

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, October 12, 1961.

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

ASSENT TO BILLS.

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Appraisers Act Amendment,
Adelaide Park Lands Alteration.

QUESTIONS.

PREMIERS' CONFERENCE.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: This morning I was told that a conference of State Premiers and the Prime Minister would probably be held on local government matters, particularly finance. During the discussion it was said that all local government bodies in Australia were short of money and had borrowed considerable sums. Does the Premier know anything of this conference and, if so, is he likely to attend to assist local government?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The only communication I have had from the Prime Minister in the last few days dealing with rating and local government is associated not with the Leader's question but with the rates that might be payable to councils by the diplomatic corps in Australia. That would not be a general matter, but would relate to rating on specific properties owned by foreign Governments in this country. The answer to the latter part of the Leader's question is simple. South Australia for many years has adopted the policy of being prepared to attend any conference requested by any other State Government or the Prime Minister. We have never refused to attend such conferences, because we realize their value, and I should be prepared to attend the one to which the Leader has referred. I agree that for some time anomalies have arisen because some councils have much Commonwealth property in their areas and, consequently, are deprived of rates on that land, whereas other councils have no Commonwealth property in their areas. Firstly, there is a certain inequality about it, and secondly, the functions of local government are available to all Commonwealth institutions the same as they are to other people, and therefore I do not think there is any reason why the Commonwealth should not reasonably support them.

HAIRDRESSING.

Mrs. STEELE: An announcement appeared in yesterday's Melbourne *Sun* to the effect that the Victorian Cabinet had decided to allow women's hairdressing salons to remain open until 10 p.m. on Thursdays to cater for working women. I understand that members of the South Australian branch of the Federated Hairdressers' Association may consider a similar move here, and as such a decision would be a great boon to the working public who cannot be given this service during the present hours, will the Premier say whether this matter could be considered?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes.

RADIUM HILL PROJECT.

Mr. McKEE: When recommending the closure of the £2,000,000 uranium treatment plant at Port Pirie, no doubt the special committee would have considered the future of this plant which, we know, has been very costly to the State. A press report stated that there was a possibility that this plant would be converted to a desalination plant. Can the Premier say whether the committee considered converting this to such a project or some other type of project, or whether the plant is likely to be taken over by private enterprise?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I saw the press report referred to by the honourable member, and I must confess that that was the first I had heard of the proposal for experiments in the desalting of water. Unless there is some major break-through in this field, I consider that the cost involved will be too high for us to consider such a proposal soon, except perhaps in isolated spots. The most favourable costs that I have seen would be regarded as excessive for anything but isolated places such as Andamooka. The costs would rule it out. We are investigating the possibility of providing an alternative industry at Port Pirie to take the place of the plant that may no longer be required when the uranium plant shuts down. One mission of Mr. Barnes overseas was to see to what extent rare earths could be produced at Port Pirie. We have also examined the position and had long and intimate talks with a world-wide company interested in the production of titanium, and there are other companies with which we have had discussions to see whether we can find some logical and satisfactory use for the plant. The honourable member spoke of its becoming "available to private enterprise" but, if private enterprise could put into this plant a worthwhile industry which would be a good

employer, I do not think he or any other honourable member would rule it out as something that should not be done, even if it was done by private enterprise. The Government's policy would be to make this plant available on liberal terms provided we got a satisfactory industry to use it, because the use of that plant is the important thing. The plant while idle is of no value, and would be of very little value if sold for breaking-up purposes. It is much more valuable if we can find a permanent use for it. As to whether or not an industry would be interested, we would not argue about the terms upon which the plant should be made available provided we were satisfied that it would be an industry providing useful employment and production in this State.

Mr. HEASLIP: In the question he has just asked, the member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee) said that the plant had been very expensive to the State. This uranium plant was part of the Radium Hill venture and I understood that over a period of years its cost had been amortized and that the plant had not cost the State any money. In addition to that, it has provided much employment and large funds overseas that we could not have had had it not been for this venture. Has this venture been expensive to the State?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I did not put the same construction on the honourable member's question as my colleague did. The honourable member said it was expensive, but I did not take his statement that it was expensive to the State as criticism. The position is that the project has not been a financial failure. The State borrowed from the Import and Export Bank of the United States and from the British Treasury certain moneys for the establishment of a plant, and those moneys were used to establish the plant in the most complete sense. For instance, nowhere else in the State has a project provided schools, nor has any other industry in the State been called on to provide housing or the capital cost of a railway line. All those things were part of the uranium project and were paid for out of the moneys originally borrowed for the establishment of this project. The final balance-sheet has not yet been made up, because the mine is still producing. We could not get a final balance-sheet until probably next February or March. Present indications are that all the borrowed money will have been repaid and some moneys provided in the State Budget for investigation will also be repaid, which will mean that all the assets of the mine, of

the town and of the treatment plant at Port Pirie will be free of debt. They will be free assets from the State's point of view. The honourable member for Rocky River is correct when he says that this mine has produced overseas exchange and large overseas credits. I think the total, when the final winding up takes place, will be about £15,000,000. More than that, over the period of its existence it has employed many South Australians, under extremely good conditions.

Mr. Fred Walsh: They were wanted up there.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Everyone associated with the field at Radium Hill will be sorry that the contract is completed. That of itself answers the interjection of the honourable member. The conditions provided have been good and I do not for one moment decry that: I think it is proper. The industry has been a success. Unfortunately we have no control over the world market for uranium, which has flopped. Today there are literally no uranium sales. The few sample sales made in recent years were at a price so low that no Australian mine could operate on it. Consequently, all mines in the world are in trouble when their contracts terminate. Most of the Canadian mines have closed down and, I think, the South African mines have reduced their production to extend the term of their agreements. They have not increased their tonnages. No financial problem is associated with the Radium Hill field. It has worked almost in accordance with what was contemplated when the agreement was drawn up.

Mr. HEASLIP: Recently I visited Radium Hill, where I witnessed a naturalization ceremony for nine people. I agree with the Premier that none of the residents of Radium Hill would voluntarily leave that happy community, but from the report of the special committee it would appear that Radium Hill will be closed down and, consequently, many men will be unemployed through no fault of their own. Can the Premier say whether the Government has considered this aspect and taken steps to provide for those men who may become unemployed when the mine ceases work?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Cabinet has discussed this matter and I have been authorized to see what can be done. I have had discussions with the Director of the Commonwealth Labour and National Service Department, Mr. Dwyer, and with the Public Service Commissioner. The Government intends

to appoint a committee consisting of the Director of Mines, the Engineer-in-Chief, the Public Service Commissioner and Mr. Dwyer to investigate the problem. It will commence its inquiries soon. Two officers will be sent to Radium Hill to ascertain the classifications of the employees involved. This may require the officers to interview the staff on the field.

Mr. Lawn: The mine will be closed down before that happens.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I disagree, because it will be done next week. I have also discussed with Mr. Cartledge questions about housing, but obviously we cannot proceed with that aspect until the question of employment is determined. I do not believe we will be successful in solving the unemployment problem completely, because some men were engaged as hard rock miners and we have no hard rock mines in South Australia. However, with the combined resources of the departments concerned and with the co-operation of the Commonwealth I believe we will achieve something. I assure all members that the Government will do its utmost to meet the position.

Mr. RICHES: Last week the member for Frome asked the Premier whether the Government would set up a re-employment committee as recommended by the Radium Hill Project Committee, and the Premier replied:

If a committee is recommended to be appointed for this purpose, I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that the honourable member may expect a Cabinet decision giving effect to that recommendation. I can assure him that that would be in keeping with Government policy on that. I will inform him as soon as a decision on this matter is reached by the Government and also on any committee that may be appointed.

This afternoon the Premier indicated an appointment of a committee with a different constitution from the one suggested by the Radium Hill Project Committee. Can he say whether the committee he referred to this afternoon will deal with re-employment, compensation and such other matters as have been recommended by the Radium Hill Project Committee in its report, or whether it will be an additional one?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I thought I had made it clear this afternoon that the committee had not yet been appointed. I said that Cabinet had concluded that such a committee should be appointed, and obviously the persons that I had included in the committee would be much better able, as far as the Government was concerned, to

arrange re-employment than anyone else. I am not overlooking the recommendations of the special committee that went into this matter, but obviously the big employment authorities are the Engineer-in-Chief, the Director of Mines and the Public Service Commissioner. With the co-operation of the Commonwealth Director of Labour and National Service, it is a strong and well-chosen body to deal with the question of employment within our own realm. When a precise decision has been reached I will convey the information to the honourable member.

Mr. McKEE: Last Tuesday, in the Premier's absence, I asked the Minister of Works a question concerning the payment of *pro rata* long service leave to employees at Radium Hill. Can the Premier say what Cabinet has decided?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Government would not be involved in payment of *pro rata* long service leave. This matter has many ramifications for other departments as well as for Radium Hill. The question of whether the Government can assist the personnel of Radium Hill in some other direction is being examined, but to tie it down to *pro rata* long service leave would involve the Government, over a very short period, in hundreds of thousands of pounds, so we could not establish such a precedent. Discussions are taking place at the Treasury and some useful conclusions are being arrived at. We would be able to give some assistance in other ways. I do not want the honourable member to feel that we do not understand the problem, but when we tie it up to something creating a precedent that will stand for all time, that is an administrative act. We cannot have *pro rata* long service leave in one department and deny it in another. Honourable members know that the moment it was paid in one department it would be demanded—and rightly so—in every other department, and it would be not long service leave but annual leave. We have never paid *pro rata* long service leave in any department. I am not suggesting that we will not try to help in re-establishing these persons in other ways, but this way would be extremely expensive because of the precedent that would be established. I cannot give the honourable member any assurance that we could carry that out, but I can say we are looking at the project generally.

