

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Tuesday, September 16, 1952.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Walter Duncan) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

SUPPLY ACT (No. 2).

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor intimated by message his assent to the Supply Act (No. 2).

DEATH OF MR. H. C. DUNN.

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN (Chief Secretary)—I move—

That as a token of respect to the memory of the late Mr. Herbert Charles Dunn the sitting of the Council be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

Since our adjournment on August 21 we have suffered a severe loss in the death of Mr. H. C. Dunn, the member for Stirling in the House of Assembly. He represented that district ever since it became a single electorate in 1938 and his friendly personality and many good qualities endeared him to all members of this Parliament whatever their political views. He was a member of the Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement for 3½ years, a life member of the Agricultural Bureau, with which he was associated for 35 years, a member of the district council of Strathalbyn for 22 years and at one time its chairman. We respected him because of his integrity and tolerance and on behalf of the Council I express deep sorrow at his death and extend sympathy to his widow and family.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—It is with a feeling of regret that I find it necessary to support the remarks of the Chief Secretary. The late Mr. Dunn served his Party and this State faithfully and well over a long period and he won the respect of all of us. Let it be some small consolation to his widow and family to know, in their time of sorrow, that we extend our deepest sympathy to them and may God help them to bear their sad trial.

Members carried the motion by standing in their places.

The sitting was suspended from 2.4 p.m. until 2.30 p.m.

QUESTIONS.**LEASING OF CARAVANS.**

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—An ex-serviceman with two children was renting a caravan on a block of land but during his absence the cara-

van was taken away and the family left in the street. Can the Attorney-General explain the law in this matter?

The Hon. R. J. RUDALL—If the honourable member will supply me with the particulars I will be glad to help him in any way.

EYRE PENINSULA RAILWAYS.

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS (on notice)—To what extent will the Eyre Peninsula railways system participate in the proposed programme for new rolling stock and equipment?

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—The Railways Commissioner reports:—

The completion of the broad gauge working to Kalangadoo will enable three "T" class locomotives, two brakevans and 56 freight cars to be released for the West Coast. Plans are also in hand for the provision of a reconstructed rail car and trailer, and this rail car and trailer will be given a high priority and should be available early in the next financial year. This vehicle will be provided with modern seating and the bogies will be of the latest modern design with deep springing to provide the maximum comfort on the narrow gauge tracks. The grain and superphosphate trucks are bogie vehicles, very suitable for the handling of wheat and are of modern design, having been constructed during the war. It is expected that the work will be completed to Kalangadoo by the middle of October, but the following programme for the shipping of rolling stock has already been finalized with the Adelaide Steamship Company and will be implemented irrespective of the progress of the work in the South-East. September 8, one "T" class engine; September 15, one "T" class engine; September 20, seven bogie trucks, thereafter seven bogie vehicles, inclusive of brakevans, each week until November 15; November 22, one "T" class engine. The "T" class engines and the new freight cars will thus be available before the next wheat harvest, in addition to which it is confidently anticipated that the whole of the old wheat required to be shipped will be moved to ports before the end of December.

PORT AUGUSTA SUB-BRANCH R.S.S. AND A.I.L.A. (PURCHASE OF LAND) BILL.

The Hon. R. J. RUDALL (Attorney-General) brought up the report of the Select Committee.

Ordered to be printed.

KANGAROO ISLAND DEVELOPMENT.

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the fourth report of the Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement on Kangaroo Island development (Crown lands in the hundred of Ritchie and part hundred of McDonald—settlement "D").

HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 20. Page 451.)

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—In supporting the second reading I draw honourable members' attention to the Notice Paper. This is one of three Bills which has been introduced in this Chamber first and notice was given today of the intention to introduce a further Bill. In last week's press there was a statement from the Liberal and Country League concerning a vote against a referendum. The *Advertiser* reported:—

A resolution urging the State Government to submit the question of a State lottery to the people by referendum either for final approval or rejection was defeated by a large majority at the annual meeting of the Liberal and Country League yesterday. It was pointed out that to hold such a State referendum would cut across the functions of the Legislative Council as a House of review.

How can it be said that this is a House of review when out of seven measures introduced into Parliament three have been introduced in this Chamber first? This Chamber is not merely a House of review; it is also a House of initiation. That has been proved.

Last year the Health Act was amended dealing with tuberculosis and the examination of individual suspects. It introduced compulsion under a penalty not exceeding £10. The Act also dealt with the enforcement of an order for individual examinations. Section 128 of the Health Act, 1935-1943, provides:—

Every medical practitioner attendant on or consulted by any person suffering from pulmonary tuberculosis or any other form of tuberculosis shall, so soon as the fact becomes known to him, report the same (together with particulars of the form of tuberculosis from which the person is suffering) to the Central Board: Provided the notification shall not be necessary if the case has been previously reported to the Central Board.

Prior to that a practitioner had to report to the local board of health in the district in which the person resided. Section 129 provides that the local board shall pay 2s. to the medical practitioner for every report made by him and that if one was made concerning two or more persons in the same building only one such fee was payable. Under the 1950 Act "local board" was deleted and "Central Board" inserted. The Bill requires more information to be supplied about priorities for admission of persons to hospital, X-ray examination reports, the eligibility for tubercular allowances, and so on. A regulation is to be promulgated prescribing the form of report.

The Bill will increase the fee of 2s. 0d. paid to private medical practitioners to 10s. 6d., but no fee is to be paid to any medical officer of an institution. In 1951 the Central Board of Health's receipts totalled £1,910, payments for administrative expenses being £36,416. The proposed increase will mean extra expenditure to the board.

Parkside Mental Hospital will deal with cases mentioned in the Bill. Provision is to be made for 30 inmates of Ward M.O.B., about two-thirds of them being sufferers from pulmonary tuberculosis or from a condition believed to be pulmonary tuberculosis. In addition, tuberculosis patients were found in other wards because of the unsuitability of Ward M.O.B. to adequately control them. A new ward for tubercular male persons at Parkside Hospital has been recommended at a cost of £72,455 and it will accommodate 30 patients. Last year differences of opinion on the legislation existed, but I believe that many of them have been ironed out since the Act was passed. As Parliament saw fit to pass that legislation it is only right that extra precautions should be taken now. I think that the Government, on the recommendation of the Public Works Committee, is proceeding with the work, which is a step in the right direction and I sincerely hope that something further will be done in this matter. I support the second reading.

