial expansion of this State the surest way would be to tamper with the present industrial tariff.

Not very long ago we were negotiating for the establishment of a large industry near Mount Gambier, and the first real hurdle was this very question of power supplies. I emphasize that it was only when we were able to assure the company concerned that we would not require it to take electricity from us but would allow it to use its surplus heat for its own power generation that we were able to reach a compromise which I think will ultimately lead to the establishment of this industry. Even an additional 0.1d. in the charge for industrial electricity becomes extremely important. As honourable members know, to meet this particular matter the Government came in with what was virtually a gift to the South-East of £1,000,000 to enable electrification of that area to go on, irrespective of whether or not this company took tariff electricity from the trust.

Some honourable members may ask: if we amended this motion to provide for an increase

in city tariffs—and these are some of the things advocated by members of my own Party—and a reduction in country tariffs so that they would meet half-way, what would be wrong with that? Firstly, electricity in the city has a very strong and capable competitor, and if city tariffs were raised I am sure it would mean a very big swing to the use of gas, with the overall result that the country consumer would be in a less fortunate position than he is at present. I take this opportunity to make a general statement upon what I know to be the trust's policy in this matter and what has been the Government's established policy over a long period. Honourable members know that in South Australia, unlike other States of the Commonwealth, there has been no increase in electricity charges since 1953, despite increased costs arising out of industrial awards and the general inflation of the economy. The trust, because of good management, has been able to keep costs down and charges stable.

Mr. Jennings: There has been a decrease in cost in Tasmania.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: There have been very heavy increases in Tasmania. Even in places where hydro-electric power plays such a big part, substantial increases have occurred. In fact, the increases in Tasmania are very much higher proportionately than in other States where thermal power is used. Indeed, there has been some agitation in Tasmania for the establishment of a thermal power unit. We must deal with States where the position is comparable, but if the honourable member wishes some comparisons I am quite happy to provide them. Let us deal, for instance, with New South Wales, which has thermal stations and which uses black coal. South Australia has thermal stations and uses both black and brown coal. The interesting thing is that only this year there has been a general increase in charges in New South Wales of five per cent, and there have also been general increases in Victoria. Those increases have been imposed not because the power authorities in Victoria and New South Wales are inefficient: both those States are confronted with the position confronting every electricity undertaking in Australia today, namely, pressure for expansion and the limited amount of capital funds available for that purpose. The increases in the States I have mentioned arise out of the necessity for expansion in the country areas, for which at the present time virtually no funds are provided under the existing set-up and under existing semi-governmental opportunities. I emphasize that

in actual fact South Australia has decreased electricity charges on a number of occasions.

Mr. Shannon: Especially in the country.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes. All the decreases have resulted in country tariffs coming closer to the city tariffs. There is a limit to where we can go if we are not to cut off country expansion. This matter of charges is reviewed in October each year, but I do not know yet whether the trust proposes to make any reduction this year. On a number of occasions we have cut out a country zone.

Mr. Lawn: There will be a reduction in October, for sure. There is an election next year.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The cutting out of a country zone means that the tariffs in the zones above it are reduced. If we were to cut out the present Zone 2 that would become Zone 1; Zone 3 would then become Zone 2, and all other zones would come down correspondingly. If honourable members opposite—and particularly those representing country electorates—wish to curtail the expansion of electricity into their areas, I know of no more certain way to do it than carrying this motion.

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla): I should like to comment, first of all, upon some of the Premier's remarks in opposing this motion, which aims, as he said, at reducing country tariffs to the level of city tariffs. The Premier has made the point that, if this were done, extensions in country areas of electricity supplies would suffer in consequence. It is interesting to examine the position of the Electricity Trust to see just how valid this objection really is. The member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) pointed out that the trust had an investment in generating equipment and distribution networks of about £84,000,000. The Premier is, in effect, saying that an organization with an investment of £84,000,000 cannot get Loan money to the extent necessary to offset the extra loss of revenue that the trust might naturally experience from reducing country charges to the extent of, I think, £375,000—because that amount represents the extra cost of electricity to residential country users, not £500,000, as the Premier mentioned this afternoon.

In other words, the Premier is suggesting that an organization with this tremendous capital investment cannot obtain Loan money to the extent of £375,000 which would otherwise be used in extending power to the country. I cannot say offhand just what £375,000 would mean in terms of the extension of power in

country areas but, from recent figures presented to us for the extension of power in the South-East, this represents a small amount compared with the amount spent on extension of power in country areas. It seems to me to be a poor argument to say that an organization with this tremendous capital investment cannot get sufficient funds to offset what might be a small loss of revenue. If that is true, it only goes to show what a parlous position our public utilities are in today, if they cannot get Loan money to this extent to extend power in the country where it is so badly needed. It shows us to what stage Liberal policy has brought us in this Commonwealth if that is the case, and that is what the Premier is saying.