Mr. McKEE: Can the Premier say whether, in the event of employees being transferred to

or being absorbed in other governmental instrumentalities, they will maintain their continuity of service for long service leave purposes?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have no problem at all in answering this question. Regarding any person who has been employed for a period at Radium Hill and who now transfers to some other department of the Government, there is not the slightest doubt that the Government will accept that period as being one on which long service leave can be computed and become payable.

LOADING EQUIPMENT.

Mr. DUNNAGE: I noticed in the press during the week that a big overseas ship loaded over 20,000 tons of iron oxide at Port Adelaide at 1,000 tons an hour. Does the equipment used belong to the Government? Do we have such equipment in any other port in South Australia? If we do, would it be available to any big company that would like to come here to mine iron ore, for instance?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The equipment in question is South Australian Government property. We have bulk-loading equipment available at a number of ports, not the identical equipment mentioned but equipment capable of the fast loading of bulk materials. Such equipment is already provided at Thevenard and Port Lincoln and it is intended to install similar equipment at Port Pirie. I have already informed another industry farther up the gulf that, if it can get satisfactory orders, we shall be prepared to install bulk-loading equipment in the area just south of the Port Augusta power-station. The answer to the question is "yes" and the Government has undertaken to establish this equipment wherever it can be shown that it is economically justified.

WHYALLA BRIDGE.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Can the Premier, representing the Minister of Roads in this House, tell me what stage the plans for the second bridge over the Whyalla to Iron Knob tram-line have reached, and whether there is any prospect of that bridge being started soon? It is a bridge which, I think, would go to the other side of the line opposite Norrie Avenue, on the north-west side of Whyalla.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have not the information the honourable member seeks but will see that the matter is brought to the notice of the Minister of Roads. I will try to have a reply ready by next Tuesday.

PRE-SCHOOL KINDERGARTENS.

Mr. RICHES: It has been the practice of the Kindergarten Union to subsidize kindergartens that have been able to obtain the services of fully qualified directors. The Port Augusta pre-school kindergarten, which experienced difficulty in obtaining the services of a fully qualified director in South Australia, enlisted the services of a teacher from Germany and brought her to this country. After serving a reasonable term at Port Augusta she left, and as each subsequent teacher has left (to get married or to come to Adelaide) the subsidy has ceased. Other kindergartens that are being established could and would employ fully qualified teachers if such were available, but until they are available the kindergartens are denied assistance with the result that an unfair proportion of the grant the Government makes available for this work is being spent in the metropolitan area. It has been suggested that these circumstances could be overcome if the Kindergarten Union appointed inspectors or established districts and had the work carried out under the direction of a visiting inspector or director. Will the Minister of Education have this suggestion examined and ask the Kindergarten Union whether it has any alternative suggestion that would help to ameliorate the difficulties of committees finding themselves in a serious predicament when the services of a qualified teacher are not available?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: I shall be pleased to consider the suggestion and to refer it to the Kindergarten Union for its expert opinion. I take this opportunity of saying—as I have said frequently over many years—that the Government has never accepted the responsibility for pre-school education, although it has voluntarily assumed a progressively higher financial responsibility. About 15 years ago it started with a nominal grant of £3,000 to the Kindergarten Union but this year it has increased it to about £171,000. However, 15 years ago there were only about 10 kindergartens in the State, all in and around the city of Adelaide, which catered for under-privileged children. Since then the ramifications of the Kindergarten Union have grown enormously and there are now 110 kindergartens; consequently, the Government has progressively increased its grant, but has wisely left the administration to the Kindergarten Union, which is a widely representative body comprising many experts in pre-school education. I do not know whether the honourable member's suggestion is practicable but I am sure the responsible officers of the Kindergarten Union will examine it. I will

be meeting with them within the next few weeks and I shall be pleased not only to examine the suggestion in the meantime, but to discuss it with them then.

Mr. RICHES: The Minister said that, when the Kindergarten Union was established, it catered specifically for underprivileged children. My impression is that, as where subsidies are not granted fees have to be charged, the need for catering for underprivileged children is not being met, generally speaking, today. When the Minister approaches the Kindergarten Union, will he obtain its opinion on that matter? I understand, too, that the Minister has at his disposal a reply to remarks I made during the Loan Estimates debate on this matter. I should appreciate it if he could make that information available to the House.

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: I shall be pleased to take up with the Kindergarten Union the point raised by the honourable member. On August 22, in discussing the Loan Estimates, the honourable member spoke at some length on the work of the Kindergarten Union in general, and its relation to Port Augusta and Willsden in particular. I referred the *Hansard* copy of his speech to the Kindergarten Union and received a reply on August 25 from the general secretary (Miss Dorothy Hughes). I have had it in my bag for a long time and I inadvertently overlooked supplying the honourable member with a copy. I now have pleasure in reading it to him:

It is the accepted principle throughout Australia that teachers in charge of approved pre-school centres should be trained. The organization of pre-school groups for educational purposes is a specialized piece of work and requires those in charge of them to have specialist training. This is a period in the child's life when, if he attends a pre-school group, his guidance should be in the hands of people who understand the nature of his growth and development. It has been said by specialists that a great number of personality problems in adult life can be traced back to the mismanagement of the child's emotional development during pre-school years. It really is because of the skill required in this area by the teachers who have charge of pre-school centres that anyone interested in young children should insist that those taking charge of such centres should have appropriate training.

Special consideration was given to the Port Augusta kindergarten earlier this year to enable it to carry on when it was without a trained teacher. In this case the committee was given adequate time to make suitable arrangements, which were made with the co-operation of the union. It is definitely not our policy to leave committees "high and

dry" or to cut off the subsidy unless every possible avenue has been explored without success. This has only happened twice in my experience, and in one of those cases the centre disaffiliated not under pressure from the union but because the committee itself saw no future for the centre for lack of local support.

The suggestion of having regional supervisors in country areas has been considered from time to time by the union but because of the lack of a sufficient number of senior teachers and lack of funds to finance such a project, we have not made any such appointments. This, however, is the kind of arrangement we try to make, on a temporary basis, to enable an established kindergarten to carry on if it loses its trained staff, *i.e.*, we try to arrange for temporary supervision of untrained staff, rather than withdraw the subsidy. On the other hand, we think you will agree that it would not be sound policy to give affiliation on this basis to new centres (such as Willsden) who have no trained staff, and then carry them in the hope that one day they may meet the requirements of affiliation met by other affiliated centres. We can only expand in accordance with the availability of staff and finance.

The following facts may be of interest:

There are at present 64 students in the college, the number having doubled since training allowances were introduced.

Of the 108 kindergartens operating under the supervision of the union 37 are in the country; of these, two are at Woomera, one at Whyalla and one at Port Augusta.

We especially welcome students from country districts and ask committees to make the course known as widely as possible to girls (and their parents) with a view to their enrolment at the college. To further interest girls in country work, this term four of our graduating students carried out a period of practice teaching in country centres.

I am sorry I did not supply that interesting and informative report to the honourable member before. I assure him again that I shall be pleased to take up the matter personally with the responsible officers of the union when I see them within the next two or three weeks and have a full discussion on the whole matter. I will then supply him with further detailed information as soon as possible.

COUNTRY FACTORIES AND SCAFFOLDING ACTS.

Mr. KING: Can the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Industry, say when the provisions of the Country Factories Act and the Scaffolding Act were brought into operation so far as Upper Murray districts were concerned; which towns or districts are concerned along the Murray; and to which other parts of the State these Acts apply?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: The provisions of the Country Factories Act and the Scaffolding Inspection Act were brought into operation so far as the Upper Murray districts are concerned by proclamation in the *Government Gazette* on September 14, 1961, which determined October 16 as the operative date of the proclamation. Towns or districts concerned along the Murray are Barmera, Berri, Loxton, Renmark and Waikerie. Other parts of the State to which these Acts apply are:

Country Factories Act:

Angaston, Gawler, Kadina, Millicent, Moonta, Mount Gambier, Murray Bridge, Naracoorte, Noarlunga, Salisbury and Munno Para, Nuriootpa, Port Augusta, Port Lincoln, Port Pirie, Penola, Tanunda, Wallaroo, Whyalla, Woodside.

Scaffolding Inspection Act:

Metropolitan area, Angaston, Blanchetown (site of new bridge), Gawler, Kadina, Moonta, Mount Gambier, Murray Bridge, Myponga Reservoir, Naracoorte, Noarlunga, Nuriootpa, Peterborough, Port Augusta, Port Lincoln, Port Pirie, Salisbury and Munno Para, Stirling, Tanunda, Tea Tree Gully, Victor Harbour, Wallaroo, Whyalla, Woomera.

BOGUS COMPANIES.