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE (Midland)—The Bill needs no deep explanation as it merely sets out, as many small amending Bills do, to rectify some anomalies or adjust some provisions nearer to modern requirements. The Act provides for a brief notification by a doctor that a patient is a sufferer from tuberculosis. With the present incessant form filling it was probably thought that it would be just as well to get a little more information and allow a doctor to furnish additional information and to express his opinion as to the extent of the illness. I think the increased fee should adequately recompense a doctor for expressing his professional opinion. He will obtain a little more for his trouble and at the same time afford the authorities a little information on the patient.

Mr. Condon referred to compulsory X-ray examinations held to assess the extent of tuberculosis throughout the State with the idea of controlling it. Members will recall, during the debate, the trepidation with which we approached the compulsory clauses and how it was felt that any form of compulsory

examination and the concomitant disciplining of those who would not readily submit to an examination and the concomitant disciplining. The Central Board of Health, in charge of operations, approached the matter wisely by selecting a small and fairly densely populated area for what might be called a "guinea pig." The board's approach to that was on sound psychological lines. People in Clare and parts of the surrounding district had time to talk the matter over and get used to the idea. It was pointed out that, ultimately, it would be all to their good and in the immediate instance would not inconvenience anybody. It was found that in the area in question not only people in the age group between 14 and 65 readily submitted themselves to medical examination, but many people outside that group and others who lived outside the local government area voluntarily sought to be examined. I believe there was no instance of anyone refusing to co-operate and only one case was reported. This person was sent to Adelaide for further treatment. He was away for about 14 weeks and was finally found not to be a sufferer from T.B. If anyone might be said to have cause for complaint it was he, but he was full of praise for the scheme, expressing freely his appreciation of the fact that it was much better for him to have submitted to that careful examination and treatment than to be let loose in the community, and possibly infect other people. I thought the Council would be interested to hear that in this very thorough guinea-pig test of compulsory examination the community it was tried on accepted it very well, which augers well for the future of the scheme. Without prejudicing any further attempt at similar legislation I think it may encourage compulsory examination in regard to other things detrimental to the health of the community. I support the second reading.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY secured the adjournment of the debate.

BUILDING OPERATIONS BILL.

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 21. Page 499.)

The Hon. F. T. PERRY (Central No. 2)—Members who have spoken so far in this debate, and I think also the Minister in his second reading speech, have deplored the fact that the Loan Estimates provide for a lower sum this

year than last, but I feel there is no need for regret about that. I have always thought it axiomatic in political affairs that loan money should be reserved as far as possible for expenditure during a drought year, or when some other misfortune overtakes a country, rather than when the country is prosperous, and I suggest that the prosperity of Australia over the last few years can be summed up in the value of our exportable products. It is true that we have allowed our domestic economy to get out of order, and the position is not as satisfactory from that point of view as we would like, but I maintain that at no time in its history has the prosperity of the State been greater. The prices for metals, wheat and wool have all been very high and that money has flowed back into the pockets of the people, so I do not have any regrets that the amount provided in this Bill this year is lower than last year.

My colleague, Sir Wallace Sandford, indicated the progressive increases in loan expenditure over the last few years from about £7,000,000 in 1948-49 to £42,000,000 last year, although it is true, as he said, that only £31,000,000 of that was spent. The Bill purports to provide £29,000,000 of loan money for the present year, or £2,000,000 less than was spent last year, but we find that that is not all. Clause 9 provides that if the Treasurer is able to find the money he is permitted to expend a further £8,000,000, and clause 10 authorizes the expenditure of an additional £6,000,000 in the early part of 1953-4. This seems to indicate that the Treasurer and the Government are expecting to spend the £29,000,000 authorized by this Bill, a further £8,000,000 if they can get it from the Loan fund, and another £6,000,000 to be provided for in the early part of 1953-54. This, I think, is a rather unprecedented clause in Bills of this nature. In fact the Bill authorizes an expenditure of between £42,000,000 and £43,000,000, therefore, although it has been instanced as a decreased vote on that of last year, it is actually a bigger vote than appears on the face of it.

It is rather interesting to note that State Governments have been the last to be surprised and disconcerted at the change that has developed in the loan market in the last 18 months. As I see it, funds for the loan market are replenished by the savings of the people and their willingness to invest in loans by either Governments or companies at satisfactory rates of interest. Every bank or institution which

handles peoples' savings must naturally feel some responsibility both as to the principal and the rate of interest to be paid. The present demands on the loan market by the Government and industry have reached a point where the savings of the people are not sufficient, and the willingness of the public to invest money is not as apparent as it was. High wages and short production, with a resultant tendency to inflation, have had an effect and we are now going through a period of adjustment before reaching that state of equilibrium which we all desire. In the last few years loan expenditure has caused me some concern and I have extracted a few figures which may be of interest. In 1939 the population of South Australia was 595,000 but at present it is estimated at 730,000, an increase of 22 per cent. The State revenue in 1939 was £12,300,000 and in 1951-52 was £37,000,000, an increase of 300 per cent. The increase in revenue per head of population was 250 per cent higher than in 1939 when the amount was £20 as against £50 now. The greater the number of people the less the amount per head of population and the less the individual responsibility.

The Hon. E. Anthony—Should not that be the other way about?

The Hon. F. T. PERRY—No. In 1938-39 the loans were £2,600,000 but in 1951-52 the actual money spent was £31,200,000, or an increase of 1,200 per cent. In 1938-39 that represented £4 7s. a head of population, but in 1951-52 it was £42 15s., an increase of 100 per cent, again showing that the greater the spread of population the lesser the individual responsibility. These contrasts are perhaps not as fair as they should be in as much as in 1938-39 the expenditure on housing was nowhere near as great as now. We also did not have the Electricity Trust nor were the tramways so dependent on Government assistance. After deducting those amounts the figure for loans in 1938-39 was £2,350,000 and in 1951-52 £19,000,000, an increase of 800 per cent. In September, 1939, the basic wage was £3 18s. a week, but in September, 1952, it was £11 4s., an increase of 300 per cent. In 1939 the deposits in the State Savings Bank were £24,230,000 and in 1951-52 they were £81,223,000, an increase of 335 per cent. These figures are relevant in the State's economy and in examining these figures it is obvious that there is a 300 per cent increase in them all with the exception of the loans. It seems that the Government and the people are expecting a position that cannot be maintained. Loan moneys come from the savings

of the people which have increased by only 335 per cent whereas our loan expenditure has increased by 800 per cent. There are other means of raising money. It could be raised from bank credit, which I would not support except as a last resort, or it could be obtained from abroad but we would have to pay a higher rate of interest than we have been paying in the last few years.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—You are not suggesting that the money to be expended will not benefit the State?

