

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Thursday, October 30, 1958.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Walter Duncan) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

ASSENT TO ACTS.

His Excellency the Governor intimated by message his assent to the following Acts:—Mining Act Amendment, Police Offences Act Amendment, and Road Traffic Act Amendment.

QUESTIONS.**CHELTENHAM BUS FARES.**

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I ask leave to make a statement with a view to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I have received the following letter in connection with the proposed conversion of trams to buses on the Cheltenham route:—

On November 23, 1958, the Municipal Tramways Trust has announced that they intend to change the Cheltenham tram route to buses. When this comes into operation the present method of the use of transfer tickets will be practically discontinued. The attached information sets out clearly the effect of this withdrawal of the right to transfer on the people of Port Adelaide and district. In fact, it is an indirect method of increasing fare cost to the people in the Port Adelaide area using M.T.T. transport who are in the main ordinary workers.

The trust alleges that it is desirous of winning back patronage, but this vicious plan will drive further patronage from the service. Because of the urgency and the time factor I am bringing this matter directly to your attention as I feel some effort should be made to bring this before the Government and the public with the object of having this anomaly removed in the interests of the workers in Port Adelaide.

The following statement sets out in more detail what it means to the people of Port Adelaide and suburbs:—

A working man at Holden's and travelling from Rosewater to work by bus at present pays, if travelling from Addison Road, 1s.; new fare 1s. 6d., or at present 10s. a week. New fare 15s. a week. If from Rosewater, present fare 9d., each way. New fare 1s. 3d. each way; or at present 7s. 6d. a week and new fare 12s. 6d. a week.

The above arrangements have been in operation for some 30 years and have been a great help to the poorer class of people in getting to the beaches for relaxation. The new arrangements can have only one effect—fewer passengers. It will make it harder for parents to make the break during the summer months to go to the beaches as often as they would like.

This is what it means to a man with six

children:—Finsbury Hostel to Semaphore—Present fare for two adults 4s., four children 4s., total 8s., new scale of fares:—Adults 6s., children 4s., total 10s. Osborne to Semaphore—two adults 5s. four children 4s., total 9s.; new scale of fares—two adults 7s., four children 5s., total 12s.

I regard this as a very serious matter and ask the Government if it will take up the question with the Tramways Trust with a view to obviating this increase in fares, which will affect the working classes.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—I undertake to speak to my colleague the Minister of Works who, no doubt, will obtain a report as early as possible.

FACTORY EXPLOSION.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—In yesterday's *News* and this morning's *Advertiser* appear accounts of an explosion in Franklin Street when the lives of 20 employees as well as others in adjoining factories were endangered. According to the reports a faulty acetylene gas cylinder was the cause. I ask the Minister of Industry what methods are adopted by the department for the proper inspection of these cylinders before they are delivered to factories?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—We all regret that an accident of this nature should have occurred, but are gratified to know there was no serious injury to anyone. I will secure a detailed report and let the honourable member have as much information as I can regarding the incident.

ADVANCES FOR HOMES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

HOMES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is on the same lines as the previous Bills. It extends the operations of the principal Act for a further 12 months. The Government is satisfied that the activities of the Prices Department continue to be highly beneficial to the State and that the continuance of its operations is justified. The department's work is carried out not only by means of orders having legal effect, but also by negotiations

and arrangements. In some cases an investigation by the department, without other action, produces valuable results. Information in the hands of the Government indicates that the prices of many essential commodities are lower in this State than in other States, and that this result is attributable to the work of the Prices Commissioner and his officers. One important aspect of the work of the department is in connection with the prices of building materials and rates for building services. South Australia is the only State still exercising control over these costs, and it is significant that an average five-roomed brick dwelling can be built here today for about £800 lower than the same type of house in any of the other States. Houses built of materials other than brick are also cheaper here than in other States, although the difference is not so marked as for brick houses. The Government's information also indicates that commercial buildings are substantially cheaper in this State than elsewhere.

The Government has also received much information about the effect of the work of the Prices Department on the prices of clothing, footwear and foodstuffs. There is no doubt that the activities of the department in connection with these prices have been highly beneficial to the State. Not only consumers but manufacturers and traders also have derived benefit from the arrangements made by the department. Primary producers, too, have benefited through the action of the department in connection with the price of superphosphate and several other important commodities used in primary production. Reductions in the prices of petrol, lighting kerosene, distillate and diesel oil are also attributable to the work of the department.