Mr. Clark: Does the honourable member believe for one minute that that is the case?

Mr. LOVEDAY: No, I do not believe it for one moment, and that is why I say that the Premier's argument is invalid. He has put up a case that will not stand investigation.

Mr. Lawn: Its annual surplus is £469,000.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Yes, and that shows there is room for expansion, still leaving a surplus to the trust, quite apart from the ability of the trust, an organization with £84,000,000 of investment, to get Loan money for the purpose of extending power facilities to the country.

Mr. Bywaters: The Premier said it would cost about £500,000 to do this.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Yes. I was interested when the Premier said that an industry was recently considering setting up at Mount Gambier, that one of the first questions asked related to the industrial tariff charges, and that the establishment of the industry hinged on the industrial tariff. This simply strengthens our case for the passing of this motion. It shows that it is necessary to consider now the cost of electrical power in the country if we are to get any decentralization in South Australia. The very statement of that particular case proves the worth of this motion. We on this side of the House are convinced that this is one of the most important things involved in decentralization from the point of view of not only the establishment of industries in the country but also the obtaining of skilled tradesmen in those parts of the country where we have hopes of industrial expansion. One of the difficulties in retaining skilled tradesmen in South Australian country areas where we hope to expand—such as some of the major towns in the north—is the fact that skilled tradesmen are always comparing their cost of living

in country areas with what it would be if they were working in the city. Therefore, from those two points of view, this motion is important.

The Premier went on to say that it had been suggested that we might bring the city tariff up and the country tariff down, to meet half way. He said that, if that were done, the trust would have a strong competitor in the city, that there would be a swing to the use of gas and that the trust would be in a much weaker competitive position. I should like to see an unbiased report from engineers on this question rather than have to rely on the statement of the Premier when he is endeavouring to defeat the motion we are putting forward. The efficiency of thermal units over the past few years throughout Australia has improved to such an extent that the possible competition from nuclear power stations has faded into the background for a long time. It is admitted that the increased efficiency of thermal stations has been phenomenal over the last few years. I doubt the truth of the statement that, if this slight adjustment were made, the Electricity Trust would naturally suffer to such an extent that gas would become a competitor that would seriously hamper its operations. That bald statement alone is insufficient for us on this side of the House; we would require an unbiased investigation by engineers capable of giving us the true facts.

On the face of it, all that we have been told about the general increased efficiency of thermal stations and the small impact of this proposal on the use of electricity in the city if there was a half-way adjustment causes us not to rely on the Premier's objections in that regard. I have not dealt with the broad question of the effect on decentralization. Our Leader mentioned the transfer of people from country to city over a long period, and indicated the small percentage of people who would be residing in country areas in a comparatively short time if the present drift from country to city continued. **It is unnecessary for me to reiterate the figures, which have been discussed here on many occasions. The most important points we should deal with are the objections that the Premier has raised. Towards the conclusion of his remarks the Premier again referred to how the country would suffer if our proposal were agreed to. What I have said shows that those arguments will not bear inspection. It is absurd to suggest that an organization with such capital**

would not be able to obtain the small amount that would be required if our proposal were adopted. What the Premier said, in effect, was that this country had been so mismanaged in the past few years by Liberal Governments that Loan funds were not available for a public utility to extend power facilities throughout the country. In saying what he said this afternoon the Premier condemned the policy followed by his own Party, particularly in the Commonwealth sphere.

The thinking in all country areas, where the question of decentralization is considered vital, is that unless country living costs can be reduced to approximately those of the city, there is little hope of decentralization. Private industry is not interested in going to the country unless it can see some economic advantage or unless the area is on the same economic basis as the city. This motion is a concrete move towards achieving that objective. The Premier's remarks in no way invalidate the arguments we put forward, and his arguments in rebuttal will not bear critical inspection. I support the motion.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River): I want to inform the House where I stand on this matter.

Mr. Ryan: Right behind the Premier!

Mr. HEASLIP: One might think that as a country member I should support a measure which, in theory, seeks to provide country people with cheaper electricity. However, this will not provide cheaper electricity. If adopted, the large industrial towns would get cheaper electricity, but the real country people would go without it altogether. I am from the country, and the primary producers and the small country towns that are part of the make-up of primary production would suffer.

Mr. Jennings: How would it affect the Grosvenor?

Mr. HEASLIP: I will come to the Grosvenor later.

Mr. Jennings: You will go there soon, too.

Mr. HEASLIP: Money would not be available for the extension of the single wire earth return scheme in country areas. Members opposite might say that the member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) who spoke on country electricity tariffs would support this proposal.

Mr. Ryan: Not after the Premier told him he could not.

Mr. HEASLIP: Nor before the Premier spoke, because what Mr. Hall suggested was entirely different from what this Bill seeks to do.