The Hon. F. T. PERRY—No, but I point out that we are departing from the principle we once accepted, namely, that we should spend Government money when calamity or adversity faced the country. We should have a pool of money available for such times and should not be spending so much when the country is as prosperous as it can be. It is time the position was considered and there is nobody more competent to consider it than the Government which has a great responsibility to see that the future stability of the country is not jeopardized.

It is proposed to spend £3,800,000 at Radium Hill. Members will realize that this is not the first time that a similar line has appeared in the loan accounts. I presume that, including last year's allocation, at least £4,500,000 will be spent at Radium Hill in obtaining the ore and processing it for export. Members who visited Radium Hill appreciate that the products of this mine have a great potential value to the State. I pay tribute to Mr. Dickinson, the Director of Mines, for his outstanding work, energy and judgment in the development of this project, also to his officers and to the Premier for his unswerving belief and faith in its development. We must realize that other discoveries are being made and from press reports it appears that the Rum Jungle discovery in the Northern Territory has even greater possibilities than Radium Hill. I am in favour of developing Radium Hill but I am surprised that an amount of £3,800,000 is to be provided when there has been no intimation as to the ultimate cost of development. The veil of secrecy has been drawn over everything connected with uranium and we are being asked to pass high loan expenditure with very little information. When I read in the press and hear over the wireless such a flood of general matter dealing with nuclear energy I wonder what is the reason for the secrecy about the actual mining of concentrates at Radium Hill. The matter

is not explained and we can only imagine the production of uranium has some effect on world affairs. This Council has not been given sufficient information on the method of development of the mine at Radium Hill. I presume that the Government is satisfied that it will have a sufficient life to pay for the cost of production and eventually repay loan expenditure, otherwise it would not ask for Parliamentary appropriation.

Parliament passed legislation in 1949 giving the Minister of Mines extremely wide powers for mining uranium and the treatment of the ore. That was in the early stages of uranium research. Again, in 1951, legislation was passed giving the Minister power to proceed with certain work without reference to the Public Works Standing Committee. No real objection was raised to either measure as the work was still in the investigational stages. It appears that that stage has passed and we are entering the stage of planning for production and the actual production of ore. This raises a doubt in my mind whether the actual running of a mine of such magnitude by the Minister of Mines and the Mines Department is the best course to adopt. I do not cast any reflection on the Minister, who has much work to do as Minister of Health and Chief Secretary.

The Hon. E. Anthony—It is a big job for any department to undertake.

The Hon. F. T. PERRY—Exactly. The Mines Department has done a good job so far, but it is an advisory and service department only, comprising experts in their work. Production mining, I think, is foreign to the department and Government routine is not the best for managing or running an activity so diversified as mining. I say that in all seriousness. I cast no reflection on Government methods of control, but from the very nature of it Government control puts on a brake and causes stoppages in places which would not happen under some other form of control. The Radium Hill mine is a definite project and should be established on the best possible basis for its future development. I do not know whether the Government has decided on the method proposed to be adopted. It has never indicated how the management and work will be carried on.

The Hon. E. Anthony—We have a parallel in the development of Leigh Creek coalfield.

The Hon. F. T. PERRY—Leigh Creek is not run by a Government department, but by an outside trust independent of any hampering

by Government control. I suggest that the following methods could be adopted by the Government, if it has not already decided on the method of control of the mine:—(1) By a Government department; (2) by a commission or trust; (3) by experienced mining companies, acting as managers at a management fee, or (4) by a company formed by the Government, the Government owning all shares in it. The method to be adopted is a matter of great concern to both the people and the Government. My third proposal is perhaps the most likely to be adopted by the Commonwealth Government at Rum Jungle. There are plenty of precedents for it and instances of satisfactory results. The uranium mine at Radium Hill is small compared with some mines in other countries or even here. Top professional men in mining are only available in the big companies, but I feel sure they would give their services at a fee and regard the job as a patriotic as well as a money-making one. I understand that the New South Wales Coal Board is using my fourth proposal—a company formed by the Government. Proprietary companies are formed there with the Government owning all the shares and appointing directors. I know of certain companies which have been formed to mine coal under that proposal. In the case I referred to there are three directors, one being a Coal Board official and two outside accountants or businessmen qualified to act as directors. I make these suggestions because the Government has not indicated what form of control will be undertaken at the mine. I think that proposals Nos. 2, 3, and 4 are all preferable to No. 1.

I have tried to show that we are extending our loan proposals to an extent far greater than the country can stand. The Government should give the most serious consideration to this matter and the general community should be able to rest on the information that the Government has at its disposal. I am afraid that the excessive pace which has been set will not benefit the country and earnestly ask the Government to consider the method of control at the mine and make an announcement for the benefit of members. I support the Bill, as we are unable to do anything else.

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS (Northern)—With other members I listened with great interest to Mr. Perry's analysis of the Bill and his remarks on its ramifications. I do not know whether members concur entirely with his deductions. He suggested that governmental expenditure should be guided by the

seasons in a reverse way to what I imagine would be the case. He contended that governmental expenditure should be curtailed during periods of prosperity and increase when the people were less prosperous. As I see it, one of the difficulties of putting that into effect is that when the economy is declining there would be far less opportunity of raising the necessary capital from our usual sources of supply. Mr. Perry said that, in one instance, it could be obtained from the savings of the people. I think we would be able to get it from the savings of the people in times of prosperity, but to a lesser extent when our economy was not so buoyant. However, the points raised by him are worthy of consideration especially when we remember that our Loan Bill is, on the up grade every year. Today we have reached an almost record sum. It is necessary to take stock of where we are going and see to what extent increased production will help in the advancement of the people and the development of the country. Were the total even more it could be justified provided we were satisfied that the expenditure was desirable and was for the purpose of developing the country. In perusing the schedule one is struck by the immense ramifications of Government and semi-Governmental expenditure and control and I find it difficult to suggest any instance where we could, with justification, curtail the amount. In other words, let us ask ourselves whether there is one item that is not justifiable. Consider the first item—the State Bank—which has control of the various departments enumerated under this heading. We are continually reminded that there is still a great demand for homes; much has been achieved, but much more remains to be accomplished if we are to house our people in the way they are entitled to be housed. I cannot see any item under that heading which could be eliminated without retarding the advancement of the State.