I do not propose to give details of all the items which the department has investigated and in which prices have been fixed or arranged but there is no doubt that the department has been responsible for important reductions of prices over a wide field, involving very large sums of money, and that all sections of the community have benefited from them. It is admitted that some reductions in prices are not attributable to price control and some are only partly due to control. But there is no doubt at all that many price reductions are due to the department's work and in numerous cases the department has negotiated reductions greater than those which would have taken place had it not been involved in them. And while the public has benefited from the work of the department it cannot be said that traders

have suffered any injustice, because during last financial year companies in this State operating under price control experienced an increasing volume of business and satisfactory profits.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 29. Page 1445.)

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2)—This is one of those Bills that come before this honourable Chamber in the first instance. I do not dispute or disapprove of this practice because I realize that it can be convenient and helpful when both Houses are sitting concurrently. Particularly is it often appropriate that such Bills be introduced first in this Chamber when the Minister concerned is a member of this Chamber. The Government has always shown much discretion in what Bills it introduces in the first place, which is proper because, generally speaking, we are laid out as a House of review. Our methods, and indeed our Standing Orders, are basically those of a House of review, and thus I believe that Bills first brought here should properly be of the type that I have already mentioned.

Our Standing Orders also make it difficult to handle a Bill in the first instance because it is harder to get anything new into it than it is in another place because of the restrictions of our Standing Orders or their interpretation, which I do not dispute. I am not suggesting that our Standing Orders should be amended in that respect, but it is a matter that may have to be considered one day because, after all, the procedure of the Council should reasonably be within its own hands. I do not suggest anything immediate, but am using that as a background to the thought that Bills brought here in the first instance should be carefully selected by the Government. I congratulate it on what it has done since I have been a member of this Chamber for more than two and a half years.

This is a typical Bill that may be brought here in the first instance. It could not, without exaggeration, be described as controversial. It has been described as a Committee Bill; it is largely that. The only restriction is that I may have offered certain suggestions had I not felt myself contained by the Standing Orders. However, if and when

the Bill is passed in this place, it will go to the House of Assembly where, no doubt, it will be bandied about.

The Bill is not a nation-rocking amendment in any shape or form. The amendments are comparatively minor. Although such amendments do affect the public at large, I should not think that the Bill affects a great proportion of them. It has been suggested to me that as this is properly described as a Committee Bill, the debate on the second reading should be kept to a minimum. I do not agree with that, because whether the Bill is a Committee Bill or not, it is proper that all Bills should have a general survey at the second reading stage. It is most desirable that Bills should be considered in general first, and then one should get down to some scrutiny of particulars at the second reading stage, and then of course closer and further scrutiny at the Committee stage. That is how I made my approach to the Bill.

I will now discuss briefly some of the clauses. The first that comes under review is clause 2. It is a consequential amendment, and I do not think it is necessary for me to deal any further with it. Clause 3 provides for the appointment of a deputy chairman of a district council. I am not altogether enthusiastic about it, although I shall have to determine more carefully my attitude in Committee. There are certainly good reasons why a deputy chairman should be appointed, but I consider there are reasons that militate against the virtue of such a procedure. Naturally, if the chairman is absent there must be a deputy chairman, but that does not mean that there should be a standing deputy chairman. When a chairman is absent the normal procedure is to appoint a deputy to act in his place, and in my experience of local government I have never found any difficulty in that regard. If a full-time deputy chairman is appointed, it could happen that he was absent at the same time as the chairman. It may be that the deputy chairman attains a standing, as he ranks second to the chairman. I can see things undesirable in that. It may be that with such standing he may interfere with the work of the chairman himself, which I imagine would be undesirable.

I think that the present method of appointing a deputy chairman whenever the need arises is a very good one, and I know of no reason why there should be a standing deputy chairman. Indeed, I feel, tentatively at any rate, that the difficulties attaching to the appointment might well outweigh the virtues of having someone permanently in that office.

I propose to give this clause further consideration at a later stage.

The next amendment relates to a council being able to prescribe a minimum rate. I think this is a good clause in these days of high costs of administration. It has been said that it takes quite a substantial number of shillings these days to get out any assessment, however small it may be. That is undoubtedly true. This amendment, as I see it, will enable a council to prescribe an adequate amount to cover its expenses in relation to small assessments, which it is, of course, obliged by law to make. It gives the council a certain latitude of authority, and prescribes that a council need not necessarily fix any minimum rate. I have said in this Chamber before that I believe we can within reason trust our councils and give them latitude, and as that is what this clause sets out to do it has my support.