Mr. CASEY: Recently, several electors of the Frome district approached me and asked me to inquire whether the Attorney-General was aware that during the last two years in South Australia three men have separately borrowed from the public, mainly by high pressure salesmanship in country districts and without security, sums totalling not less than £600,000 and that these men have been declared bankrupt leaving the investors with little or no hope of recovering any of their money. Will the Minister of Education ascertain whether the Attorney-General is also aware that the men obtained this money from the public by registering business names containing the word "company" and by issuing documents, called indentures, bearing a seal and calculated to give the impression that the borrower in each case was a limited company that had complied with the provisions of the Companies Act relating to borrowing money from the public? Will the Minister consider what amendments to the legislation are necessary to prevent the misuse of registered business names in this way? Over £500,000 of public money appears to have been dissipated by these people. Will the Minister

see that full police investigations are made to ascertain whether criminal offences have been committed, and that criminal prosecutions are launched where offences are established?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: I shall be pleased to refer all the honourable member's requests to my colleague, but I assure him that the Attorney-General is well aware of most, if not all, of these matters and that they are causing him, the Crown Law Office and the Police Department serious concern. They have been the subject matter of discussions between them, the Attorney-General has referred them to Cabinet, and possible further action is being considered. In addition, the Attorney-General recently conferred with his fellow Attorneys-General of other States and the Commonwealth with the intention of bringing to an end as soon as possible these deplorable practices.

NORTH ADELAIDE CROSSING.

Mr. CUMBE: My question relates to the continued undesirable traffic conditions at the North Adelaide railway crossing, about which I have asked many questions but have got nowhere. In last night's *News*, in an article headed "Crossing makes them all cross", was a photograph of a long queue of motorists waiting impatiently to cross at this crossing, and the article said:

Irate motorists have been fuming at long delays at the North Adelaide rail crossing. They have called it a shocking inconvenience to motorists.

The reporter who dealt with this matter said:

From 5.15 to 5.45 ten trains thundered over the crossing holding up hundreds of cars for a total of 17 minutes.

The article also contained reports of interviews with several motorists. Is the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Railways and Local Government, aware that this crossing is causing much inconvenience to the public generally, and to motorists especially, and that it is becoming more and more congested because many motorists from the western and Port Adelaide districts who desire to go to the northern suburbs use the crossing, which is one of the few they can use? Will the Minister confer with his colleague and ascertain whether the Road Traffic Board, the Railways Department, the Adelaide City Council, the Highways and Local Government Department, and any other relevant authority can get together to evolve some plan to eliminate this bottleneck? It has been suggested that automatic gates, which I have advocated in the past, are not the

answer because the road situation is not satisfactory for their use. Will the Minister see whether a conference such as I suggested can be promoted?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Certainly.

COMPANY TAKE-OVER.

Mr. STOTT: In this morning's *Advertiser* it is reported that apparently an offer has been made to take over the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited by a big financial interest in a near eastern Asian country that has considerable millions of pounds to offer to take over this company in this and other States. Although this matter has not yet caused me any great concern, I (and probably other members) am interested to know whether, if this take-over offer is accepted, the agreement that the Government has with the company in relation to iron ore deposits will be affected, and what effect there will be on the proposal to build, at considerable expense, a dual main. Will the Premier say whether this State would become involved in any way with the Asian company and whether Cabinet will refer the matter to the Crown Law authorities, have the matter examined, and see how the agreement would be affected?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Evidently the honourable member has been misinformed; I assure him that it is not the Broken Hill Proprietary Company, but Broken Hill South Limited, that is involved. That is not a South Australian company; it is predominantly a New South Wales company regarding the mine, although I think the head office is in Melbourne. If the Broken Hill Proprietary company were available for £16,000,000, I should be prepared to organize a syndicate tomorrow to purchase it.

MEAT PRICES.

Mr. LAWN: In the last two or three weeks I have received several complaints about meat prices, and some people who have complained have said that they have watched prices and have noticed that whenever there has been an increase in the prices of carcasses at the abattoirs the prices to the consumer increase immediately but that, whenever there is a reduction in the price of carcasses, a considerable time elapses before any reduction is passed on to the consumer. In recent weeks the Prices Commissioner has issued a guide to meat prices. Will the Premier investigate this matter with a view to re-imposing price control on meat?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: As far as I know, the Prices Commissioner does not recommend that action at this stage. He has the approval of the Government to issue reports from time to time setting out what the price of meat, based upon the ruling prices at the abattoirs, should be. I believe that these reports have been of considerable value to the public and, in some instances, of some value to the industry. I believe they are being observed more and more by the industry and consumers, and that they serve a useful purpose. I do not know whether it would be possible or desirable to do this permanently, but at a time of fluctuating prices these reports undoubtedly have a use. Contrary to what the honourable member said, substantial reductions have been made in the price of various meats recently.

Mr. LAUCKE: Recently, I brought to the Premier's notice the wide disparity between the prices that producers receive for lambs marketed and of meat sold in shops. I referred at the time to the bad influence that this disparity would have on the producers' interests and said that disproportionate retail prices would tend to decrease demand and therefore prolong a glut in the wholesale market. This led to the introduction of the guide issued by the Prices Commissioner. Has there been any beneficial effect to the producer arising from the issue of this guide, which might have led to a greater consumption of lamb in South Australia?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Obviously, any reduction in prices to the consumer must cause expanding consumption. That applies to every industry; it is a well-known economic fact. There has been more stability in the lamb market since prices have been listed but I cannot say that the two things are completely and directly related because I believe that, apart from that, there has been a significant development: the Victorian market has brightened up and there has been some call from Victoria for South Australian lambs. It is inevitable that that results in a better deal for the consumer and in all ways leads to an increase in the volume of business.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Premier a report on the investigation made by officers of the Prices Department into beef prices at Port Pirie?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have not received that report yet. I referred the question to the Prices Commissioner who informed me that he would arrange for two officers to visit Port Pirie to check the position. I noticed in the press recently that the

local industry had adjusted the prices, but until I get the report I cannot answer the question.

STUD MERINO EXPORTS.

Mr. JENKINS: I understand that there is a complete ban on the export of stud merino sheep from Australia. On Monday I was told that there had been a considerable trade in the export of stud merino semen from New South Wales for the last three years, and that this was now being undertaken in South Australia. Will the Minister of Agriculture say whether this trade is being conducted under the supervision of the Commonwealth Government and, if it is not, in the interests of sheep breeders will he make some inquiries?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The embargo on the export of merino rams does not extend to the export of semen. I think this would be a matter entirely for the Commonwealth Government, but I shall inquire and obtain a report for the honourable member.

FIBROMA VIRUS.

Mr. HARDING: Some time ago I asked the Minister of Agriculture a question regarding the introduction into New South Wales of what is known as the Shoppe fibroma virus. It is freely introduced into that State for the purpose of inoculating rabbits, bred for commercial purposes, against myxomatosis. I have also drawn the Minister's attention to the complete ban on the introduction of this virus into Victoria. Has the Minister any information on this subject?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: This virus is a vaccine against the disease of myxomatosis in rabbits, and it has been so used for the protection of commercial rabbits. The question was discussed in the Agricultural Council some months ago because of the unsatisfactory assurances about the spread of the immunity. Although I do not know the probabilities of it, the immunity could spread to wild rabbits and thus weaken the effect of myxomatosis. Until that position is clarified, it is not easy to say much more. Its registration as a stock medicine has always been refused in South Australia, but even that does not prevent its use in certain circumstances should it be obtained from other sources. A proclamation has been made prohibiting the use of this vaccine within South Australia and, until the matter can be satisfactorily investigated with certainty by veterinary authorities, that prohibition will remain.

METROPOLITAN MILK SUPPLY.

Mr. BYWATERS: Yesterday I had the opportunity to look at the Metropolitan Milk Board's report, and I was interested in some comments by Mr. Gale. One was:

During the next ten years the minimum quantity of milk available daily will have to be increased considerably in order to maintain a safety margin. This can come from one or two sources—from present producers, or from additional producers in new areas.

I have previously taken up with Mr. Gale the question of admitting Cooke Plains into the pick-up area for the future, but at the time there was no vacancy, Meningie-Narrung having priority. However, in view of Mr. Gale's report, will the Minister of Agriculture take up with him the possibility of including the Cooke Plains area, which is fairly close to the river? It is an ideal spot for future development of dairying and has a large potential.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The question of additions to the area from which the metropolitan milk supply is obtained requires to be considered carefully, for such additions are generally opposed by the licensed dairymen in the existing areas.

Mr. Bywaters: Not when the need is there.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: At present, extensions to the area are generally resisted by the licensed dairymen. Additions have been made from time to time, but no new additions are contemplated at present, apart from Meningie-Narrung which will be included shortly. The question of extending an area is always difficult, because the increased distances add to the transport problems involved, and people who oppose the increase usually contend that the farmers within the existing areas can provide all the requirements. The production of milk varies considerably, according to the economic stresses in other primary industries. For example, should the price of wool fall, an increased interest would be taken in dairying inside the areas in which the licensed milk is produced, so sufficient milk might be produced within the existing areas. Although that does not happen rapidly, that factor has to be considered. However, I am perfectly willing to ask the Chairman of the Milk Board to consider the honourable member's question and give me a considered report on it.