Mr. Lawn: It is not a Bill.

Mr. HEASLIP: Mr. Hall spoke of the equalization of prices, but this proposal seeks to bring country charges down to metropolitan charges. Instead of the trust—and I do not care whether it is a Government instrumentality or a private company—making a profit, it would lose, and how could extensions be made to country areas if there were no profits? Where would the money come from?

Mr. Hall: Out of the Socialist printing press.

Mr. HEASLIP: Under a Socialist set-up it might be done, but not under the present set-up. Country people, who go without many of the amenities that metropolitan members enjoy, would have to go without more. We get some amenities today through the single wire earth return system because of the profit made by the Electricity Trust. I represent a country electorate and will not vote for anything that will deprive country people of amenities. The member for Whyalla asked why money could not be borrowed for these extensions. The Electricity Trust could borrow.

Mr. Bywaters: It does borrow.

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes, because it is a successful concern. One can easily borrow when one is successful and makes profits, but if an industry is losing it cannot borrow.

Mr. Bywaters: The trust made a profit of almost £500,000 last year.

Mr. HEASLIP: Investors will not put money into a company that is going broke.

Mr. Coumbe: The trust's loans are over-subscribed.

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes, because the trust is a successful undertaking, which is how we want it to remain. If it loses money it will not be able to borrow successfully.

Mr. Loveday: Supply us with figures to show how it would make a loss.

Mr. HEASLIP: The member for Enfield, by interjection, referred to the Grosvenor. If the honourable member wants to bring the Grosvenor into it—

Mr. Jennings: I don't want to, but I thought you might.

Mr. HEASLIP: Because I am chairman of directors of the Grosvenor I know something of the economics of electricity *versus* gas. Electricity is one of the most expensive mediums for heating and gas one of the cheapest. If the cost of electricity is to be increased then there will be a big swing from electricity to gas. The Grosvenor has tried both forms of heating and today we are 100 per cent gas.

Mr. Jennings: You have always been 100 per cent gas!

Mr. HEASLIP: No, we have not. We have spent much money in determining the most economic means of heating. Two other large residential establishments in Adelaide use gas exclusively for heating and cooking because it is the most economic form. We cannot afford to increase electricity costs because if we do it will mean a loss of business and, consequently, fewer country extensions. I cannot support the motion.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): Were it not so tragic it would be amusing to follow the antics of members opposite. Earlier this session they advocated cheaper electricity charges for country areas. Now that the master has spoken they must eat their words. They do not now advocate cheaper electricity charges but say that it would be wrong to have them. Last week one Government member opposed a Bill introduced by the Opposition to amend the Electoral Act. Soon after he resumed his seat the master spoke, and now he must support the amendments proposed to the Bill. Government members represent electorates and are here to voice the opinions of the people they represent.

Mr. Bywaters: They are supposed to please themselves how they vote.

Mr. LAWN: Yes. I will give two examples of what happened. Mr. Shannon vigorously opposed the Bill to amend the Electoral Act, which was introduced by our Leader. He has done this for years, but now he has to support the Bill with the proposed amendments. *Hansard* reports show that the member for Rocky River has previously urged the Government to reduce country electricity charges. The member for Albert has done likewise. This session the member for Gouger raised the matter and said, "There is no justification for having—"

The SPEAKER: The honourable member would be out of order in referring to another debate in the same session.

Mr. LAWN: It is obvious, and the honourable member for Gouger said—

The SPEAKER: He was speaking during the Address in Reply debate.

Mr. LAWN: I did not say which debate it was. I did not say that the member for Gouger had said it in the Address in Reply debate. You said it.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member picked up the *Hansard* file and began to read from it. I think the honourable member

realizes that he would be out of order in reading from the report of another debate in the same session.

Mr. LAWN: Now that you, Sir, have raised the matter, I remind you that both you and your predecessor (Sir Robert Nicholls) permitted it. This is the first time in 12 years that I have been picked up for reading from a *Hansard* report without my saying I was doing it. This is the first time that I have been told that it would be out of order. I did not say that I was reading from *Hansard*. I did not say that the member for Gouger said it in the Address in Reply debate. I was going to quote two lines from his remarks urging a reduction in country electricity tariffs. This is the first time that you, Sir, or Sir Robert Nicholls has pulled me up, or any other member, when we did not say that we were reading from a *Hansard* report of another debate. I do not want to go into past history and quote what the members for Rocky River and Albert said. The member for Gouger said it only a few days ago, and it is fresh in the mind of everybody, and was reported in the *Advertiser*, which said that he had urged a reduction in country electricity tariffs. He said "There is no justification for having different prices for country and city consumers". That was the gist of his remarks. He said there was no justification for having two sets of tariffs. He went further and said that it would cost the trust about £375,000 to give effect to what was wanted by the Opposition.

