HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, August 26, 1958.

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

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

The SPEAKER—I have to inform the House that His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor will be prepared to receive the House for the purpose of its presenting the Address in Reply at 2.10 p.m. today. I propose now to proceed to Government House and I ask the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply and other members to accompany me.

At 2.2 p.m. the Speaker and members proceeded to Government House. They returned at 2.19 p.m.

The SPEAKER—I have to inform the House that, accompanied by the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to the Lieutenant-Governor's Opening Speech, and by other members, I proceeded to Government House and there presented to His Excellency the Address adopted by the House on August 20, to which His Excellency was pleased to make the following reply:—

I thank you for your Address in Reply to the Speech with which I opened the fourth Session of the thirty-fifth Parliament. I am confident that you will give full and careful attention to all matters placed before you, and I pray that God's blessings may crown your labours.

QUESTIONS.

COUNTRY SUBSIDIZED HOSPITAL CHARGES.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Recently I had a complaint from a Pensioners' Association about charges made against aged pensioners at Government subsidized hospitals in the country. Can the Premier say whether in the arrangements made by his Government under which subsidies are granted to these hospitals, there is any provision that they should treat indigent persons and aged pensioners either free or at a reduced charge?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Government provides two types of subsidies to country hospitals. One is the subsidy paid in respect of building costs, and that is usually an amount equal to the amount raised by the local hospital board. The other is a subsidy in respect of payments made to the hospital, and I think that is the one the honourable member is concerned about. The position is that the Government takes into account in its annual grant to a hospital the number of patients that it is obliged to treat free because they are not in a position to pay. So far as I know, there is no set formula that is followed. Each hospital operates under its own board with the assistance of the Government, and the Government subsidy is much more liberal if many patients have to be treated without charge than where the number is small.

DAIRYING STANDARDS.

Mr. JENKINS—Has the Minister of Agriculture a further reply to the question I asked last week about dairying standards and the fall in the price of butterfat?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I have a long report from the Director of Agriculture to the effect that South Australia has five per cent of the Australian dairy cow population and produces seven per cent of the total Australian milk production. In 1957 Australia exported approximately 80,000 tons of butter, South Australia's contribution being 1,000 tons. South Australia imports over 3,000 tons of the 10,000 tons of butter consumed in this State. South Australia is the second largest producer and exporter of cheese in the Commonwealth. For some years the quality of South Australian cheese has been the best for the Commonwealth. The quality of cheese exported from South Australia during 1957-58 was of a standard never achieved previously by any other State. In view of those facts, it is not likely that the quality of South Australian butter exports has any significant effect on overall prices for Australian butter on the United Kingdom market. The fall in overseas prices is general and has applied to produce from all countries. The outstanding achievements with cheese quality would indicate a good standard on most dairy farms; in fact, it can be said that the percentage of bad dairy farms and farmers is no higher in South Australia than in other States or countries. Those last remarks are in reply to the honourable member's question about the standard of hygiene in dairies. The Director's report is a long one, so I shall not read it, but I have given the main points and will let the honourable member, or any other member, see it if he desires.

MEDICAL BENEFITS ORGANIZATIONS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Can the Minister representing the Attorney-General say whether the Ajax Hospital and Medical Benefit Company Limited has gone out of business or is

insolvent, and whether the same firm has now formed a company known as the Australian Dental Fund?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I was informed that the honourable member desired this information, and I have for him, through the Attorney-General, a report from the Registrar of Companies:—

The Ajax Hospital and Medical Benefit Company Limited was incorporated on 7th October, 1952, as a company limited by guarantee and not having a share capital. The Dental Fund of Australia Limited is a private limited company, which was originally incorporated on 24th June, 1952, under the name of Ajax Hospital & Medical Benefit Company Limited, changed its name to Atlas Hospital & Medical Benefit Company Limited on 7th October, 1952 (to enable the above guarantee company to be registered under the name of "Ajax") and later changed its name to Dental Fund of Australia Limited on 20th December, 1956.

Both companies are still on the register and no reports have been received to the effect that either of them is insolvent or has ceased business, nor have any complaints been received in this office, concerning their inability or refusal to meet their commitments.