CLEVE PROPERTY.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Further to my recent question about a property owned by the Government at Cleve, is the Minister of Agriculture aware that an operator has been crushing

material on this property for some years and has been disposing of it at about 25s. a yard? During Mr. Sims's lifetime a royalty was being paid to him. Can the Minister say whether the Government is collecting royalties on that material now?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The report I promised the honourable member is not yet to hand, but I shall see that that report includes an answer to this question also.

BORDERTOWN HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked on Tuesday as to whether the solid construction additions to the Bordertown high school would be ready for the scholastic year commencing February, 1963?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Director, Public Buildings Department, has advised me that the new buildings for the Bordertown high school, which are estimated to cost £80,000, appear as item number 64 on the priority list prepared by the Director of Education for new school buildings. Present indications are that funds will be available to let tenders for only approximately 20 of these schools during the 1961-62 financial year. In the case of Bordertown high school it is not possible to advise the commencement date for erection until it is known what funds will be available for new school buildings in subsequent financial years.

PREMIER'S TELECAST.

Mr. RYAN: On Thursday evenings the Premier usually announces some outstanding achievement concerning the creation of new industries in South Australia. This afternoon he gave notice of another industry to be brought into South Australia—Harmac (Aust.) Ltd. Can the Premier say whether the creation of this new industry will be the subject matter of his telecast this evening?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Government is doing so many good things at present that I am rather embarrassed with subjects. In fact, it will not be the subject of this evening's talk. Harmac has been the subject of long negotiations between the South Australian Government, on the one hand, and Australian and Canadian interests, on the other hand, for the establishment of a large industry at Mount Gambier. The fact that the indenture has been signed and can now be presented to Parliament will cause great satisfaction to honourable members generally. This evening, I was going to tell some

of the people of South Australia (and, I hope, the member for Port Adelaide) what the Government has done and is doing in the education and care of certain classes of children.

SHARK FISHING.

Mr. JENKINS: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about a close season on certain sharks during November?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The honourable member said that he had heard that some Victorian fishermen doubted the value of a close season on sharks. There is a close season on school sharks and gummy sharks in Victorian, South Australian, Tasmanian and Commonwealth waters during November. That restriction was imposed as a result of protracted discussions in the early 1950's which resulted in an agreement between the various States. Expert opinions vary on the value of such a close season, but I think Victorian opinion strongly favours it. This matter has been set down for discussion at the first meeting of the Fisheries Council to be held within the next few months. In the meantime, the close season will operate during November. There is no likelihood of this season being altered so far as I know, because there has been no move to alter it.

BUSH CHURCH AID SOCIETY.

Mr. LOVEDAY: The Bush Church Aid Society receives £1,000 a year from the Government as a maintenance grant, but the society is seeking financial assistance for the purchase of a new aeroplane to service the area. The service the society renders by means of the Flying Doctor Service is increasing annually. I instance that recently daily trips had to be made to Coober Pedy during the gastro-enteritis outbreak among aboriginal children. Because the grant paid to the society has not been altered for some years and is only a maintenance grant, and because of the increasing work the society is doing in the area with personnel who are working for much lower salaries than they could get elsewhere, will the Government consider assisting the purchase of a new aeroplane?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This matter has arisen since the preparation of the Estimates and as far as I know no application has been made to the Chief Secretary. However, I will refer the question to him to see whether he can assist in some way.

PENOLA HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. HARDING: Has the Minister of Works anything to report on the tenders that closed recently for the Penola high school?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Director of Public Buildings states that tenders for the proposed new high school at Penola have been received and are being considered.

LOCATION OF INDUSTRIES.

Mr. BYWATERS: I was most interested to hear this afternoon of the development taking place in the South-East and of the possible establishment of Harmae, particularly because of the suitability of the industry to the area. I also recognize that development at Whyalla has been carried out because of the iron ore deposits in that area. This morning I attended a symposium arranged by the Australian Institute of Agricultural Science and heard some interesting talks on water problems. The Engineer-in-Chief (Mr. Dridan) gave an excellent address in which he spoke about the miles of water mains throughout this State and the good work the department is doing. An interesting point was his comment that water was the most valuable mineral. Realizing that employment and industry must naturally be taken to where minerals exist (as is the case in some of the new ventures the Premier spoke about this afternoon) and having regard to future development, will the Premier consider placing industries near water instead of taking water to the people?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Obviously, the honourable member will realize that when an industry desires to establish in this State it often has decided preferences about where it can establish most successfully. Always associated with this matter are two problems: first, where the market is situated; and, secondly, where the raw materials are situated. These two things, more than anything else, govern the location of any industry. The two proposed industries mentioned were good examples of that. The steel industry was established at Whyalla because the iron ore was located there, and other services were taken to the spot. Similarly, if the Mount Gambier undertaking goes forward as intended, it will be established because the timber is there. I assure all members that if there is any chance of giving preference to the country and the Government is asked for an opinion it always does its utmost to see that industries are taken to country areas or to suggest that they go there. In fact, it gives much more assistance to an industry if it will establish in the country.

KEITH RAILWAY YARD.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Works obtained a reply from the Minister of Railways to my recent question about the Keith railway yard?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Minister of Railways has informed me that the Railways Commissioner is satisfied that the new yard at Keith has sufficient accommodation to handle all the traffic offering at present. However, it has been decided to retain for the time being the dead-end siding serving the grain stacking blocks so that experience can be gained in the operation of the new yard.

TELEPHONE DIRECTORY.

Mr. CASEY: If the Premier examines the South Australian telephone directory he will see that Cockburn and Mingary are not listed. Several telephone subscribers in that area have spoken to me as they have been perturbed that friends and relatives in the city and other parts of the State cannot find their telephone numbers in the directory. They are listed in the Broken Hill directory, and many people are under a misapprehension about this matter. Will the Premier take up this matter with the Postmaster-General and ask whether, when a new telephone directory is being printed, both these towns can be included in the South Australian directory?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I shall be pleased to do that.

BREAD PRICES.

Mr. LAWN: I received a letter today from a big organization in South Australia complaining about the price of bread. The writer said, among other things, that whilst advertising would be justified in regard to many articles, much advertising of bread, including television advertisements, takes place. He points out that people will buy bread without its being advertised as they must have it to live, and he feels that the consumer of bread is paying an unjust price because it must include a sum for advertising. Will the Premier take up this matter with the Prices Commissioner, obtain a report from him about the recently fixed price of bread and ask him to submit a report on what in his opinion the price of bread would be if in the fixation no allowance were made for this great amount of advertising?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I would not express an opinion about the effect of advertising on the price of bread, but some time ago an investigation was made on

advertising of other commodities and it was found that it tended to lower prices in some respects rather than increase them. By increasing the volume of sales, advertising lowered the unit value and was therefore favourable and not detrimental to prices. I am not speaking about bread, however, as that would probably be one commodity on which advertising would have the least effect in increasing total sales. However, bread is one commodity in respect of which a committee, with consumer and industry representatives, operates. As a result, consumers are directly represented and have the full facts of the industry before them before the price is determined. As far as I know, the prices now operating were fixed as a result of the unanimous recommendation of the committee.

Mr. Lawn: Will the Premier ask for a report?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes, I shall be happy to give any information obtainable to the honourable member.

LAMEROO ELECTRICITY DEPOT.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Works obtained a reply to a question I asked on October 8 on whether the Electricity Trust had purchased land for a depot at Lameroo and, if it had, when it intended to erect the necessary buildings?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Electricity Trust proposes to establish a depot in Lameroo and has purchased land for this purpose. Designs are at present being prepared and it is expected that construction will start early in 1962.

PUBLIC RELIEF.

Mr. LAWN: This morning I received a short letter from the administrator of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, a temporary shelter for homeless men at Whitmore Square, Adelaide. That letter reads:

The bearer is a lad from Central Australia who has had shelter with us. I sent him to the Public Welfare today for help if possible. He informs me that they told him he must be in the city a month before he is eligible for any help. As it must also be three weeks, perhaps longer, before he can obtain Federal social service help, what must a person in such circumstances do to get a living?

Earlier this afternoon the Premier told the member for Port Adelaide of the many good deeds his Government had done, so if the Premier has not done his good deed for the

day, can he tell me the reply to the last question in that letter? If our own Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department will not help him until he has been in the city for a month, what can I advise that person to do?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If the honourable member will let me have the correspondence I will examine the matter.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN AUSTRALIA CONSTITUTION BILL.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to give legal force and effect within the State to the provisions of the constitution of the Church of England in Australia and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

As its long title indicates, it has as its object the giving of legal force and effect in this State to a constitution for the Church of England in Australia. As honourable members know, there is no established church in Australia. The various denominations are governed by their own internal constitutions, rules and regulations without the direct intervention of the State except when, at their specific request, such intervention becomes necessary. Most frequently, the State is asked to intervene where property held upon trust is concerned, perhaps to authorize an alteration in the terms of the trust, perhaps to authorize a sale of property where power was not originally given.