I heartily support the motion because I am a Socialist, and the contents of the motion are in keeping with my socialistic principles. I am a little disappointed with the Premier, if he was right in presuming this afternoon that the reason for the motion was that three members on his side had asked for an equalization of electricity charges. About two years ago I advocated a reduction in country tariffs. At the time I was speaking in the Budget debate and was referring to the Auditor-General's report. I mentioned many of our State enterprises, such as the Woods and Forests Department, the Harbors Board and the Electricity Trust. I said that the report disclosed that the trust had made a profit of £469,000 in 1959. Last year, in 1960, it made a profit of £468,000. Two years ago I advocated that we should reduce country electricity tariffs to what they were in the metropolitan area. I do not know what is in the mind of my colleagues, but if the Premier were right, and they only sponsored the motion because of representations

on the other side of the House, it appears that my remarks in 1959 were wasted. The member for Murray previously advocated a reduction in the charges. Earlier this session in an interjection the member for Onkaparinga asked for my interpretation of Socialism. I gave it to him. I now believe the actual interjection was "What is your Party's interpretation of Socialism?" Briefly it is this: Labor believes that Democratic Socialism is the utilization of the economic assets of the State in the interests of its citizens. Can we get anything clearer than that in the motion? It was introduced by the Leader of the Opposition because we believe that the Electricity Trust should be used equally in the interests of all the citizens of the State. I see no reason why I, who reside in the metropolitan area, and the member for Frome, who represents a larger electorate in area than the Adelaide electorate, should pay different charges. Why should the people in the two districts have to pay these different charges? It is against my principles and the same can be said about water and other charges. Since I have been a member in this place the Leader of the Opposition has more than once on our behalf sponsored a motion dealing with decentralization in one form or another. Each time the main argument against it has been that the Government cannot force industry to go to the country.

Mr. Bywaters: It does not encourage it either.

Mr. LAWN: I will come to that later. Another argument is that the Government cannot force people to go to the country. At Elizabeth we have seen an example of whether or not people can be forced to go to the country. Referring to Mr. Bywaters' interjection, I agree that the Government cannot force industry to go to the country, but the Labor Party believes that it can encourage industry to do it. I do not think the Premier realized what he said this afternoon. Later I will come to some of the points he raised. He said that before industry will go to the country it looks at the costs of industrial tariffs. It makes a comparison between the tariffs of all States. Before any industry is established here, is it not reasonable to expect it to look at the cost of industrial tariffs? A firm finds that if it sets up an industry in the country the industrial tariff will be much higher than that in the metropolitan area. What is the result? We find that industry is growing in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Jenkins: There is little difference between country and metropolitan industrial tariffs, is there?

Mr. LAWN: Get up and tell the Premier! It is all very fine for the honourable member to agree with me now but, when it comes to a vote on this matter, he will line up with his master. There will not be many speakers from the Government side, but they will all vote the way the Premier spoke this afternoon. The only objection raised to the motion was that advanced by the Premier. Nothing was advanced by the member for Rocky River. He did not know it was a motion; he called it a Bill! The Premier said that the first thing an industry looked at before deciding where to establish was the industrial tariff, and he claimed that we have a lower industrial tariff in South Australia than exists in other States. He is hoping to get industry here for that reason. I know that industry wants to produce in the cheapest market, and that it wants to buy its labour, power and other things in the lowest market and to sell its goods in the dearest market, so it is logical to assume that industry looks at tariffs.

Mr. Loveday: What the Premier wants is that country residents shall pay for this advantage he says the State has.

Mr. LAWN: Exactly, by getting them to come to South Australia. If industry compares the tariffs here with those in New South Wales (the Premier said there had been a five per cent increase in New South Wales) it will look at the tariff in the metropolitan area compared with that in country areas. If it is such a big factor in the decision of industry on where to establish, the higher country tariff will be detrimental to getting industry into the country. We have been saying for years that this Government has got this State gerrymandered. The gerrymander was sponsored by the Butler Government and continued by the Playford Government. This Government restricts its opposition in the metropolitan area in the main to 13 districts, and in the country its own supporters are split into 26 districts: and this is what the country is getting for it! Country people are paying for the gerrymandered State. The Government does not want industry to go to the country because it naturally follows that in time an area where an industry is established returns a Labor member to the House of Assembly in preference to a Liberal member. That seems to me to be the reason for the Government's opposition.

It does not want industry to go to the country, and one obstacle it places in the path of industry is higher country tariffs. The State Government sponsors railways and harbours and provides roads, not only in the metropolitan area but throughout the State. There are harbours at Whyalla, Port Pirie, Wallaroo and other places in the country, and railways and roads throughout the State. What is wrong with giving country people electricity at this same rate as is charged in the metropolitan area? There is no reason other than that which I have advanced: that the Government does not want industry to go to the country. If members opposite want to serve their country constituents (the people they are supposed to represent) they should support the motion to give people in their districts, whether they are primary producers, firms, or people who use electric light and power in the home, cheaper charges for electricity.