The Highways and Local Government Department is concerned with the construction of roads and bridges, and from my knowledge of the conditions in many country districts, and even in the more settled areas, there is ample evidence of the need for very great expenditure in that connection. I have constantly agitated in this Chamber for greater expenditure upon our highways in the outer areas and I will continue to do so because I appreciate the very grave need for it. I have recently completed a comprehensive tour of one of our highly productive pastoral areas, and I was appalled by the poor roads and transport

facilities in a locality producing a considerable proportion of the wealth of this country in the shape of wool, meat, and livestock. Throughout the many hundreds of miles I travelled there were considerable distances on which not a penny of Government money had ever been expended; it appeared that the so-called roads merely followed the tracks made by the first bullock teams that went through the country many years ago, and there is small wonder that, under these conditions, the people are concerned when they are called upon to contribute their proportion of taxation. I do not find it difficult to appreciate their point of view when they say that they seem always to be paying out and never getting any return in the way of Government expenditure. I will continue to press for expenditure for this purpose in any Bill which comes before us and, indeed, to urge that there should be a considerable increase in the provision for highways in outside areas.

Provision is made under the Lands Department for the re-purchase of land for closer settlement and for the purposes of the Crown Lands Development Act. We know something of what has been done for the settlement and repatriation of returned servicemen and I do not think one member would wish to repudiate what they have been urging ever since the last war. We must continue to meet our commitments in that regard and I would hesitate to believe that any member here would suggest curtailment of the expenditure necessary to honour our promises to the men who have done so much for us. The same remarks apply to irrigation areas where we have another phase of the settlement of returned soldiers. Much has been achieved, but more remains to be accomplished.

The Hon. E. Anthony—Does not the honourable member think that they should be nearer paying their way?

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS—I have no doubt that ultimately they will pay their way, but settlements of this nature must pass through their initial stages. We know that generally the returned soldier is not blessed with much in the way of capital reserves and he is dependent for his establishment upon moneys made available by the Government, but I have not the slightest doubt that in the majority of cases they will be able to show a 100 per cent profit on the expenditure. I have had the opportunity of inspecting some of the lands submitted to the Government for closer settlement and I have in mind particularly those areas adjacent to the great fresh

water lakes of Alexandrina and Albert. With the erection of the barrages they have become permanent sources of fresh water and because of the quality of the land adjacent to their shores I feel that we have a province there which some day will go a long way towards providing the foodstuffs required, not only for the people of this country, but for those in some other parts of the world which we have a responsibility in supplying.

Unfortunately, not much progress seems to have been made in the provision of sewerage systems in country towns. It is some time now since provision was made by Act of Parliament for this to be done, but many difficulties have arisen and, even allowing for the time necessary to prepare plans and so forth, I am not aware of one project having been commenced. This amenity is very desirable and must be provided for country people. One of the biggest items in the schedule is under the heading "Miscellaneous" which brings me to two of the matters specifically referred to by Mr. Perry. In the Electricity Trust of South Australia we have certainly built up something probably greater than we expected. When the legislation was before this Chamber providing for the acquisition of the business of the Adelaide Electric Supply Company few of us realized the vast ramifications it would cover as a semi-governmental organization. Many of us had an opportunity to visit the power station being constructed at Port Augusta and we can realize what a big undertaking it is. I cannot say that it is not justified, for I believe we are probably on the eve of a very great development in the economy of our State. I sometimes think it would be most interesting if we could come back in 12 or 15 years' time to see the results of all this work. One of the main arguments which influenced many members to support that legislation was the promise of extension of electricity facilities to country districts, but here again progress seems to have been slow. Although a power line has been erected between Port Augusta and the metropolitan area so far no provision seems to have been made for settlers and towns *en route* to receive the facilities they so earnestly desire. We do not know all the particulars covered in the item of £5,400,000 in the schedule provided for the Electricity Trust and therefore we have to assume that it is for the completion of the power house at Port Augusta and the ultimate provision of those facilities which we have all envisaged ever since the trust was established.

I hope that is the case because country residents and organizations and industries in country districts are anxiously awaiting a connection to these power lines.

I sometimes think that hysterical interest is aroused over uranium; there is certainly a lot of speculation about its value and what it will achieve. There is much speculation, particularly in our press, as to what is behind the secrecy attached to uranium production and nuclear energy. I think we must take the Government on trust, and I have not the slightest hesitation in doing so, because it is well advised, it has the interests of this country at heart and has a full appreciation of the part it will be called upon to play in the protection of the Commonwealth of Nations. We are on the eve of entry into an organization constituted by our kith and kin and other English-speaking nations and as a unit of that organization we must accept responsibility. If this country is endowed with essential minerals which will play a great part in the ultimate safety of our people and the preservation of our ways of life, we should accept anything that might be put forward in this connection with the knowledge that the expenditure proposed will be put to the fullest use. It was my intention to briefly mention a few of the subjects which are of particular interest. All are of importance and frankly I cannot see that any of the expenditure could be curtailed, nor should it be curtailed provided the money is expended wisely. Most of the proposals are developmental and will ultimately return value to the State and I have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Central No. 1)—I support the second reading. I was surprised at the dismal atmosphere Mr. Perry attempted to create in referring to loan expenditure. It is true that this Bill provides for an expenditure of £29,000,000 which is approximately £2,000,000 less than was appropriated last year. The fact remains that all loan moneys spent wisely, whilst they may not show an immediate return, provide assets to the State. If we look at loan expenditure through business lenses it is obvious that whatever money is expended in industry must show a quick return. Mr. Perry mentioned that we have been expending loan money excessively, but every pound spent has been approved by Parliament and we must take full responsibility. Would anyone suggest that we have done wrong in spending money on the Leigh Creek coalfield or the South Australian Electricity Trust?