Another amendment increases from £50 to £100 the amount that councils may subscribe to local government associations and organizations. It is only small money for any district council, and as costs have risen considerably I think the amendment is proper. The next amendment relates to the revenue received from the sale of timber which, under certain conditions, now has to be paid into a special fund and applied towards tree planting. This clause is one of great piety, in my estimation. It is one of those things that sound wonderful and that people advocate, but it does not always work out that way. I think that most councils of any standing strongly support tree planting, and therefore such a clause these days is probably unnecessary. This proposed amendment moves towards my view to some extent, because it gives councils greater latitude to decide their own destinies. An arbitrary clause that provides that all moneys obtained from timber sales shall be paid into a fund for tree planting is properly described as pious, and a piece of window dressing, because it does not necessarily mean that such a fund will be devoted to tree planting. Councils can be trusted to see that adequate trees are planted in their districts, and if they do not and there is a resurgence of opinion against their attitude, then it is in the hands of rate-payers to see that they get councillors who will pay proper attention to these things. However, for the reasons I have mentioned the clause has my support.

The next amendment, limiting to 10s. a foot an owner's contribution towards road-making costs in the circumstances mentioned

in the clause, is one that I think most members expected had been properly dealt with last session. It would appear that the amendment is necessary because last year's amendment had proved ineffective. I am sure that this amendment now expresses what Parliament intended and that it is a good and proper one.

The Act contains a provision that an owner of property who contributes towards the cost of making a roadway has the right to use that roadway, and the next amendment deals with that right. It is pointed out that often such roadways become roads over which the public have a right of way, and the right referred to is a comparatively limited one. In view of these circumstances it is suggested that in future the right should be taken away, because it can cause embarrassment and uncertainty, but that existing rights should be preserved provided they are registered on the title concerned so that anyone having dealings in the neighbourhood shall know exactly where he stands. I do not feel at this stage that I know enough about this aspect to say that future rights should be altogether taken away, although I can see that very good reasons have been given for that, and I propose to make further inquiries to endeavour to clear up any doubts that I may have. I certainly agree with its intention that any rights over land, as provided for with such an admirable Act as the Real Property Act, should be registered on titles so that everyone will know where he stands. If the owner wants to retain his rights I cannot see why they should not be registered on the title within a certain period. It seems to me a good principle that people who have to make roadways adjoining their premises should have some rights over those roadways, even though they are to be restricted by some condition. I do not see altogether the necessity to take rights away *in toto*. However, I propose to give some further consideration to this matter.

The clause relating to septic tanks deals with a development that coincides with modern discoveries regarding such tanks. In the earlier days the Central Board of Health supplied the owner with a notice prohibiting the throwing of shaving water and soap in the pan because it would upset the bacteria down below. That conception seems to have disappeared because it has been discovered that soapy water and its like can, within reason, be used without upsetting the bacteriological action of the tank. As I

read it, this clause also empowers the Central Board of Health to see that waste water, in addition to ordinary sewage, shall be properly dealt with, and, particularly for the more highly populated areas, this is probably a very good amendment.

I am very interested in clause 10, which provides that a councillor shall not be disqualified from voting or speaking if he is interested in a transaction between the council and any non-profit making organization. I have fairly strong views about that, having served on a council off and on for about 25 years. The present provisions of the Act that disqualify a councillor from speaking are, I feel, unnecessarily restrictive and do not work in the best interests of the council. This is not a newly formed opinion, as I have expressed it on many occasions. In this Legislative Council our procedure is regulated by the Constitution Act, which has no similar restriction that I know of. When things have come before the city council of which I am a member I have often felt that I could contribute towards the thinking of members if I were allowed to tell them of things I knew. I do not suggest that people should have a vote on matters in which they are personally interested because their vote could be swayed by an inner bias of which they themselves were not aware, but consideration should be given to allowing these people to speak after making a full declaration of their interest in the matter. That is to say, if I am a shareholder in Company A and say to the council, "I am interested in this matter because I am a shareholder, but I feel that I have some details that I can tell you about" I should then be entitled to speak, but not to vote. I have always felt that that would be quite proper and that the requirement of a declaration of interest before speaking would protect the situation against unscrupulous people who want to use the situation to their own advantage. I do not deny that such people exist; human nature being what it is they are bound to exist, but the remaining members of the council, after a declaration of interest, can be trusted to view the matter in its proper perspective. I suggest that this matter could be given further consideration by the Minister. I am not suggesting it in relation to this Bill or that the alterations should be made hurriedly, because I realize that a full investigation is warranted before making a comparatively far-reaching alteration to a law that has prevailed for some considerable time, but from long experience I think consideration of it would be well worthwhile.