The Church of England in Australia has been legally organized and is constituted in different ways in different States. In this State its legal basis is consensual; that is to say, its members voluntarily accept certain basic principles and subscribe to certain formal documents containing the rules of procedure and forms for use in the government of each diocese. The synods of both dioceses are incorporated under the Associations Incorporation Act. Since 1872 the Church of England, although having a separate legal existence in each State in Australia, has regulated its general affairs throughout the Commonwealth through the medium of a General Synod which meets in Sydney every five years but which has no legislative authority, being little more than a body set up and operating by the consent of the 25 autonomous dioceses of the church.

For some fifty years church leaders, clerical and lay, have laboured to bring about a constitution which would unite all the dioceses of the church throughout the country and provide a firm basis upon which the whole of the church could work and speak as a whole rather than in separate parts through the several dioceses. In 1955 the present general synod approved of a draft constitution which has now received the assent of every diocese in Australia, including those of Adelaide and Willochra in this State, and which is expected to come into force shortly. The constitution provides that it can be brought into operation when 18 dioceses have given their assent and Acts have been passed in five States. The other five States have, in fact, enacted the necessary legislation. It now remains for this Parliament, if it sees fit, to do likewise. The reason for enabling legislation is not, as might be supposed, that legislative force may be given to principles of faith and doctrine as such, but that the trusts upon which property held on behalf of the church may be related to the new constitution and that documents relating to the church shall be read and construed by reference to it.

The Government introduces this Bill at the request of the Diocese of Adelaide through its Bishop, with the concurrence of the Diocese of Willochra. The Bill has been seen in draft by the standing committee (the executive body) of the synod of the Diocese of Adelaide, acting in pursuance of a resolution of the full synod at its ordinary session last month accepting the constitution by a majority of over 75 per cent of clergy and laity of the diocese. The Diocese of Willochra accepted the constitution some time ago and left arrangements with respect to the necessary legislation to the synod of the Diocese of Adelaide.

This Bill will go before a Select Committee and I do not, therefore, go into detail as to the constitution itself. Approval of the constitution has not been unanimous. Indeed, by one vote the Synod of the Diocese of Adelaide rejected it in 1955 and there are still many who consider the constitution an unsatisfactory document, for one reason or another. I believe, however, that, as a Parliament, we are not concerned with internal objections and that, if we are satisfied that it is the wish of the church in this State as a whole that effect should be given to the constitution, we should be prepared to enact any legislation that is desired and necessary to that end. The operative clauses are clauses 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7. Clause 3 gives the constitution and

canons and rules made in accordance with it binding force in relation to property. Clause 4 provides that no canon or rule contrary to a law of the State shall have any effect. Clause 5 enacts that all statutes and documents, rules, regulations, etc., are to be read as if the name of the church in Australia were substituted for any name meaning the Church of England, however expressed. Clause 6 expressly empowers the administration of the customary oaths for church purposes, and clause 7 gives to the tribunals to be set up under the constitution the powers normally inhering in an arbitrator to summon and examine witnesses. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the Act and the coming into force of the constitution in accordance with its terms.

The foregoing clauses are common to the Acts which have been passed in the other States with such adaptations as local circumstances require. Clause 8 is, however, unique. It provides that the Diocese of Adelaide, by resolution confirmed at a subsequent session of the synod, can withdraw from the constitution upon which event the *status quo* is restored in relation to that diocese. This clause has been included with the concurrence of the Standing Committee of the synod of the Diocese of Adelaide which, in view of certain objections that have been seen to the constitution, felt that a clause on these lines would meet the objections of those who felt disinclined to accept the constitution unreservedly. The basis of the suggested clause is that should the diocese wish to withdraw from the constitution it could in any event approach Parliament for the necessary action. Clause 8 is designed to obviate the necessity for such action should the need arise. The clause is limited in its application to the Diocese of Adelaide.

As I have said, this is essentially a matter for the church itself and on which there will, of necessity, be a select committee to see that the facts are as contained in the Bill and as submitted by me to Parliament. I commend the Bill to honourable members. As this session of Parliament is nearing its close and it is necessary for this Bill to go to a select committee, I hope a long debate will not be necessary until the report of the committee is available. Otherwise, the Bill will not receive Parliament's approval this session. That, I think, would deprive the South Australian church of representation at the next synod proposed to be held under the new constitution.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I do not intend to delay the

passage of this Bill. I have received information on certain aspects of the Bill. I agree that the church should be enabled to determine its own affairs. The church is a Christian body and there should be no need for any dispute. The Bill will be investigated by a Select Committee and, consequently, I support the second reading.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart): I do not oppose the Bill, but like many people I cannot understand why it is necessary for Parliamentary approval to be obtained for a constitution for the church. I plead ignorance, and am not being critical, but there must be some reason for this procedure.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): We are not setting up a church by Act of Parliament, but at present all of the property held by the church is held by it in its present form and if the constitution has to be altered, the property must be transferred to the new authority. This is a legal device to enable the new authority to assume control of the property.

Mr. Fred Walsh: Would not similar circumstances apply to other denominations?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes, in certain circumstances. When we debated the Land Tax Act Amendment Bill I pointed out that one denomination had all of its property vested in the church itself. There are differences in the constitutions of various churches.

Mr. Riches: What did you mean by your reference to the inability of the church to attend synod?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If the church is not a member of the new synod it cannot attend it. I have no direct knowledge on this matter but I understand that it was agreed that if a certain number of the States joined in, and the necessary legislation were passed, a new order would be established. The South Australian Parliament is the only Parliament that has not passed the legislation and unless we do our State will be out. I am sure the Select Committee will make the necessary investigations.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of Messrs. Coumbe, Dunstan, Millhouse, Tapping, and Mrs. Steele; the Committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, to adjourn from place to place, and to report on October 26.

ROAD TRAFFIC BILL.

Committee's reports adopted.
Bill read a third time and passed.

BRANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Works): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to prohibit the placing or application of unscourable substances on the wool of sheep. The reason for the proposed prohibition is that manufacturers have complained that Australian wools have sometimes been found to contain tar, enamel paint and other unscourable substances and the special treatment necessary to get rid of those substances from wool increases the cost of manufacture considerably, and consequently adversely affects the price the primary producer can expect to receive. In order to meet this problem, section 28 of the Brands Act was amended in 1955 so as to read as follows:

A paint brand shall be made with a substance prescribed by regulation and shall be of a colour prescribed by regulation.

Pursuant to this amendment, regulations were promulgated to ensure that only scourable branding fluids would be used for registered paint brands and (as black substances could be mistaken for tar) that the colour black should not be used for any paint brand. However, this does not prevent the use of black or unscourable substances for purposes other than branding; for instance, placing unregistered marks on sheep or tar on wounds. Fortunately, such acts do not occur frequently but when they do occur the whole industry in South Australia is affected, and the Government feels that the only effective means of protecting the industry in this State is to prescribe a penalty for such acts.

Accordingly, clause 3 amends section 70 of the principal Act by inserting therein a new paragraph under which it will be an offence to place or apply on any sheep or on the fleece or skin of a sheep, whether for the purpose of branding or otherwise, any tar, paint or any substance that is black in colour or any substance whatsoever, other than raddle, grease crayon or a substance prescribed as a scourable substance or as one with which a paint brand may be made. The maximum penalty for the offence will be £25 or three months' imprisonment.

Mr. JENNINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

BOTANIC GARDEN ACT AMENDMENT
BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 5. Page 1089.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I have examined this Bill and consulted the principal Act, and I find that these amendments are necessary. I trust that the Botanic Garden Board will be able to continue its good work. I do not know what is involved in relation to the Mount Lofty annexe, but I see no reason why it should not be publicized. The board has done most valuable work and as a result we have an excellent botanic garden, which is a pleasant place to visit. I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

DOG FENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 10. Page 1129.)

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla): As this Bill proposes some fairly steep increases both in rates and in payments for maintaining the dog fence, I think it is worthwhile to refer briefly to the history of the legislation and to see the way in which these rates have been increased over the years. The first Dog Fence Bill was introduced in 1946 by the present Minister of Lands. Before its introduction, vermin was dealt with by vermin districts, the first of which was formed under the Vermin Act in 1896, and the enclosed areas were gradually extended from the more closely settled areas until by 1946 there was an outside dog-proof fence about 1,350 miles long extending from the New South Wales border to the west of the State. With the passing of the legislation in 1946, the inside fences were allowed to fall into disrepair. The Bill provided for the establishment of the Dog Fence Board, comprising the Chairman or a member of the Pastoral Board, two nominees of the Stockowners Association and one nominee of the Vermin Districts Association. The board was authorized to decide the site of the dog fence, which was to consist of existing fences, and new fences where required. The owner of the dog fence, that is, the person who had the dog fence on his property, had to inspect and maintain the fence in proper condition and destroy wild dogs in the vicinity of the fence. Under that first Act the board

had to pay every owner £8 a year per mile for the maintenance of the fence on his property and for other obligations, and he could devote part of that payment towards his interest payments on the cost of the fence.

The board was enabled to declare a rate on ratable land each financial year. The ratable land was similar to that defined in the Wild Dogs Act, and applied mainly to the northern areas. At that time the rate was not to exceed 1s. 3d. a square mile, and there was an additional rate, which was not to exceed 1s. 3d. a square mile, on all ratable land within 10 miles of the dog fence. That is to say, those owners who had land adjacent to the dog fence and within 10 miles of it had to pay an additional rate of 1s. 3d. a square mile. The occupiers who had the use of the fence then were paying for the fact that they had the use of it as well as the protection of it. In addition to that, a Government subsidy was provided in the Act so as to provide the board with extra finance, and that was determined at an amount equal to the rates paid on the ratable land.