Would any member say that because the Government has acquired an interest in or control of that social service it should be prevented from expanding it? Mr. Perry mentioned that the trust is not controlled by the Government but I remind him that it is not out of the control of Parliament because Parliament votes large sums of money for the extension of electric energy throughout country districts. It is useless for any member to view Government expenditure on the same basis as expenditure in private industry. Those who invest in private industry desire a guaranteed and quick return because in many instances it is their only means of livelihood.

Mr. Perry said that our economy has got out of order over these last few years and instanced that our metals have risen in price. In referring to the Statesman's Pocket Year Book compiled under the authority of the Chief Secretary I found that in 1948 approximately £22,000 worth of gold was produced in South Australia but in 1950 it had dropped to almost £5,000. These are some of the things which should agitate the minds of members not only of this Parliament but of State Parliaments throughout the Commonwealth. Another aspect enters into it—the changeover from war economy to peace economy. Mr. Perry had a lot of experience in the manufacture of munitions and in the changeover to munition production and back to private industry, and it is interesting to record that after the war the Chifley Government was successful in inducing overseas financiers to invest £50,000,000 in industry in Australia. It also leased, in order to develop our economy, munition works and plants to the value of £80,000,000. That was done so that over 1,000,000 ex-servicemen and women could be absorbed evenly into private employment. That was a contrast with what happened after World War I, when in the changeover a number of ex-servicemen were out of work for months. It took money to effect an even changeover. It is true that savings play an important part in finance of a country. I agree with Mr. Edmonds that the savings also reflect the prosperity of a country and while the Savings Bank deposits are high it indicates that there is a more even distribution of wealth in spite of a high cost of living. There would be greater deposits if the cost of living was not so high. During the war under Labor administration nearly two-thirds of the credit resources of this nation was used for war purposes. No protest was raised about the millions of pounds

that were spent each day. It was not all savings of the people and was not taken out of private industry, but out of the credit of the nation. People realized that whatever credit or resources they had would be absolutely useless if the country was invaded. The responsibility rests on Parliament. We should not attempt to follow a dismal policy of trying to control Government expenditure as against private enterprise.

Mr. Perry mentioned production and I expected him to expand his arguments. I do not know whether he became so engrossed in the Savings Bank figures that he did not do so, but ever since I have been here members of the Labor Party have constantly been twitted about the lack of production and told that we are in this cul-de-sac because of the 40-hour week. It is interesting to record that the 40-hour week was introduced by the Arbitration Court on January 1, 1948. It became operative, I think, in March. Later in the year, in order to place the issue on the proper basis, a survey was undertaken by Dr. S. S. Stephens of the Department of Economic Research at Melbourne University. He visited no fewer than 70 industries—large, small, and medium—in order to get an overall picture of the operation of the 40-hour week. His findings disclosed that there was an increase in production per man-hour of more than 9 per cent. That speaks volumes and indicates that in the early stages of its introduction, when industry was not geared to receive the sudden change, there was an increase of more than 9 per cent per man-hour, within a few months in industries that had set themselves out to meet the situation.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe—That inquiry was made in 1948?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Late in 1948. The report indicated that where industries had set themselves out to meet the changed circumstances and co-operated with their employees all the talk of lack of production was not borne out.

The Hon. L. H. Densley—We want co-operation both ways.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Some employers, not all, want it only one way. Those who are desirous of building up industry and playing their part in the economy of the nation have attempted to view the problems in the interests of the State and Australia. My next point is about primary production. Some of my country colleagues might ask what I know about primary production.

The Hon. R. J. Rudall—Why limit it to primary production?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—As an ordinary citizen and a member of Parliament I know there have been justifiable outcries and demands by all States for increased primary production, which is really the first solution of our current economic crisis. There is also the question of land aggregation. Land falls into two categories, the first being privately-owned land and the second Crown lands. I do not want to be charged with saying that I believe in confiscation, because I do not. However, where large areas of undeveloped land are kept out of production the Government should either purchase it at a just price or use its powers to force people to put it into production. Australia has been clamouring for more farms and I approach this matter from an Australian point of view. I have spoken previously about the activities of our Land Settlement Committee and have eulogized it for recommending the Government to force recalcitrant owners who have not put their properties to best use to sell it in order that the Government could put it to better use.

We have been told by prominent and capable primary production experts that in 10 years Australia will be importing foodstuffs—a most alarming statement, seeing that Australia is endowed by Divine Providence with all the necessities it needs for production. I do not blame any responsible public officer for allowing that state of affairs to arise. If it is the position it is our responsibility as a Parliament to arouse ourselves and do something about it.

The Hon. L. H. Densley—You do realize the urgency of it?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Members of the Opposition always have; that is one of the Labor Party's planks. Land aggregation is reaching alarming proportions. A large area is rapidly coming under the control of a decreasing number of owners. I do not say that people who own large areas should have them broken up into smaller ones; but if they keep them out of production they should be purchased by the Government and not allowed to remain waste. This feature of our rural areas is probably one of our worst. Recently the Leader of the Opposition in the House of Assembly said that in travelling along certain country roads he had noticed that homesteads were allowed to get into disrepair on farms which had been purchased and that they had become scenes of desolation.

The Hon. E. H. Edmonds—A mistake was made in cutting up those areas.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—In 1938-39 there were 253,536 rural holdings in Australia, but in 1950-51 there were only 243,636, a decrease of about 10,000. During the same period holdings increased by about 43,000,000 acres. Sooner or later we will have to face up to this problem of aggregation. Even if every State in Australia was able to attract large secondary industries from overseas they would be unable to continue for long because we would be unable to feed the people required to work the industries.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—A few years ago South Australia produced 48,000,000 bushels of wheat and last year only 26,000,000.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—The right to govern also connotes duty to serve. We desire to see our Parliamentary and democratic institutions remain free and unfettered. A responsibility rests on this Government, as well as the Commonwealth Government, to rectify these things so that we can maintain our democratic institutions. I support the Bill.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Midland)—I have listened with great interest to all the speeches on this Bill. My reaction to them is that it will be extremely difficult for members to obtain an adequate appreciation of what is involved in a Bill of this nature, covering such a large sum. It is almost impossible for us to check the various items in the schedule. The question arises whether the amounts are necessary and will be spent wisely in the best interests of the State. In matters of this kind we are largely in the hands of the officers of various Government departments who have to attend to the details of expenditure. I pay a tribute to our civil servants who, in the past, have spent our Loan moneys wisely and to the general satisfaction of the people.