Clauses 11 and 12 relate to raising the maximum penalty in respect to damage to property and the dumping of rubbish. I agree with the intention, and my only query is whether the general penalty for a breach of the by-laws is not out of date and whether it should not also be raised. I do not think it has been dealt with for quite a while. I have not had a chance to examine the point—although I will do so—but I have a feeling that the general penalty is a maximum of £10, which was fixed quite a number of years ago, and I consider it should be raised.

Clause 14 relates to authorized witnesses. This is necessary owing to an obvious defect when the law was last amended. I did not detect it at the time, and am afraid that I misread it. I can remember considering the clause and thinking that the ratepayer witness was being added to and not that it provided a substitution for the very small list of authorized witnesses. I had my attention drawn to this after the Bill was passed by both Houses and was surprised when told that it was so. It is obviously something that slipped through and I doubt that it was ever intended. I can remember saying on the last debate on this matter that we should facilitate postal voting. Members know my views on voting because of a recent debate in this Chamber. I believe that people should vote voluntarily and not compulsorily, but that every facility should be given them for voting.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Is not postal voting often plural voting?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL—That is an ambiguous expression and could mean anything, but I approve of the principle of postal voting which, I think, was first adopted only in 1933. Subject to those few reservations and the further consideration that I must give to this Bill, I indicate that it has my general support.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 7 passed.

Clause 8—"Registration of approved rights of access, etc."

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL—This is the clause that I indicated I would like to investigate further, and, if it meets with the Minister's approval, I move that progress be reported.

The CHAIRMAN—The honourable member is not in order. Only the Minister can move in that way.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL—On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, on my reading of the Standing Orders I have that right.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE (Minister of Local Government)—I give the honourable member an undertaking to have the Bill recommitted later if the Committee will agree to proceed with the remaining clauses now.

The CHAIRMAN—On further consideration, I find that my ruling was wrong and that the honourable member has the right to move that progress be reported.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL—In view of the Chairman's ruling, I now move that progress be reported.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, can any member at any time move that progress be reported?

The CHAIRMAN—It is not usually done, but the honourable member is in order. It is Standing Order No. 375.

Motion carried.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

BROKEN HILL PROPRIETARY COMPANY'S STEELWORKS INDENTURE BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 28. Page 1404.)

The Hon. R. R. WILSON (Northern)—The introduction of this Bill removes any doubts about the long-awaited steel industry for South Australia. I feel confident that this is the most important industry ever to be introduced into the State. As it will be established in my district, I have much pleasure in contributing to the debate. I thought that Sir Frank Perry last Tuesday spoke excellently on it. His remarks are valuable, because he is engaged in the manufacture of heavy machinery. It is of men like Sir Frank Perry that we take notice. Much to my surprise I did not see a report of his speech in either the *News* or the *Advertiser*.

One reason the industry is to be established here is that an abundance of the raw material is available in the Iron Knob-Whyalla area. Negotiations have been in progress since 1955 with the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited. It was a case of taking the industry to the raw material to avoid the huge expense involved in conveying the iron ore to Newcastle. I have heard many claims about who was responsible for the industry coming here. I have even heard members for the district claim that it was their action in Parliament that decided the company's coming

here. It was not, because this question had taken many years to determine. To spend £30,000,000 on an industry requires vast investigation. There are sufficient raw materials in that area, I understand, to enable the industry to continue for many years and, apparently, according to the report of the Select Committee, there are still large areas where iron ore may be found, even in areas adjacent to Cowell. With so great an expenditure of money, it is only natural that the company would want a clear understanding and security over everything required for the industry. Therefore, it is proposed to grant security over the right to prospect and over mining leases everywhere in that area, and in relation to the housing of the employees, the labour supply, water and foreshore and adjacent lands. The company has also asked for exemption from rigid price control. Everything has more or less naturally been provided for such a great expenditure of money.

It is anticipated that it will build the works in 10 years, and we look forward to the steel industry being in production there in 1970. The prospecting undertaken over the years would convey to anybody at all observant that it was not done for nothing. The same principle applies under the B.H.P. lease in this area as applies to any mining leases, except that is for a period of 50 years, not 21 years, with the right of renewal.