At the time there was general support for the Bill from the Vermin Boards, landholders and the pastoralists most closely concerned. The Act was amended in 1953, and the maximum annual amount payable under section 24 was increased from £8 to £16. That is the amount payable to the owners of the dog fence for the maintenance of the fence itself. The Stockowners Association approved of the increase. The increased rate on the ratable land was also increased from 1s. 3d. to 3s. a square mile, no doubt because of the difference in the value of money since the original Act was passed. The additional rate on land within 10 miles of the fence was not increased at that time—in other words, it was left in its original form at 1s. 3d. a square mile—and the Government subsidy was not increased. It was also set down that the pound for pound subsidy was not to apply to the rates declared at an amount greater than 1s. 3d. a square mile. The Bill was carried without amendment, and there was only one speaker during the second reading debate.

The present Bill proposes to increase the amount payable to owners of parts of the dog fence from £16 to £30 a mile, which is a very steep increase. It also lays down that the maximum amount of rate which may be declared by the board on ratable land shall be increased from 3s. a square mile to 6s. a square mile. Here again, there is a steep increase, and it is questionable whether that is

really justified. The board has also recommended the repeal of the additional rate on ratable land within 10 miles of the dog fence, that is to say, the abolition of the additional rate on that land which is adjacent to the fence and owned by the persons living adjacent to it and receiving its protection. The Government subsidy is proposed to be increased from 1s. 3d. to 2s. a square mile of ratable land, owing to the increased cost of maintenance.

I inquired regarding the attitude of the Stockowners Association on these proposed increases, and I have been given to understand that they favour them because of the present unsatisfactory financial position of the board, but on the condition that the increase in rates to the maximum would be applied not immediately but only when such increases were warranted in view of the financial position of the board. In other words, they are prepared to see the rates increased only to the extent required to enable the board to function satisfactorily. I have had a look at the financial position of the board, and I find that it has had a deficit for at least the last two years. In 1960 the administration costs were £1,387, and payments were made to fence owners of £20,396. The total expenditure was £21,783. The board's income consisted of subsidy from the Government £6,494, the rates declared, £12,337, and penalties for late payment of rates, £50, making a total of £18,881. The deficit was therefore £2,902.

A similar position is shown in the Auditor-General's report for 1960-61. In that report the board's deficit is shown as £967—a slightly less deficit, but, nevertheless, in the red. Last year the board was charging the maximum rate allowed under the Act—3s. a square mile on ratable land—and also the maximum additional rate of 1s. 3d. for that area which was within 10 miles of the fence itself. The board therefore was getting in all the money possible under the provisions of the Act as it then stood. The Government subsidy paid for last year was £6,572. This amount appeared to me to exceed what was permissible under the Act, because apparently 94,000 square miles of ratable land comes under that legislation, and at 1s. 3d. a square mile that works out at £5,875. There may be a reason for this which the Minister might like to explain when he concludes the debate, but it seems that the subsidy paid out last year exceeded what was permitted under the Act, because the maximum rate was charged.

Q3

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Perhaps it was necessary to meet the board's deficit.

Mr. LOVEDAY: That may be so. Probably the board was in such a financial position that something extra had to be paid, but it shows that the provisions of the Act had to be exceeded in order to meet that position. I notice that under the new Bill the limit of Government subsidy is raised from 1s. 3d. to 2s. a square mile of the ratable land, and if that were paid to the limit of 2s. it would raise the total of the subsidy to £9,400 on the 94,000 square miles, which is a substantial lift. It is worthwhile looking at the possible financial position in the event of this Bill's being passed, and on doing so I find that the payment to fence owners could increase to the limit of £39,000 or so. The rates from ratable land could increase from just over £14,000 at present to over £28,000, at the 6s. limit on approximately 94,000 square miles.

The repeal of the section covering the power to impose an additional rate of 1s. 3d. on ratable land within 10 miles of the fence would mean a loss of revenue of about £640, which is derived from about 10,000 square miles. That is not a very serious amount, and in view of the situation over the years I would think that that was desirable and that it would probably simplify the rating arrangements under this Act. I have ascertained that the 94,000 square miles does not include all the area protected by the dog fence, because rates are not collectable from those owners of land within the ratable area whose holdings do not exceed four square miles; there would be a limited number of those because of the nature of the country.

When the Minister replies to the debate, I should like him to deal with the point raised by members of the Stockowners Association: that they would like to see these rates raised, not immediately to the maximum permissible under the new Bill but only to the extent necessary for the board to function properly and achieve a financial balance. Obviously, the board has been functioning at a disadvantage with deficits year after year, and that position should be rectified. But I do not think the rates should be increased beyond what is necessary to do the correct thing. The subsidy paid out last year seems to have exceeded what was permissible under the Act.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Has the honourable member the figures?

Mr. LOVEDAY: Last year (1960) the amount was £6,494; and it is £6,572 for 1961. There is not much difference between the two but obviously, in both cases, they seemed to exceed the permissible subsidy because, on the area given to me as the ratable area of 94,000 square miles at 1s. 3d., the amount payable would be £5,875. That figure is not necessarily correct to within a few pounds but, apparently, it would be about that. It is probable that the extra amount had to be paid for the board to function satisfactorily. With those few remarks and provisos, I see no reason why the Bill should not be supported. It is obviously necessary because of the changing value of money. The suggested provision repealing the present provision in respect of an additional rate on land within 10 miles of a fence seems desirable. It would not mean a great loss of revenue to the board. I support the second reading.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Acting Minister of Lands): Whilst I cannot now work out the exact figures for the area in question, I can say that the Government subsidy is £6,535, which is about the figure given by the honourable member. I can see nothing here to indicate that a subsidy was paid in excess of the 1s. 3d. rate. The matter is not vital. If I may, I will get the information for the honourable member and let him know in due course rather than hold up the progress of the Bill on that account. The main point of this legislation is that the Dog Fence Board is really a producers' organization run by the lessees in those pastoral areas protected by fencing. The names of the members of the board are well known to me. Its members are all outstanding graziers who have the confidence of the other lessees. I am sure that there would be no real dissension in that respect.

The whole purpose of raising the rates is to try to assist those people who have to maintain the fences by giving them extra money for each mile of maintenance. The releasing of graziers living within 10 miles of the fence from the extra levy was deemed advisable by the Dog Fence Board, after serious consideration. There would be no real difficulty in that respect. I will convey to the board the comments of the honourable member on the use of the maximum levy. Although I give no undertaking as to what is in the board's mind, I do not imagine for a moment that it intends immediately to apply the maximum levy that it would be entitled to under the Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 10. Page 1129.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): The provisions of this Bill affect the Governor's allowance and do not require debate. The Vice-Regal couple have become well known to, and are beloved by, the people of South Australia and I trust that their stay in our midst will be happy. I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

HOUSING AGREEMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 10. Page 1131.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): This is mainly a machinery Bill extending the provisions of the 1956 Housing Agreement for a further five years and its important part is the schedule which contains the amendments to the agreement between the Commonwealth and the States to take the place of the original agreement which was negotiated when the Chifley Government was in power in 1945. In the original agreement there was a provision that rents should be determined on what was called an economic basis and for a subsidy to assist persons whose family income was considered insufficient to meet rents fixed on that basis. In other words, provision was made to assist the less well-off sections of the community to meet the financial difficulties brought about by rising rents. It is true that this State never took advantage of that section of the agreement. As a matter of fact it did not take part in any of the provisions of the agreement until 1953-54, and I suggest that some of our citizens lost a good deal because of that and the Government alone is to blame.

The 1945 agreement provided that the Commonwealth would make funds available for housing at 3 per cent per annum. Because the bond rate had risen in the meantime, the rate was increased by the provisions of the 1956 agreement to 4 per cent per annum. Exactly the same provisions are continued in the present agreement because the rate is fixed at 1 per cent less than the bond rate

and this makes the interest charge 4½ per cent per annum on the funds to be made available under the present agreement. Interest charges form the major portion of the rental cost and, on present-day interest rates and construction costs, the charge to occupiers for interest alone would be about £3 per week, representing an increase of approximately 7s. 6d. a week on the interest charges under the old agreement. This is all part of the price we are called upon to pay because the Commonwealth Government has bowed the knee to Shylock. It set out deliberately in the early stages of its career to raise interest rates, and this action has had far-reaching consequences. It so disturbed the bond market that the price of bonds was depreciated until many investors, particularly the small ones, lost confidence in that type of investment. The result has been difficulty in filling the necessary Government loans required to meet the State's capital financial requirements.