Some years ago, when country people complained that tariffs were so high, this Government's explanation of why they paid higher tariffs than did people in the metropolitan area was that the power was generated at Osborne and the cost to the Electricity Trust to provide power lines to take it into the country was so great that country consumers had to be charged a higher rate.

Mr. Loveday: That was the argument.

Mr. LAWN: It was, and country people have told me personally that when that was pointed out to them they realized it was logical and correct. But what is the position today? It has entirely changed. We in the metropolitan area are using power produced at Port Augusta and brought over 200 miles to Adelaide. If the statement that country people were charged a higher tariff because power produced at Osborne had to be taken to country areas was not sheer hypocrisy, then people in the metropolitan area should now be getting power at dearer rates than people in country areas. However, I have not advocated that, and we do not want to see it. Now, the coal is obtained from Leigh Creek and taken by rail to the Port Augusta power house, where the power is produced. It then travels through the lines to Osborne, whence it is sent around the metropolitan area, so country people are now asking why, as in the past they had to pay higher tariffs because the power was produced in the metropolitan area and it cost a lot to take it to the country, should they now not have their tariffs reduced because the power is produced in the country and brought to the metropolitan area? The people

represented by the member for Rocky River, the member for Gouger, and others are asking these questions.

Mr. Bywaters: The power line passes their doors.

Mr. LAWN: It goes through their districts; if it does not, it goes close to them. I am assured that it goes through both Rocky River and Gouger, and then it may be taken back again from Adelaide. As it goes through their districts to the city, it is wrong to say that the same argument prevails as applied before the establishment of the Port Augusta power house.

Mr. Bywaters: They would probably be on the highest tariff of the lot.

Mr. LAWN: I have not investigated country tariffs, but, if I were a country member, I should have investigated them years ago and had a lot to say about them.

Mr. Heaslip: We want electricity.

Mr. LAWN: The honourable member will do only what his master tells him to do. I remind the House that when I raised this matter in 1959 I referred to the Auditor-General's report, which indicated that the Electricity Trust had shown a surplus of £469,000. I advocated the adoption of that course over three years and I was confident that the trust could supply electric light and power at a uniform tariff wherever people resided in South Australia.

Mr. Clark: There was much favourable comment in the country on your speech.

Mr. LAWN: I was supported by the late member for Light (Mr. Hambour) who told me, outside the Chamber, that he had thoroughly studied this question. Obviously, from the questions that he asked the Premier he was working diligently on the question of electricity charges. He also continually visited the trust offices to interview the management on behalf of his own constituents.

Mr. Clark: And he would have supported such a move in the House, I am sure.

Mr. LAWN: I have not the slightest doubt that had the late member for Light been here today he would have supported the motion. I make that statement with this reservation that when the late member first came into the House he believed he was free to vote as his conscience dictated, but subsequently he found out that he had to bow to his master's will.

Mr. Clark: He had the habit of sticking to his guns.

Mr. LAWN: The session before he passed away he sponsored an amendment to a Government Bill similar to one this Opposition had previously moved. Members on this side were happy to support him and the amendment was carried. I honestly and sincerely believe that the late Mr. Hambour did his utmost for the people he represented.

Mr. Loveday: Perhaps the present member for Light will support us. He has not much to lose.

Mr. LAWN: No, and I hope he will shed the light shown by his predecessor. The late Mr. Hambour made some useful suggestions in the debates of this House and if he could advise the present member for Light I am sure he would ask him to buck the master and support the motion before the House. The member for Gouger said that it would cost £375,000 to give effect to the motion, but what I advocated in 1959 was that, over three years, from the additional £469,000 country tariffs could be greatly reduced to more closely comply with those applying in the city. The late Mr. Hambour agreed with me.

Mr. Hall stated what it would cost, and although I did not know the cost I was sure that it could be accomplished in three years. However, the member for Gouger said it could be done in one year. The trust's surplus for the following year was £468,000, but I do not know this year's figure. I have the highest admiration for the management of the trust, which has not increased its tariffs despite basic wage increases amounting to 15s., 10s. and 5s., respectively, over the last four or five years. Although the trust has not increased its charges private enterprise has passed on not only the living wage increases but twice the amounts. If the amount stated by the member for Gouger is correct, the trust could accomplish this result in one year and still show a surplus for the year's undertaking. That prompts me to say this: three years ago the Opposition raised this question and on the eve of the election the Premier announced some reduction in country tariffs for power.

Mr. Bywaters: That was a by-election.

Mr. LAWN: It was just prior to the Light by-election and the Premier announced a reduction in electricity tariffs.