When I travelled through that country on my first visit to Eyre Peninsula in 1927, the track was through the Middleback Station and we passed the homestead *en route*. Gazing on those barren hills, I never thought that they would be worth anything at any time. Now the position is revolutionized and this huge industry will loom up in the near future. The area surveyed and contained in a map in the Bill measures 42 miles long by six miles wide. The hills adjacent to the road on the way to Port Lincoln are just a network of what appear to be trenches. It must have cost the Government much money to carry out the prospecting there. The company is very fair and is prepared to pay 1s. 6d. a ton royalty for the ore, when not long ago it was only 6d. I understand that it will fluctuate according to the basic price of £21 7s. 6d. a ton for foundry pig iron.

The report of the Select Committee is interesting, and I commend it to all members. It is most comprehensive, and hardly a thing was missed in the evidence given before the Premier, Mr. O'Halloran, Mr. Millhouse, Mr.

Loveday and Mr. Laucke, who comprised that committee. Evidence was called for from Mr. Campbell (of the Engineering and Water Supply Department), Mr. Ramsay (Housing Trust), Mr. Huddleston (Electricity Trust), Mr. Parkin (Mines Department), Mr. Newton and Mr. Jones (B.H.P. Company), the Parliamentary Draftsman (Sir Edgar Bean), and Mr. Ryan (Whyalla Town Commission).

Had not water been available from the River Murray or elsewhere, Whyalla would never have been established. That pipeline from Morgan, 231 miles long, is one of the greatest achievements ever at the price it cost us. Its cost was under the estimate, but the main will be found to be entirely inadequate to provide a supply to the new industry. Mr. Campbell reported that the main will be duplicated from Hanson to Port Germein, that booster stations will be installed and that it is expected that it will not be long before even more water will be required. The South Para reservoir will also assist in the supply of water to Whyalla by relieving the demand on the Morgan-Whyalla main supply to Paskeville and other places beyond. The price for water will be the same as in the past—2s. 6d. a thousand gallons. People at Whyalla have been paying 2s. 6d., although the actual cost was 3s. 6d., 1s. being refunded by the Government. Not only will the further supply of water help the mining industry, but Murray water is also being sought for other areas, particularly Wirrabara, Melrose, Ororoo and those districts where there is insufficient water to meet their needs. The main from Morgan will have to be duplicated as far as Port Augusta. I feel that such experts as Mr. Dridan, Mr. Campbell and others in the Water Supply Department will leave no stone unturned to see that there is ample water to meet the requirements of the new steel industry.

Housing is another colossal undertaking. The Housing Trust has undertaken to erect 400 houses a year. The site of the old aerodrome appears to me ideal but, from the report, it appears that a proportion of that land is considered unsuitable for house building. That area comprises 660 acres, is almost perfectly flat and will make Whyalla a compact town in the very near future. The trust anticipates that it can lift the number to 450 houses a year, which will be essential to house the employees in the steel industry.

Electricity is another important item. I appreciate the vision shown in establishing

power stations at Port Augusta. It would appear that the vision of those great men who foresaw the possibilities of this industry many years ago is now unfolding. I presume the power stations at Port Augusta will be able to supply the extra power required at Whyalla. The local supply at Whyalla will be unable to meet future demands.

Transport will be revolutionized. Last week when I travelled to Port Lincoln I was pleased to see the new sealed road which extends for 13 miles. That road will be completed to Cowell by the new year. With the stabilizers that are in operation there, road making is not going to take as long as previously. I do not say it will be any cheaper, but it will be considerably quicker. I congratulate the Minister of Roads on the progress being made. It was a real treat to be able to travel over it and not have the former dusty and rough conditions to contend with. Roads are not very difficult to make in that area because it is fairly flat country.

When the steel industry is in operation the population of Whyalla is expected to be 30,000. Apart from Elizabeth, it will probably be the biggest city outside the metropolitan area. The industry will be a great asset to Eyre Peninsula, because it will provide better markets, which are essential to that part of the State. I feel sure that production on Eyre Peninsula can be increased to meet the demand that will arise with the growth of Whyalla. The pleasure resorts in those parts are ready made, and will be well patronized when this huge population is centred at Whyalla.