I listened with particular interest to Mr. Perry's speech and to his statement that we were apparently spending far too much Loan money. He contended that it might be wise if some of the less urgent works were put off until they could be carried out at less cost, with advantage to those employed on the works. I must confess that I thought there was a good deal of substance in his remarks but if we followed them to their logical conclusion we should have to go through this list and ascertain what works could be postponed. When we try to do that it seems that there are

not many, if any, items which could be postponed without creating some hardship or difficulty. Therefore, I think the point which the honourable member was trying to make could be better expressed by saying that in the conditions under which we have had to spend loan money in the last two or three years perhaps less work has been done in relation to the amount spent than we would have wished. We are like the person with limited means who has a block of land which is crying out for capital development in all directions. He has to make the choice between the more urgent and the less urgent work, that which will return the earliest result and that which will, perhaps, not show a return for some time to come. I feel that we will have to watch our expenditure in future to see that we do not spend more loan money than is absolutely necessary.

There is one point which occurs to me in connection with the raising of loan money, namely, that we have not treated the people who make this money available quite fairly. Going back to the time of the Premiers' Plan it will be remembered that the man in receipt of wages or salary had a cut of 10 per cent and the man who got his income from investments a cut of 22½ per cent. Mr. Perry showed that the basic wage in 1939 was £3 18s. a week compared with £11 4s. in 1952, whereas during the whole of that period the rate of interest on money borrowed for public purposes increased from 3½ per cent only to 3¾ per cent.

The Hon. Sir Wallace Sandford—And some of that 22½ per cent cut still holds good.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—I realize that, so it appears that we have unfairly penalized the people who have lent money to the State. The point that interests me most is that the people who make this money available are, in the main, not those with large means, but people who have managed to save a few thousands by thrift and frugality during the whole of their lives. When we realize how long it takes the average person to save £1,000, and realize further that at 3¾ per cent it earns only £37 10s. a year—and that subject to a higher rate of taxation than income from personal exertion—it is rather amazing that we have received so much money by way of loan.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—What is the honourable member going to do about it?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—I am simply stating the facts and indicating that the rate of interest we have been paying is due for more consideration than it has received. From my

personal experience I think that had we raised the rate of interest a little in the last four or five years we may have stopped quite a lot of reckless spending which has gone on during that time. I have recollections of clients of mine who, perhaps for the first time, had surplus funds and when faced with the choice of putting it in the Savings Bank at a negligible rate of interest, or in Commonwealth loans, also at a very low rate of interest, or keeping it free for speculation in motor cars or sheep, have sometimes chosen the latter course, I think, to their ultimate disadvantage. I believe it would have been wiser to put the money aside against the day when they might need it, and a little higher rate of interest may have been sufficient inducement to do so.

Under the heading of Architect-in-Chief provision is made for expenditure on Government buildings and land. In his second reading speech the Minister indicated that the sum of £35,000 would be expended upon new garages and residences for police officers at Barmera, Eudunda, Yorketown, Port Lincoln and Mount Gambier. The time has arrived when we will have to spend more money on some Government buildings in order to provide adequate accommodation for the Civil Service. To give one particular instance which calls for early attention I refer to the Supreme Court buildings. At present there are four court rooms, one of which is used almost exclusively for the hearing of criminal cases. It occasionally happens that two court rooms have to be made available in a particular month to deal with criminal cases. For example, in August 50 were listed and two court rooms were used for portion of that period, so it seems that in future two rooms will have to be allocated entirely for hearing this type of case. At present a room known as the conference room sometimes has to be used as an additional court room but it is not particularly suitable for the purpose. As an instance, on August 20, the Chief Justice was required to hear a case in this conference room. In the building there are five sets of judges' chambers and, with the appointment of a sixth judge, which is necessary to enable the Supreme Court work to proceed satisfactorily and expeditiously, there will be further confusion and overcrowding in the judges' chambers. That position is made worse during visits of the High Court to South Australia as the judges of that court have to share the existing rooms.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—How often do they come here?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—According to the requirements of the court, but almost certainly not more than once a year. Then too we must consider the position of the Master and the Deputy-Master. Because of the pressure of work another Deputy should be appointed, for the present officials are working excessively hard. However, there is no satisfactory accommodation in the building for a second Deputy-Master. The Supreme Court possesses a very fine library, but it is housed in seven different rooms, and anyone with experience of a library will know that it is extremely difficult to house a library properly under those conditions. I understand that the Government is aware of the situation and is making certain alterations at the present time, but they will not overcome the inherent disadvantages of the building. The Government has also caused plans to be prepared for the ultimate enlargement of the building in successive stages. This is necessary to enable the judicial business of the courts to be conducted in congenial and satisfactory surroundings, to enable delays in the execution of justice to be avoided and to obviate public inconvenience which may follow from the congestion of business in that court. The judicature is, in my opinion, a branch of our service equally as important as the legislature and just as we find that we can conduct our business more satisfactorily and with better decorum and proper dignity in circumstances which are congenial, so the same applies to the Supreme Court Judges and officers of the court. I think it is obligatory upon us to see that they have proper accommodation. Now that we are reaching the stage when building controls are being relaxed we can contemplate some buildings of this nature and I feel that this is one calling for early attention.