Mr. Loveday: He did not say that would prevent country extensions.

Mr. LAWN: No. It was not October when the announcement was made, but he now says that the usual time this is fixed by the trust is October. He believes that in October the trust will announce a reduction in country

tariffs. The Premier always announces reductions, but increases are announced by Mr. Murphy (Prices Commissioner). Following the motion of the Leader of the Opposition, the Treasurer will, some time between now and the next elections in March, 1962 (perhaps on a Thursday evening) announce a reduction in country tariffs and this motion will be solely responsible for that. The member for Rocky River and others who support the Premier and claim that he is right will eat the words uttered today. The member for Rocky River did not understand what matter was before the House because he never once referred to it as the "motion". He said, "If the Bill becomes law"—there is no Bill before the House—"large country towns would get electricity at the same price as the metropolitan area—"

Mr. Heaslip: And the country would get none.

Mr. LAWN: "And other people in the country would get none." He meant that they would get no power. The member is agreeing now. They would have no power at all. That is how his mind works.

Mr. Jennings: What mind?

Mr. LAWN: I do not know how else to describe it. The member is not able to get up and support his master but he gets up and says, "This Bill"—it is a motion and not a Bill—"if it becomes law"—and it won't become law if it is carried—"is an expression of opinion of the House of Assembly that country people should have uniform charges." It is up to the Government to give effect to the motion but it need not give effect to it. The member for Rocky River says that if the motion becomes law large country towns will get cheaper electricity but other country people will get no electricity at all.

Mr. Clark: Are you suggesting that he was a bit confused?

Mr. LAWN: Often when listening to members on the other side I think of *Jeremiah*, which states, at Chapter 7, Verse 19: "Do they provoke me . . . Do they not provoke themselves to the confusion of their own faces?" Members opposite rise in this House and speak any tripe or rubbish at all if they think it will please their master. The member for Rocky River did not hear what the Premier said.

Mr. Clark: It did not matter very much, did it?

Mr. LAWN: No. Let me deal with the debate as it took place this afternoon. The Premier first mentioned the reason for it. He presumed that the reason was, as I said earlier, that representations were made by

three of his supporters, and then he said the motion asked for a reduction in country tariffs. He was right and honest for once in interpreting a motion or a Bill initiated by this side. His usual practice is to say that a Bill or motion introduced by this side is something entirely foreign to what it means, but he was honest when he made that statement.

Mr. Jennings: Only accidentally honest!

Mr. LAWN: In saying that the motion asked for a reduction in country tariffs the Premier was perfectly correct and honest. The member for Rocky River followed the Premier and in his speech said that if the "Bill" became law it would take away all electric light and power from country people, except those living in country towns. Can you, Mr. Speaker, understand such a statement? This is the Parliament of South Australia. Members do not have to possess special qualifications to become members, but surely they should be able to understand the matters that come before the House and properly express the wishes of the people they represent. That is one thing that I stress when I conduct parties through the House. Look at the pillars of the Chamber. One sees angels' faces looking down upon the member for Rocky River.

Mr. Clark: And then they start to cry!

Mr. LAWN: At the commencement of every session we have the Governor's Speech and he concludes with these words: "I trust that your deliberations may be guided by Divine Providence to the advancement of the welfare of the State." Mr. Heaslip is sitting near a pillar on which is a circle of eternity on a four-square base. We are here to represent the people and not our own personal interests. I represent the electors of Adelaide and Mr. Heaslip represents the constituents in his district, who want electric power at the same rate as my constituents pay, and they would like to receive it at an even cheaper rate.

Mr. Heaslip: In my electorate many people have none at all.

Mr. LAWN: As a result of legislation introduced by the Government to take over the old Adelaide Electric Supply Company the honourable member and his constituents are now receiving electric power and there is every likelihood that still more will be receiving it. I do not say that the Government's action amounted to Socialism, but it was near-Socialism. As we get more and more Socialism in this State, so the people in Rocky River and in other country electorates will benefit more and more. Yet Mr. Heaslip says that

if this motion is carried it will deprive his constituents of electric light and power. It will do nothing of the sort.

The Premier went on to say that the first comparison an industry makes before considering establishment here is in relation to the industrial electricity tariff. He also said that we have a cheaper industrial tariff here than that of any other State. He did not say (but I will say it) that employers in this State pay cheaper premiums for workmen's compensation than those operating in any other State. Our Workmen's Compensation Act provides for lower payments for death and for injuries than apply in any other State. Our Act does not provide for compensation for accidents or for death that occur when a worker is travelling either to or from employment, but the Acts of other States do. Therefore, industries in other States have to pay a higher premium for workmen's compensation, and, according to the Premier, they also pay a higher industrial electricity tariff. If that is the case, why have we any unemployment in South Australia at all? Industries are being favourably dealt with here, and let us deal with them even a little better as regards their establishment in the country. I am not asking that we should reduce our electricity tariffs to encourage industries to come from other States, but let us encourage industries in the city to establish in the country and any future industries to go to the country, and let us say that wherever they are established they will not have to pay any additional charge for electricity.