I support the remarks of Sir Frank Perry concerning the work of those responsible for the project. Much organizing and planning was necessary, and credit is due to those responsible. Much praise has been given to the Premier, and in that respect I endorse everything that has been said. He has negotiated with the B.H.P. and with people overseas, and has done everything necessary for the introduction of this industry. I pay a special tribute to our Minister of Mines (Sir Lyell McEwin) for the work he has done over the years, often under very trying conditions. When we have been on a tour in the north I have often known him to break away and inspect the prospecting area to see for himself what was going on.

I wish to make a special reference to Mr. Essington Lewis and the late Mr. Harold Darling. They are entitled to much credit for

the establishment of the steel industry. It is to these men and the other directors of the company, of which you, Mr. President, are one, that we owe so much for this great industry, and to whom I feel sure it will be a standing memorial. I also pay a tribute to the former Director of Mines (Mr. Dickinson) who was a very valuable State officer.

We can see what the B.H.P. Company has done in various parts of the State. My home town of Ardrossan became almost a ghost town after Smith's implement factory closed, but the B.H.P. Company discovered dolomite in that area and revolutionized that nice little country town on Yorke Peninsula. The introduction of the bulk handling of grain also helped. It was the State's first bulk handling installation. Rapid Bay is another place where vast improvements have been made. I emphasize that the company has never taken everything away from places where it has made its money, but has put something back for the benefit of the people and the district. No-one can assess the value of this company where it operates, whether it be in New South Wales or South Australia.

I have no doubt of the success of the undertaking visualized in the Bill. I wish the company every success, and I feel sure that its future will be a credit not only to South Australia but to Australia in general. Sir Frank Perry in his speech remarked on the difference between the cost of imported steel and that manufactured in Australia, and I maintain that that alone warrants the establishment of the industry, which we hope to see in operation in the near future.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY (Central No. 2) —I feel sure that no talking will alter one line of the Bill. Members are all agreed that it is a very good measure. We have all had an opportunity to read the report and recommendations of the Select Committee, and it is a very interesting one. That committee, with the Premier as chairman, examined various State officers regarding the supply of water, houses, and the various other things necessary to this industry. All those officers agreed that these requirements could be satisfactorily arranged.

I pay my tribute to a very great company that has brought tremendous wealth to Australia. Without this industry during the last war our efforts would have been seriously hampered, and it contributed very largely to the successful prosecution of the war. With ample supplies of water, iron ore, and with every other

necessary facility, one may visualize Whyalla becoming the Sheffield of South Australia.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—You are not going to allow the Government to take the credit for all these things, are you?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—It is entitled to all the credit it can get. I join with others in supporting the Premier and the Minister of Mines in their pertinacity to get this industry. They are entitled to much credit for bringing this industry to fruition. I join with other speakers in commending all those who played such an important part in the industry, and I wholeheartedly support the Bill.

The Hon. J. L. S. BICE (Southern)—I support this very worthy measure. I am absolutely in accord with the expressed opinion of Mr. Wilson concerning the splendid report of the Select Committee which inquired into the supply of electricity, housing, water and other essentials. I also pay my tribute to the work of the Premier and the Minister of Mines who, over the years, have done really magnificent work and helped in the establishment of a magnificent industry in South Australia.

I have had the privilege of seeing the activities of this company in Newcastle and Port Kembla. I remember very vividly going down one of its coal mines at Burwood, near Newcastle. A very long distance below the surface was a beautifully prepared room with a tiled floor and partly tiled walls, lit with fluorescent lighting, and in that room young boys who had not long left school were being trained in mining activities. These amenities were provided because a boy is not allowed to work down a mine until he becomes 16. One must realize that work in an underground mine is not an easy job, and is something for which a boy must be trained.

Much will be accomplished in South Australia by the establishment of the steel industry by such an excellent firm, and Whyalla is indeed very lucky to have this £30,000,000 project established. The *B.H.P. Review* of August, 1958, discloses what the company does for the citizens of Australia. For instance, it is training 2,200 people who will ultimately become its executive officers. It has carried out this training over the last 30 years. This work is most valuable, because these young men will play a big part in the future of South Australia. I also have in front of me a list of B.H.P. associated companies and subsidiaries. It is an amazing list. It includes 12 manufacturing companies, such as Stewarts and Lloyds, Lysaghts, and various companies of

that type, which employ a tremendous number of people. We are fortunate that the company is to establish steelworks at Whyalla. I support the Bill.

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

LAND SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 28. Page 1405.)