The Commonwealth Government's most recent reaction to this has been to increase the bond rate still further, and this is the main reason for the increased cost of housing. The present Liberal Governments have got away from the intention of the original Housing Agreement of 1945 and to substantiate this view I quote from the first interim report of the Commonwealth Housing Commission of 1943, as follows:

State Governments should be requested (as a condition of participation of any subsidies and the securing of other financial assistance from the Commonwealth Government), to enact legislation setting up State housing authorities with powers, *inter alia*, to:

- (1) acquire land for housing projects;
- (2) effect slum clearance;
- (3) condemn and order demolition of any substandard dwellings;
- (4) construct dwelling units for rental and for purchase;
- (5) administer housing projects covering dwelling units for letting, at economic and sub-economic rents, and for purchase on easy terms;
- (6) make advances to assist the purchase or the erection of dwellings, the release of onerous mortgages, and the repair, alteration or extension of dwellings;
- (7) construct communal facilities;
- (8) purchase, distribute and/or manufacture building materials; and
- (9) delegate all or any of their powers and functions to an approved local government authority or a group of local government authorities.

This Government has done little towards meeting the recommendations of this commission. It is also interesting to note that the agree-

ment put before us is contrary to a statement issued recently on the authority of the Department of the Interior, which states:

The desirability remains, however, of making houses available to families on small incomes. Since the Federal and State Housing Agreement funds cater particularly for such people, it is this special part of the housing backlog which is most relevant to the decision on a new agreement.

That statement, emanating from the Commonwealth Government, clearly demonstrates that it is aware of the weaknesses in the present agreement. However, it has done nothing to rectify the agreement, because the new agreement is a reiteration of the old one. The Commonwealth Government has not devised any new approach to any of the matters contained in the original Housing Agreement which was introduced by the Chifley Government. I can recall, as no doubt can other members, when the then member for Semaphore (now the member for Port Adelaide in the Commonwealth Parliament) was appointed to the Housing Commission established by the Chifley Government. We know from experience that when the agreement was first introduced the emphasis was on cases of hardship, but what has the present Commonwealth Government done? All it has done is hinder it and prevent it from being the success it should have been. It has increased and increased the rate of interest on bonds and, not satisfied with making less money available to the State, is charging interest on the loan. How can we expect any improvement while it continues its present policy? The Commonwealth Government has no new approaches to this all-important question.

Despite my disappointment that the Bill does not provide any improvements on the 1956 agreement, the present rate of 4½ per cent is an improvement on what it would have been if the full bond rate had been charged, and I am forced into a cleft stick in not being able to oppose the Bill because there are only two alternatives open to us: namely, we either accept the Bill that has already been agreed to by the Commonwealth and State Housing Ministers or remove South Australia from the provisions of the Housing Agreement. Therefore, although I am not happy with some of the provisions of the agreement, I do not oppose the Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

HOUSING IMPROVEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 10, Page 1132.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): My understanding is that the Housing Trust was originally intended to cater for the lower income group, with emphasis on rental houses, whereas, in recent years, by the policy of the present Government, it has concentrated more on constructing houses for purchase. By no stretch of the imagination could it be said that these houses cater for the lower income group; that group would not be in a position to meet the mortgage payments of about £4 a week from a total income of about £14 a week.

In the housing field, the trust has done a most praiseworthy job but, despite statements to the contrary by the Government, the housing lag in South Australia has not been overtaken. If the Government does not put forward some effective plan shortly, the housing position will become completely out of hand within the next three to four years as a result of the increased birthrate just after the Second World War. The Bill before us is similar in intent to that presented to us in 1958, because it seeks to give the trust power to erect houses on any land for any persons, to erect houses and buildings on any land for any Government department or instrumentality, and to construct shops and buildings on its own land for the convenience of persons occupying houses erected by the housing authority. These activities are already being undertaken by the Housing Trust, but doubt has been raised on the legal validity of these actions. These activities are completely in accord with Labor's policy, because we feel that the prime need of any community is to be adequately housed and adequately served by the necessary and related services.

It is also of interest to note that the proposals put forward in this Bill are in accord with the social encyclical recently issued by Pope John XXIII. Thinking citizens everywhere will be deeply impressed by the encyclical's rejection of the belief held in some quarters that "Socialism growing in extent and depth necessarily reduces man to automation". This Bill is surely an example of Socialism within our own State, and this subject is one that has received such strong but unjust criticism from members opposite in recent months, wherein they have attempted to correlate Labor's policy with that of Communism. In my view, these members have only been paying

lip service to the criticism of Labor's socialistic policy, and it is exemplified by the socialistic Bill which is before us today. I suggest that members would find the encyclical I mentioned well worth reading.

The Government is seeking more powers for the Housing Trust, and I do not oppose this. However, I do not like to hear insults such as those made by the member for Gouger in a recent debate. Will he now rise to support this socialistic legislation, or will he run away from it? Under the legislation the trust will have the right to build these houses, and in addition it is to have the right to build many other structures the same as it has done at Elizabeth. Is there any other authority in Australia that has been given the same authority as the trust has been given through this Government?

We are told that Port Stanvac is to be built, and we know the trust has large areas there to be built upon. This Bill, which I heartily endorse as being a socialistic measure, will provide the wherewithal for the South Australian Housing Trust to do whatever building is necessary in that area. Let me say that I congratulate the planners of that area. Are any other factories to be erected there? If so, who is to build them? We are setting up a socialistic organization, and I heartily endorse that. The Government goes so far with a socialistic project and then it applies the brakes lest it go too far: it says to the trust, "You must call for tenders; we have to cater for some free enterprise."

Let us go the full length of the road! Give the right to the Housing Trust to go all the way, and give the right to the Minister of Works and his department to set up an organization to build schools and other things that are needed without sending the work out to free enterprise. That is what I am looking for. These amendments suit the Opposition admirably. Indeed, if my Party were on the Government side and attempted to do this a hullabaloo would be created around our ears. The Housing Trust must have built up some labour force. It has a labour force on salaries; it has a labour force that can make roads; and it has a labour force on day labour that is still working on improvements to roads. Why not give it the fullest authority? Members on the Government side, particularly the member for Gouger, are always slinging off at Socialism. Let the member for Gouger get up and preach private enterprise in opposition to this Bill! If he did, he would not get

any support from me. The Housing Trust is a socialistic enterprise, and as such it has the full blessing of this side of the House. The Bill is in line with Labor policy, and therefore I support the second reading.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): I say deliberately to the Leader of the Opposition that this is no more Socialism than many of the other things that have been named socialistic by our friends opposite seeking to tie a bit of a socialistic tag to the Playford administration. What the Leader said he wanted was Socialism, which would be a State authority that would employ its own workmen, lay down its own terms of employment, and do all its own planning and building as a Government instrumentality, whereas the set-up in South Australia is a little different from that. The Housing Trust calls for tenders for houses and for groups of shops to serve housing areas which it has built up. It is on competitive tendering that all this work has been done.

It is well known that under the present set-up South Australia is in the happy position that, taking a unit square as the basis for cost comparison, it can build the cheapest houses in Australia. Some States in Australia have had Labor Governments, and New South Wales has had one for a long time. If the Leader of the Opposition has some principle which we have not yet adopted in South Australia that will still further reduce our costs by engaging in a truly socialistic enterprise in the housing field, let him propound it. However, it is strange that Mr. Heffron (Premier of New South Wales) has not thought of it and has not evolved some method that would give the Leader of the Opposition here something to boast about.

Mr. Hall: Perhaps it is a different sort of Labor Party.

Mr. SHANNON: They see eye to eye on certain fundamental political philosophies, and I think the Leader and Mr. Heffron would be pretty good cobbers at any Labor gathering. The Party I have the honour to support in this Chamber and the Leader of the Opposition and his socialistic ideas are poles apart, and if this Bill were designed—as I know it was not—to set up a State department to actively enter into the field of constructing houses or factories or anything else, I should have some qualms about it. I do not think we would ever take that step in this State while the present Government was in office. We have had some unhappy experiences of State enterprises,

although not, fortunately, in this State. We have learned by bitter experience what happened in Queensland, where the Government had brickyards and bakers' shops and what-not, all of which were very handsome losers for the taxpayers.

Mr. Fred Walsh: What about our Electricity Trust?

Mr. SHANNON: I was one who opposed the basis on which the electricity undertaking was acquired.

Mr. Fred Walsh: You have been converted.

Mr. SHANNON: The basis of my objection, then, was that the value of shares on the market was not a proper basis for the transfer of the property involved, and I am still convinced that it was not a proper basis. That is what I said then, and I still maintain it. If the honourable member will bear with me for a moment, he will realize that share values on stock exchanges have little relation to the actual physical position that the company itself represents. Practically the only relation is to the dividend return. It is the amount it votes to its shareholders that decides the value of the shares. I should be unhappy were we to break away from our established practice in housing in South Australia of permitting private enterprise to do the work for us. If that were not to be the adopted principle, I should oppose this measure as heartily as I have opposed others I have not liked. I should take the rap, if rap there were. The Opposition, having made a decision, sticks rigidly to it, but we on this side have no inhibitions. I have been known on occasions to oppose measures brought down by the Government. One or two members are prepared to stand up for what they think, regardless of consequences. That is a healthy sign.

Mr. Lawn: We have more than "one or two" on this side.

Mr. SHANNON: I wish the member for Adelaide would show just a little individuality in that respect. The other day he appeared to be most lukewarm on a certain matter, to put it politely.

Mr. Lawn: You know you are wrong!

Mr. SHANNON: It sounded to most of us as though he were opposing a certain measure, but he voted for it all right in the end.