Mr. Ryan: That would upset the balance of power!

Mr. LAWN: Yes. We know that the Government does not want decentralization of industry. Let us consider the district represented by Mr. Ralston, the member for Mount Gambier, which was previously represented by the late Mr. Fletcher. As soon as the people of Mount Gambier found that their personal friend, Mr. Jack Fletcher, had passed away they looked to the Labor Party for their future representation. During the years Mr. Fletcher represented that district industries were established there and that also applied to Mr. Corcoran's district. Let us consider Whyalla.

Mr. Jenkins: What about Port Stanvac?

Mr. LAWN: What about it? That shows the intelligence of honourable members opposite. The Premier, when referring in this House to the establishment of the plant at Port Stanvac said (and the member for

Walleroo was responsible for his saying it, because he asked the Premier why he could not get the refinery established at Wallaroo) that the representatives of the refinery when they came to see him said they wanted to localize their plant at Port Stanvac.

Mr. Jenkins: Why not?

Mr. LAWN: And they said that if they did not go there they would establish themselves at an island north of Australia. First, the company was determined to go to that part of the State where the plant is now being established, but the Premier tried to talk the company out of it because the district was represented by a Liberal Party member.

Mr. Jenkins: He didn't say anything of the sort.

Mr. LAWN: He said that he asked them about going to Wallaroo.

Members interjecting.

Mr. LAWN: Honourable members opposite, as indicated in the Biblical quotation I gave, are becoming confused again. The Premier assured this House that he tried to have the industry removed from Port Stanvac to Wallaroo, but that the company's representative said it had taken soundings all around the Australian coast and on islands north of Australia, and that if it did not go to Port Stanvac it would establish its works on one of the islands north of Australia. That is what he told the member for Wallaroo; he tried to get them to go out of the district of Alexandra.

Secondly, how many men would be employed there? Only 350! Yet he is talking about the industry going to an L.C.L. district after he had done his utmost to get it established at Wallaroo. I do not know whether the Premier was telling the truth on that occasion. He may not have been, but Mr. Jenkins would know more about that than I.

Consider the district of Frome. The Leigh Creek coalfield and the Radium Hill operation would not have been established had they been in an L.C.L. district. At the time the member for that district was the late Mr. O'Halloran. The member for Semaphore has no difficulty in getting industry established in his district, nor have the members for Port Adelaide, Enfield, and myself in our districts: we can get plenty. After the next election, provided the people of Frome return the present member, I do not doubt that that district will get more industries, because the Government will then give Frome away and say, "Well, we have lost Frome and have no hope of getting it back, so let us put more industries

there rather than in Rocky River, Stirling or Onkaparinga.

Mr. Shannon: Does the honourable member recall that there was a district of Newcastle, represented by the late Sir George Jenkins?

Mr. LAWN: The honourable member for Onkaparinga should have been here earlier when I said he had changed his mind since last week and would do so again. He is very confused; he should read the seventh chapter of *Jeremiah*. The Premier spoke about lack of finance. He has already announced to the people of South Australia, and he has since told this Parliament, that in the last Budget a grant of £1,000,000 was made to the Electricity Trust. We all know that the trust floats its loans and raises its own loan money; the member for Rocky River admitted that this afternoon. This motion is a request to the Government on behalf of the House of Assembly for a reduction in country tariffs, and there is no logical argument for anyone to say that the action suggested in the motion would take away the trust's surplus and leave it with no more money for country development. The £469,000 surplus every year is like a drop in the ocean compared with the sum the trust is spending on country development; it is spending millions of pounds each year on the extension of electricity to the country.

Mr. Hall: You are saying that 1,000 consumers are not worth bothering about.

Mr. LAWN: I have referred earlier to the remarks of the honourable member for Rocky River.

Mr. Heaslip: I must have made an impression because you are coming back at me all the time.

Mr. LAWN: I could say what sort of an impression the honourable member made, but I should probably be ruled out of order. In conclusion, I am pleased to support the motion because it fully accords with my principles of Socialism, which the member for Onkaparinga claims he opposes. Although honourable members opposite say that they oppose Socialism, they will have to justify to their constituents their voting against a motion that seeks to give, to the people they represent, electricity at the same rate as that paid by metropolitan consumers. That is a question in itself, but tied up with it also is the greater question of decentralization.

Mr. Jennings: And the gerrymander!