I was particularly pleased that the Government was able to announce that, because of a surplus of money arising from some semi-governmental loans, it has been able to make available an additional £65,000 for the Yorke Peninsula water supply scheme and £10,000 for the Minlaton High School. Those two projects are quite important and have been delayed long enough, so I know that the people in the country will be pleased to have that information and to know that their need has been recognized. I notice that to the end of last year we spent £858,000 on portable classrooms. Whoever was responsible for the idea of portable classrooms has rendered a

particularly good service to the community. Practically every school of consequence has one or more of these rooms and they are meeting a very important need. The department has done an excellent job in meeting the situation of increasing numbers of students annually by providing what is, in the main, satisfactory accommodation for them.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Over 400 classrooms have been erected.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—If that is correct it shows that every effort has been made to ensure that our children have proper accommodation while they are being educated. Mr. Perry referred to the amount to be spent at Radium Hill. We had the opportunity of making an inspection but as far as I am concerned it is beyond me to form any estimate as to whether the money is being spent wisely and as to the likely return. When such a large sum is being spent it is only reasonable that there should be some proper executive authority to see that correct decisions are made and that the money is being applied faithfully for the purposes for which voted. We cannot hope, in this Chamber, to get down to details of that sort. We have simply to accept the fact that this money is required, but it is obligatory for us to see that some competent body is appointed to see that it is expended properly. I support the second reading.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE (Southern)—The forestry industry in South Australia is responsible for maintaining more people per acre than any other rural industry but has less said about it probably because of the comparatively remote distance the forests are from the capital city. I note that £1,110,000 is to be spent on afforestation but the figures are rather difficult to follow because they associate themselves not only with deliberate capital expenditure but take into consideration the revenue that will be derived from the forests. It may be of interest to know that last year the receipts from forests were £890,000 and £984,000 was spent. Included in the expenditure are amounts of capital expenditure, replanting and purchases of land for afforestation. I am more than satisfied that our afforestation affairs are on a sound basis and there is no reason to fear that the position will not improve from year to year. We should also consider that our forests—and particularly the Government forests—have provided a great amount of cheap timber for our State-built homes and have been instrumental in keeping prices down. The acquisition of further land and continual planting is simply

a sign of good management. It assists in the control of erosion, particularly in the more hilly areas.

I compliment the Government and members of the Forestry Department on the way they have gone about afforestation. In 1950, 3,000 acres were planted and in 1951, 5,000 acres were prepared for planting. That is a considerable area particularly when we remember the figures quoted by the Attorney-General relating to the small area suitable for afforestation. Today there are 15 sawmills working under contract to the Government, three case mills and three large Government mills in these forests. As a result there is a lot of sawdust which constitutes a growing menace in the South-East. Quite recently men in the milling industry returned from Sweden and appeared enthusiastic about the possibility of briquetting sawdust. In Sweden sawdust is not allowed to be burnt or to rot but is converted to briquettes almost everywhere. I do not know the economic possibilities of doing that in our forests. It would be a comparatively light fuel and it may not be profitable in view of freight costs but I would respectfully urge that this matter be examined by the Government. If we do not briquette it we will have a problem.

I am glad that more practical action is being taken regarding fire control in our forests. The fire-fighting plant under the control of the Government is very good and miles more breaks are being ploughed. The point I stress is that we do not want to be fire-fighting but fire-preventing. In the 1950-51 report of the operations of the Woods and Forests Department the statement appeared:—

A small area of pines was also destroyed and later salvaged at Caroline Forest. Heaped sawdust which had been ignited by a picnic party, smouldered for many months and was a constant fire hazard at this forest, particularly during the summer months.

Can we permit any sawdust to smoulder for months without dealing with it?

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—It has been the cause of fires in the forests.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—Yes, and it will be in the future and while the Government has seen fit, at the request of people, to introduce a regulation preventing the burning of sawdust and mill waste during the fire period, it has to be policed in the interests of this valuable asset. It is no use Government officers lighting sawdust heaps two weeks before the middle of November, on the ground that it is a safe period, and not seeing that the fires

are put out. A disastrous fire burnt 3,000 acres of the Penola Forest. The trees were from 20 to 24 years old and were salvaged and dealt with to the exclusion of thinning in the South-East. That timber has been recovered but it has reduced the thinning programme in other forests because of the lack of labour. I urge the Government to follow the example of New Zealand and to spend £1,000 a year on suitable publicity along the roads not only for fire prevention but for advertisement. Throughout New Zealand there are signboards about the value of the forests and signs reading "These are the people's forests—help to protect them." Between Mount Gambier and Millicent there are about half a dozen battered weather-board notices. We should follow New Zealand's example because it would be in the interests of the resources of this State to see that the forests are not destroyed as they easily could be.

Today we have a sorry picture of thousands and thousands of sheep, either being held for slaughter or in store, and which for some reason hard to determine are not exportable. They have caseous lymphadinitis and whilst I agree that we should protect our overseas markets we should look at the realistic side of it. Overseas people are crying out for meat and something should be done. In conjunction with this I deplore the prices still being charged for meat in shops when that meat is being bought at about the price of skin value. I sold sheep a fortnight ago for what the purchaser told me was little more than skin value.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Who is making the profit?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—I leave that for the honourable member to work out—it is quite simple. We are on the verge of the lamb season. In 1944 two committees examined the position and furnished excellent reports. They were the Country Freezing Works Committee and the Metropolitan Abattoirs Committee under Sir Wallace Sandford. Both reports referred to the immediate necessity of the abattoirs being able to handle 77,000 carcasses a week and I understand from a further report that this was done. In the last two years lamb production has been increasing again with the problem of the so-called glut season. It is not a glut season; it is the peak season. When the wineman's grapes are ready, or if he buys more grapes, he provides fermenting tanks to deal with his produce. If producers are asked to produce more lambs provision must be made to handle them. The

season has barely started but the committee has already advertised that from now on older sheep will not be taken into the abattoirs except virtually by special arrangement. I am informed by the authorities, who are worried about the problem, that they expect to be able to handle 33,000 lambs a week, without overtime. It is possible that if they work on Saturdays they may be able to handle another 10,000. I always understood that the abattoirs would be able to handle 78,000. I am aware of the labour shortage and difficulties which existed at the end of the war. The facts are that a chain slaughterman kills, working on a darg system, an average of 80 carcasses a day, finishing about 3 p.m. It is not for me to suggest a remedy but it is obvious, if we are to run the show properly, that something must be done about the labour problem. It is a matter for the management to work out. Surely we cannot ration the killing of sheep and at the same time ask producers to produce more and accept 10s. less because a body of men has determined that they will knock off at 3 p.m. If the work warrants higher payment we should look into it. Can any department justify its employees knocking off at 3 p.m., working approximately 30 hours a week? The figures I have quoted can be confirmed.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—By whom?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—By going to the abattoirs and watching the men go home.

The Hon. W. W. Robinson—It is less than 30 hours; more likely 26½.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Why don't you tell the House the true position about the quota system they work on?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—Members can form their own opinion on the system. Mr. Bardolph should assist in altering the position whereby more lambs can be killed. I desire co-operation, and not criticism. This is a most serious matter. A former Minister of Agriculture in this Chamber moved the adjournment of the House on the question some years ago. That year thousands of lamb producers lost thousands of pounds.