Mr. Lawn: That is not true; look at *Hansard!*

Mr. SHANNON: It is what we expect; I am not complaining. The tune of solidarity has been sung for many years, and I do not

complain. If that is Labor's policy, very well; but I personally like the individuality of the person to come out occasionally. It is a good thing for the State if we have individual opinions and the courage to express them, and occasionally exercise our vote according to our conscience. It is a good thing for everybody. Therefore, were it not for the fact that I knew that the present policy of the Government as regards housing would continue and that we would still use private enterprise to do all the construction work, I should be anxious about passing legislation that would increase its field of activity. But, since I have seen the Housing Trust in operation, I have come to have the utmost confidence not only in the trust itself but particularly in its management.

I think Mr. Ramsay has a first-class brain; he is a man with vision and has enough courage to follow the vision he sees. South Australia is fortunate, and probably we owe some of our success in this field to just that one man. I am not decrying Mr. Cartledge's work for a moment but I think the General Manager is probably the driving force, the man with the vision, the man who sees the road to take and has the courage to take it. I think Mr. Ramsay, if this were propounded to him, would be the last man in the world who would want to set up his own building organization and have his own plant and gangs of men employed by the trust. Of course, it constructs and repairs some roads occasionally but he would be the last man who would want to go in for it in a big way. He is much happier to call in gangs of organized people with their own set-up ready to carry out the required work. He is much more ready to use their skills, when they tender in the open field and so cut down our building costs. After all, our houses in cost and quality compare favourably with those of the eastern States.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart): First, I express my appreciation for all that the Housing Trust is doing. It is rendering a service to the State of which the State can be proud, but this Bill is not an amendment of the legislation that set up the Housing Trust: it is an amendment of the Housing Improvement Act. I shall say a few words about the promise contained in the original legislation when it was first introduced into this House—a promise which, like so many other promises emanating from the Liberal Party, has never been fulfilled. I urge the necessity of giving effect

to the real purposes of the Housing Improvement Act. I have been checking through *Hansard* to ensure that my memory is correct. I notice that, when the legislation was first introduced, an extraordinary step was taken. I do not know that it had ever been taken before, or has ever been taken since. When the Premier (Sir Thomas Playford) sought leave to introduce that Bill, the motion before the House—"That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced"—was debated. I am reminded that I am one of those who debated that motion. We agreed that the Bill should be introduced and a committee set up to draft it, but the title of the Bill related to the metropolitan area. I took the view (and I notice that the then Leader did, too) that the House should instruct the committee preparing the Bill to prepare a Bill that would have State-wide ramifications and not one confined to the metropolitan area.

The Bill that was introduced set out to give the Housing Trust, as a housing authority, the right to carry out improvements in housing in established areas, apart from building new houses; the right to acquire property compulsorily, to tear down slums and to build new houses. That was the picture presented to this House. That was the authority given to the Housing Trust as the authority under the Housing Improvement Act but, as far as I know, those provisions have never been implemented. In 1940 I produced evidence to demonstrate the need for that kind of thing to be done at Port Augusta, and there was a committee of inquiry that had conducted a survey on foot through the metropolitan area. It consisted of, amongst others, the present Chairman of the Housing Trust (Mr. Cartledge), the present Town Clerk of Adelaide, and others, who drew attention to the awful conditions in which people were living, the slum conditions referred to by the Premier, in nearly every back lane in the metropolitan area. The legislation was designed so that those slum conditions could be removed and people should not be ashamed to walk down the back lanes of the city. That legislation was to carry out housing improvements.

The big difference between this Government and the New South Wales housing authority is that in New South Wales they have attended to this job and have bulldozed slums and erected workers' flats in their stead. The time is past when we should be rebuilding some of our substandard houses. This should be done immediately at Port Augusta, which is one

of the oldest towns in South Australia, having celebrated its centenary years ago. Buildings have deteriorated over the years and have been condemned as unfit for habitation, but they are still occupied and the tenants are paying exorbitant rents.

Mr. Shannon: If they are not habitable, what has the local board of health done?

Mr. RICHES: It has condemned them.

Mr. Shannon: What has the council done?

Mr. RICHES: It has served notices on the owners and tenants. The next step, of course, would be to put the tenants into the street.

Mr. Shannon: You have served notices, and there the position has stopped.

Mr. RICHES: No. As these houses have become vacant we have seen to it that they have not been reoccupied. We have used every means at our disposal to facilitate the transfer of the tenants into other houses. The medical officer has attended the last three meetings of the local board of health to point out the seriousness of the situation. He instanced the case of a war widow and her son. Her health is being affected by her remaining in a sub-standard house. The owner does not live in Port Augusta. The house should be demolished, but until some other accommodation is available for this woman it cannot be demolished. The Housing Trust has not yet provided any accommodation in the country for people who live alone.

Under this Bill we are giving the authority that was established to improve our housing the right to build factories and to extend its work in many other directions. I favour that, but I urge that this should not be done at the expense of the housing programme. The housing authority should not be permitted to lose sight of the reason why this legislation was originally introduced. This is essentially legislation relating to housing improvement, but I know of no evidence of its provisions being implemented. The legislation was introduced in 1940 and although 21 years have elapsed there is no evidence that slums have been demolished and houses erected in their stead. When the legislation was introduced the then Leader of the Opposition said that it was excellent. The Government had to introduce it, following on the report of the independent committee. There were public demands and a State-wide agitation that no Parliament could ignore. However, when the Opposition questioned whether the Government intended to implement the provisions the Premier said that

we were being super-critical and chided us for not being co-operative because we expressed that fear.

Mr. Hall: How many houses have been built by the trust at Port Augusta?

Mr. RICHES: A power-station has been established at Port Augusta and about 400 houses have been built. At the outset I said that I have the greatest admiration and respect for the work of the trust. Our population has increased and consequently we have had to build houses to get operatives at Port Augusta, but the housing situation there is as desperate now as it was 21 years ago and just as many people are seeking houses. That is not common to Port Augusta. Except where houses have been pulled down to make way for service stations in the metropolitan area, where have houses been built to take the place of slums? This legislation was wonderful in its conception, and would be in the forefront of any legislation in the Commonwealth. I have referred to its history to emphasize what has transpired. I know that there have been difficulties, but I hope that the object of the parent Act will not be overlooked. The longer we delay, the harder it will be to overcome the difficulties. Not many countries have been able to grapple with this problem successfully.

Mr. Shannon: You have acknowledged that at Port Augusta you cannot cope with the problem. You have issued notices but cannot implement them, so your criticism is not fair.

Mr. RICHES: The parent Act was designed to meet that situation, but the machinery has not been put into operation, although we have made overtures. We asked for a survey to be made in Port Augusta as was made in Adelaide. Following that survey, officers of the Housing Trust who were sent to Port Augusta suggested as a solution that the trust would try to make available 12 houses a year to accommodate people from substandard houses if the local board of health undertook that as the people were rehoused the old houses would be demolished or would not be re-occupied until they were repaired. Some families have been housed under that proposal, but houses are not being built sufficiently fast. Earlier this year, in reply to a question on notice, I was told that there were then more than 60 applicants for houses which could be approved, but the Government is building at the rate of only 20 a year.

That leads me to the next reason why I have risen—to ask that that programme should be stepped up. We know that many houses have been built in various parts of the State

and much impetus given to building in one area by retarding the amount of building in another area. I do not want to criticize the trust unduly on that score, because I realize that in spite of what we hear about money being made available for housing, when one approaches officers of the trust they will show one documents and instructions to curtail programmes. I believe the trust is doing the best possible with the money made available in its attempt to apportion its operations as fairly as possible. I am not passing any aspersions on the officers responsible. Since the original legislation was passed 21 years ago the problems it sought to overcome are still with us and are still likely to be with us. I hope that the trust and the Government will not lose sight of the purpose of this legislation and the need to give effect to it. I make it clear that I am not objecting to any of the other work the trust is doing in building factories and homes for people who have not the opportunity to build homes for themselves. For instance, I do not object to the trust's building homes for the Broken Hill Proprietary Company.

Mr. Hall: What are you really objecting to?

Mr. RICHES: I think that I explained in the first place that I was supporting the Bill. If I did not, I apologize to the honourable member. I have confidence in and respect for the Housing Trust, but I am restating the need that was envisaged when the parent Bill

was introduced 21 years ago and I am asking that the powers that be, whether the Government or the trust, should not lose sight of that need. I am urging, as far as I am able, the necessity for the trust to do more immediately in my district than has been done in the past, because the position has deteriorated. We have the money, the materials and the men to build skyscrapers in Adelaide. One cannot walk around the city without seeing these buildings reaching to the sky everywhere. I hope that we shall not lose sight of the ideal which captured our imagination when the original legislation was introduced. New South Wales has given us a start and what it is doing should not be beyond our best endeavours. The housing that I saw over there gave me much satisfaction and I think that this State is capable of following that State's lead. I do not write the people of South Australia down to that extent and I do not object to the Housing Trust's building houses at Whyalla for the B.H.P. Company or at Port Stanvac, but I ask that we should not lose sight of the building of houses for people who need them most and who cannot get them with their own resources. With those few remarks, I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.18 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, October 17, at 2 p.m.