The Hon. R. R. WILSON (Northern)—This Bill extends the term of the Land Settlement Committee for another 12 months. I commend it for its excellent work over the past year. It is a non-Party committee and its reports on various land settlement schemes have been valuable. I have had some experience of war service land settlement schemes. For many years I have been chairman of the committee of a land settlers' association and I know how the war service scheme is valued. We were shocked when told that the scheme would be wound up at June 30, 1959. On October 28, 1958, the number of applicants not settled was 412. Following on a re-classification of that number it was decided that those above average totalled 115, below average 191, and unlikely to be successful 106. Since that time 25 applicants have been settled. At present, not counting the 106 unlikely to be settled, 285 returned men are awaiting settlement.

The Hon. C. R. Story—How many are awaiting irrigation land?

The Hon. R. R. WILSON—A very small proportion, about one-quarter. The ex-servicemen not likely to get land under the scheme are disappointed. It is apparent that few of the 285 men will get blocks. They were told that they would be settled if land were available. There is concern about land recommended for settlement by the State Government and rejected by the Commonwealth. In the South-East there is land with much potential. By using trace elements and having the assistance of the CSIRO success could be achieved, and there could be the same results as at Coonalpyn Downs. Single unit schemes seem to be the answer to the problem. Much land is being offered, but at high prices. I hope the Government will seriously consider this matter before June 30 next year. Our Premier has mentioned the possibility of the South Australian Government carrying out land settlement schemes not only for ex-servicemen but for civilians.

Naturally we look for preference for the the ex-servicemen awaiting land. If what the Premier said at the last returned soldiers' sub-branch conference eventuates some of them will not be without land. Some returned men failed to note the time in which they could submit applications for land, and it seems that little can be done for them. A considerable area of land is available at Lyrup for settlement purposes, but as Mr. Story knows its potential I will leave him to deal with it. The Bill also mentions the drainage of land in the South-East, which is a matter to be dealt with promptly. I visited the Eight Mile Creek area one winter and I have never seen land with so much water on it. Later it was discovered that the drains were partially blocked and as soon as they were cleared much of the water disappeared. Mr. Edmonds referred to the retirement soon of the present secretary of the Land Settlement Committee. I support his remarks about Mr. Bleckly, who has been most interested in his work and loyal to the committee. He has done much towards achieving the efficiency of the committee and we thank him for his excellent service. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

The Hon. J. L. S. BICE (Southern)—I support the Bill and join with Mr. Wilson in paying a tribute to the work of the Land Settlement Committee, the members of which are mainly men with practical land experience. This has been an important factor in the consideration given to land settlement schemes. At one time I was worried about sections 24, 25 and 26 of the 1944 Act dealing with compulsory land acquisition. Whilst that measure was before Parliament I visited the South-East and one prominent agriculturist showed me land at Hatherleigh, Furner and down as far as Wattle Range that appeared to need drainage before being put down to pasture. He also showed me a property where the settler had installed shallow drains and top-dressed the land. When I was there the pasture was excellent and the stock in very good condition.

The prominent agriculturist was confident that the acquisition powers were unnecessary because the land was under-developed. He offered me 1,500 acres between Konetta and the Millicent Road, and an area he had at Hatherleigh. What he showed me proved that under-developed land could be developed if the settlers put their minds to the job. I know the South-Eastern country and if the settlers work they can remove much surface

water and improve the land. It has been done on a property about 20 miles this side of Kingston, and excellent crops of strawberry clover and ryegrass have been grown. The Minister of Lands must feel that it has given him much help over the years. Having some knowledge of what happened after World War I, I am in a position to appreciate how much he must have valued its help in the rehabilitation of soldiers after World War II. In the light of recent scientific discoveries I hope that much more investigation will be made in respect of the counties of Cardwell, Buckingham and, possibly, MacDonnell. I saw some country that was allotted at Wattle Range where the settlers had a very difficult time indeed at the outset. Later, Waite Research Institute and the Department of Agriculture carried out experiments, with the result that these people have made a complete success of their holdings. We are fortunate in having these scientists available. As an instance of this, we have the recent announcement by the Department of Agriculture concerning the value of topdressing the lighter soils with lime, and the tremendous help that this has given in improving the carrying capacity of this type of land. The pasture lands in the 18in. to 20in. rainfall area will in future, I am sure become mixed farming country. I believe that the enactment of this legislation for a further period is justified and that the State will reap a tremendous gain from the work the committee is doing.