The Hon. W. W. Robinson—Are the chains fully manned today?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—No, because the peak season has not been reached. I want to be helpful in this matter. The agreement to sell lambs is, unfortunately, a Federal one. In New Zealand the price is differential, based on the season. I cannot understand why the

Federal Minister for Commerce and Agriculture (Mr. McEwen) could not do the same for Australia. If producers are to get 4d. a pound more for lambs marketed in August many will probably produce lambs for marketing then. We must, however, not forget Nature in the marketing of the bulk of our flocks. The average producer must market his fat lambs when they are fat and at present prices he sells at the highest weight he can. I hope that the Government will not allow this position to continue year after year. We are killing to virtually half our capacity. I quote the following from the report of the Joint Select Committee on the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board, dated June 7, 1945:—

In other parts of the Commonwealth the potential danger arising from the concentration of everything in one works is, to some extent, avoided by the decentralization that has taken place. In South Australia the abattoirs at Gepp's Cross constitute a "bottleneck" and there remains the danger of a complete dislocation of local and export trade if a serious stoppage occurs from any cause. This risk will remain as long as every animal is handled at a single plant.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—What is wrong with that?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—It points out a bottleneck and suggests that we might do something. In addendum No. 2 the committee states:—

It was stated by one witness who has had considerable experience in the industry, that the loss in weight, bloom and condition, cost the producers last year from £50,000 to £70,000. To this estimated loss should be added the depreciation in values caused by temporary over-supplies of stock to the markets. It is an established fact that when markets are loaded beyond the slaughtering capacity of the abattoirs, prices inevitably fall sharply.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—How many people support a policy of decentralization?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—I shall come to that directly. In 1944 the committee on Country Freezing Works said, and repeated it in its recommendations, that the facilities at the Metropolitan Abattoirs should be sufficient to treat 70,000 lambs weekly. In its conclusions it stated:—

9. The Government's plan to broaden the railway gauge and to settle up to 500,000 more people in the South-East for the purpose of further developing that part of the State may lead to an increase in the production of livestock for export to more than double the present number, and therefore the establishment of a freezing works at Naracoorte, which will probably be in the heart of this increased settlement, could be considered part of the

Government's developmental plan, on the principle that enough stock will be available to provide an adequate output for two works, and as a public utility the Naracoorte works would offer facilities to many export firms and thus stimulate competition for the livestock and assist in preparing other classes of produce for marketing.

As eight years have elapsed since the report was made I hope that the Government will consider a further inquiry into the need for establishing freezing works in the South-East.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—What have you done about it?

The Hon. W. W. Robinson—The committee recommended that freezing works be established at Naracoorte when production reached a certain figure.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—Mr. Bardolph will be surprised when he knows how many lambs come out of the district this year.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—If abattoirs were built at Naracoorte would lambs still be sent to Portland?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—Possibly, but not at present railway freight rates. They will go to the best market. Two years ago, when we were in trouble with our lambs, the Government virtually said, "Don't send lambs down here; it will cause trouble at our abattoirs." South-Eastern producers were barred from sending lambs to the Metropolitan Abattoirs.

I turn now to land settlement. After the lapse of so many years the time is ripe for us to see what has been done apart from what is likely to be done. Time will show that the Government has purchased some of the best land in the State for soldier settlement. We have every reason to feel pleased with the work of the Lands Development Committee in this respect. Of course, there are the usual anomalies, but most ex-servicemen are pleased with the land they have. Their grievances are few. I was pleased to be with the Premier on a recent visit to the Eight-Mile Creek area in the South-East where it was said people needed boats to get to their cowsheds. I do not know how that statement came to be published in the press. I have never heard such rubbish in my life. I was most impressed, not only with the settlement itself, but with the settlers. They had a very fair argument in requesting that high ground be provided. I think they were sincere in their claim that, if they did not get this high ground immediately, they would be in trouble. The Government

took immediate steps to see that they got high ground on Chomley's Estate, which was bought for the purpose. The future of the Eight-Mile Creek settlement will be safe provided the settlers can obtain high ground for their cattle.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—I heard that statement 10 years ago.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—The honourable member should see the settlement today. During the past two years the Government has purchased additional land on the market for soldier settlement. I have always advocated that. Like other members, I do not like any form of acquisition. The Government's action has proved satisfactory and I hope it will continue in this direction. I have some small criticism about the purchase of Campbell Park. I said, at the time of its purchase, that it was a great pity that the Campbell House portion was not offered for sale immediately as I considered it was unsuitable for soldier settlement. I still say so and think that the Government will have to sell that part. In the meantime our £140,000 is standing still. The previous year the gross income from the property was £21,000, showing a net profit of £11,000. Although we will have to put these properties into workable order for settlers, doing the fencing and subdivision. We should not take too long in doing so because we will lose the production from such good land. If we are to continue to buy big estates, tenders should be called for agistment prior to their allotment and we should not allow a few cows to be depastured on the land at the ridiculous fee of ls. 6d. a week.

The Hon. R. R. Wilson—Has the Federal Government agreed to buy Campbell Park?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—I do not know, but we have agreed to do so and have paid for it. I viewed on Sunday with some degree of satisfaction the clear statement of Labor policy in this State with regard to land acquisition. I was rather surprised that, coming from such a moderate man as Mr. O'Halloran, the Leader of the Opposition, there was no reference to the price to be paid for land and I take it that his statement must be read as printed. He definitely said that he believed that any land that could be cut up, developed or otherwise, should be taken and cut up, but he did not say "on just terms". I hope that the people's attention will be drawn to the fact that it is the policy of the Labor

Party to take developed land from those who, perhaps, have only a comparatively small area. The South-East drainage scheme is going ahead slowly as I always hoped it would. I see that we are committed to another £340,000 this year for work on the main drains and I sincerely hope that when this is done we will not have enough money to provide for minor drains until we have seen the result of the major drains. I have always said that this is a good scheme for the years to come and I am glad that the Government is proceeding with it although I am pleased to see that it is proceeding slowly.

If it continues to do that I have no fears for the future. I support the Bill.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

**LAND SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENT
BILL.**

Received from House of Assembly and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.05 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, September 17, at 2 p.m.