Mr. LAWN: Yes. The real reason why members opposite do not want electric light and power in the country to be sold at the same rate as that in the metropolitan area is

that they do not want industry to go to the country. I know that we cannot expect members opposite to disobey their master, but at least there is one Government member who has nothing to lose. He is the member for Light, and I suggest that he do one good act during the time he has spent with us by crossing the House and voting for this motion.

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa): In general principle I agree with what this motion sets out to achieve. I have previously advocated keenly the equalization of charges as between city and country, and I do so now with equal keenness. During the brief time since my entry to this House there has been a major move towards equalization. I differ in my approach to the method of achieving a given end. I do not like insisting on any particular thing but, when I can see a firm and honest endeavour to meet that to which I aspire, I am content. Let us look at what has come about in recent years towards this desirable goal of equalization of charges. Four or five years ago there were eight zones covering this State and at present there are four. That is a major move towards equalization.

Mr. Ralston: There are still eight zones; you have forgotten the four country zones.

Mr. LAUCKE: At present there are four major zones in this State.

Mr. Ralston: Yes, and four in the country; there are still eight.

Mr. LAUCKE: I want to put first things first. There is a definite trend towards this equalization, and I want to see, firstly, that every elector in Barossa who desires power taken to his farm house is supplied with power. In my opinion, that is the first consideration. I do not have as much concern about the tariffs in rural areas as I have for a firm request to have power taken to those farms. At present four major extensions are being made in Barossa, and many farmers are elated at the prospect of having power taken to their farms at a cost which is attractive and which is certainly far cheaper, both initially and as regards maintenance, than power which they could have from their private plants.

Mr. Ryan: The cost would be very attractive if this motion were carried.

Mr. LAUCKE: And that will come. In the meantime, I do not want to intrude on the Electricity Trust's administration. I have a high regard for what it has achieved through its sound and purposeful direction of its affairs. When I see the definite trend towards equalization, I am content. I do not want the world

overnight, but I do want to see this condition arrived at when it is logically sound to expect equalization to be possible. A sum of £680,000 is provided on the Estimates this year for rural extensions.

In assisting rural consumers to have power taken to their farm properties, the trust about 18 months ago allowed to each party to an agreement covering a group of consumers a subsidy of £200 on capital cost. This meant that, if there was a group of 10 and there was a scheme costing £5,000 to implement, the 10 consumers, each being allowed £200 capital subsidy, would be allowed *in toto* £2,000 against the initial cost of £5,000, leaving £3,000, on which the trust stipulated it receive 8 per cent interest for 10 years. The £200 allowance means £16 a year saving in surcharge at 8 per cent. The £3,000 I have referred to at 8 per cent (£240) divided among the 10 consumers would give a service to each farm at a £24 surcharge only. This has been made possible by the use of the single wire earth return system, a boon to farmers, giving them power at an economical cost and enabling them to use it effectively in the general running of their farms. Last year 755 miles of single wire high voltage lines were installed in rural areas. The total length of such lines in South Australia is now 1,877 miles. There were 135 extensions made last year, and ultimately supply on this system will be given to 10,000 consumers in rural areas—a fine achievement.

Then, recently, a single meter tariff for farm power consumption was introduced, which brought about real gains to the rural producer in the price he paid for his power. So we have thus far attained a single meter tariff, together with a reduction in the number of rural zones, the capital allowance made to a group agreement, and the interest charge being made only on capital investment for a period of 10 years (which has often been reduced to five). It is purely a return of five per cent or six per cent on the money borrowed, with the balance of two per cent

or three per cent for maintenance for five to 10 years. In Victoria, if a farmer desires power taken to his farm, he must, with his fellow farmers in a given location, pay the installation costs of the transmission line. That does not apply here. I should like to see this system extended as quickly as possible to give every person desiring power on his farm a supply under the present system; then that we should continue reducing the number of zones so that finally, and before long, we should have one zone covering the whole of South Australia.

Mr. Ryan: You do not favour that now?

Mr. LAUCKE: I do favour it now. Its implementation is proceeding under the direction of the trust, which is an authority running its affairs by delegation of power from Parliament. It is doing an excellent job and achieving the very end that both members opposite and members on this side seek. We do not want to say to the trust at this stage, "You must supply forthwith to country areas power at the same rate as applies in the city." If we said that, we could disrupt the present good management and conduct of the affairs of the trust, and miss out on basic extensions. Taking a long-range view of this, but looking not too far ahead, I can see that we shall have a single tariff throughout the State. It is a situation to which I look forward happily, in the interests both of those I represent (in the main, rural population) and of others. It so happens that my brothers and I are heavy users of power in five country areas but I still maintain that the policy of the trust in trying to achieve a single tariff for the whole State has been purposeful and has achieved many things in that direction. I am confident that, as soon as it is reasonably possible to achieve equality throughout the State, it will be done. I do not support this motion.

Mr. JENNINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.54 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, September 19, at 2 p.m.