The Hon. C. R. STORY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADVANCES TO SETTLERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Attorney-General)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill amends the Advances to Settlers Act so that the maximum amount which may be advanced under section 12a of that Act for the purpose of the erection of a dwelling-house will conform with the maximum amounts proposed under the Bills to amend the Advances for Homes Act and the Homes Act. Section 12a of the Advances to Settlers Act, which was first enacted in 1944, provides that the State Bank may advance to a settler an amount up to £1,750 for the purpose of enabling a dwellinghouse to be erected,

enlarged or altered on his holding. The dwellinghouse is to be used as a residence by the settler or a member of his family or an employee or by a share farmer. The advance is to be secured by a mortgage of the settler's holding and it is provided that if the holding is already mortgaged to the Crown, the bank may take a subsequent mortgage. The total amount advanced under section 12a and under other sections of the Act, which provide for the making of advances for various purposes such as making improvements, stocking the holding and so on, is not to exceed 90 per cent of the value of the holding.

In conformity with the proposals for the amendment of the Advances for Homes Act and the Homes Act, the Bill amends section 12a of the Advances to Settlers Act by providing that the maximum advance under the section is to be £3,500 instead of the present maximum of £1,750. In other respects the Act is left unaltered, including the provision that advances are not to exceed 90 per cent of the value of the holding. As advances may be made to a settler under the Act for purposes other than under section 12a, it is considered that this percentage should not be altered.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON secured the adjournment of the debate.

HOLIDAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 29. Page 1439.)

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE (Midland)—I do not rise to speak because I think I am an authority on banking or the conduct of banks but because I do not think it fair to give a silent vote. There appear to be as many opinions on this as there are people present. There is an old Latin saying, *Quot homines tot sententiae*—so many men so many different opinions. From the general atmosphere on this question, I think everybody is suspicious of everybody else and the whole picture is far from clear. We have had no really clarifying statement on the question. We are told that the bank officers want a certain thing, but the officers who appear to control the banks take the view that they do not care what happens, and if ever there was a situation which merited the term "passing the buck," this is it. The difficulty arises from the fact that only one bank in South Australia has a local board

of directors, so that everybody working in a bank is a bank officer, and even so there appears to be a difference in the attitude of the different officers. Some apparently want a holiday, and the most one can get out of others is that they do not care which way it goes. Certainly, as far as one can see, every party to this question seems to be afraid of some or all of the other parties. We have been told that there is some politics in this; that if we do not vote for the measure we shall offend a certain body, but if we do we shall offend another body. This seems to be a situation where one has to vote trying not to offend one's self, and not to see on which side one's bread is buttered.

There has certainly been no attempt to assess the effect of the repercussions of this Bill. It will certainly not be confined to the banks' closing on Saturday mornings. I shall not attempt to follow this thought to its conclusion, but it seems to me that the case in favour of the Bill is based on very weak and probably completely wrong premises. We are told that because certain people do not work on Saturday mornings it follows as a natural consequence that certain other people have a natural right to stop work. If that is carried to its logical conclusion, no-one would work on Saturday mornings; there would be no transport, no doctors, no hotels, and no shops, until a situation of absolute absurdity would be reached. It appears to me to be wrong because people in different walks of life have vastly different responsibilities; and in any case I do not think encouragement should be given to every attempt to shorten working hours. When I knew work first, I think the hours were about 58 a week. Later they were shortened and later still we had Saturday afternoons off, and subsequently came down to the whole of Saturday. Now we are down to about 40 hours a week or less.

I firmly believe that if we are to maintain our present standards of living, and perhaps even improve them, we shall not do it by working less and less. The time must come when we shall have to work a great deal harder. I think we are living in a sort of fool's paradise, which cannot go on forever. America and Germany are two places which are really going ahead better than we are. In those countries men really work and they are justifying their claim for better standards of living. Banking is a service to the public and cannot be run with no consideration other than that of the ease and comfort of bank officers. Banks are

custodians of people's money and should give unrestricted freedom of access to those funds by the depositors. We have heard much about the bank officers, but nothing has been said on behalf of the depositors, and there are many thousands of them for every single bank officer. We should afford them much more consideration before giving away their rights. If this Bill is passed it will introduce a concession detrimental to the interests of the depositors, particularly those in the country, to whom Saturday morning business is important.

I began by saying that we were warned that this was one of those Bills that was not designed to influence people and make friends, but I believe that in cases like this, one has to make up one's mind on general principles and vote accordingly. Therefore, I propose to vote against the measure.

The Hon. C. R. STORY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, November 4, at 2.15 p.m.