I have some further information giving the names of the shareholders and directors which I shall be pleased to supply to the honourable member for his own personal use if he desires.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Will the Minister of Education obtain a copy of the constitution—if there is one—and balance-sheet of the company mentioned? Will he obtain all possible information as there is considerable discontent about payments?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I shall be pleased to do so.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Has the Treasurer a reply to my question on August 13 concerning the activities of a certain medical benefits organization?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—If I remember correctly, I told the honourable member that the Government was investigating this matter with the object of introducing legislation to control societies not registered under the Commonwealth health scheme. That legislation has been drawn up by the Parliamentary Draftsman and was submitted to Cabinet yesterday. Cabinet approved of it, but desired the Attorney-General to investigate the inclusion of two additional clauses to strengthen the legislation. A Bill dealing with this matter will come before this House this session. The Government has received a number of complaints concerning the activities of certain societies besides that referred to by the honourable member.

RIVER MURRAY LEVELS.

Mr. KING—Following on recent reports of the flooding of the tributaries of the River Murray and the public concern about the levels that might be expected in South Australia, can the Minister of Works give me any information about the probable effect of any flooding on the Paringa causeway, which is part of the Sturt Highway, and on bridge works and other works in progress in the Renmark area?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The member for Murray indicated that he would ask a question on this matter, and perhaps the information I can now give will serve to answer both honourable members. This morning, Mr. Dridan, Engineer-in-Chief, said it was still a little too early to estimate what the levels are likely to be: it may be another week at least before calculations can be made with any degree of accuracy. Certain forecasts have been made, namely that the level at Renmark may reach the 23ft. mark about the end of September, and that about a fortnight later the crest of the wave may reach the downstream areas, in which the member for Murray is particularly interested. There may be a rise of some 3ft. or 4ft. at Mannum and perhaps a couple of feet at Wellington. I understand that the Highways Commissioner recently visited Renmark to examine bridge works in progress and to consider any effect a higher river would have on them. No-one can state with certainty what the river levels will be. The figures I have given are approximations based on information so far received.

Mr. BYWATERS—Settlers in the lower river areas are worried about the expected rise in view of what happened during the 1956 flood. They are concerned about whether the recently constructed banks have consolidated sufficiently to withstand a high river. I compliment the men on this job on the work they have done, and they have used good material. Can the Minister indicate whether the banks have consolidated sufficiently or whether it is advisable to place a layer of sand over them because they are constructed of fairly new clay?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I have not been in the locality recently, but as soon as was practicable after the flood the engineers began rebuilding the flood banks and using a method of packing them sufficiently. I will get a report for the honourable member.

GLANVILLE-BIRKENHEAD WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. TAPPING—During the past three weeks I have had complaints from people living in the Glanville-Birkenhead area that the water supply is badly discoloured and has a bad odour. Has the Minister of Works received similar complaints and, if so, can he make a statement about them?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I have received no complaints personally nor have officers of the department reported any. I will refer the honourable member's remarks to the Engineer-in-Chief and if information can be obtained will let the honourable member have it.

SOUTH-EAST FLOODS.

Mr. HARDING—Has the Minister of Lands any statement to make relating to the flooding in the South-East?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I have two reports, one from Mr. Roe, the Superintendent of Land Development, and another from Mr. Blake, the Assistant Superintendent of the War Service Settlement Branch. The reports are lengthy, but in order to present a true picture of the position I shall quote extensively from them. On Sunday I had numerous phone communications with people in the affected areas, including the member for the district, Mr. Harding, who helped by reporting back to me. Mr. Roe reports:—

19th August.—Proceeded *via* Robe-Penola Road past Konetta settlement area to Reedy Creek. The Baker's Range drain was flowing at a very high level in the hundred Short. The areas of Konetta and surrounding country were not unduly wet and drains functioning satisfactorily. Through the Reedy Creek Range, Drain "K" appeared to be flowing at capacity—Drain Reedy Creek—K flowing at 2ft. 9in. The flats east of this drain were wet, but normal for this time of the year. This inspection was made with the Design Engineer for the South Australian Drainage Board and a surveyor from Engineering & Water Supply Department for the purpose of selecting subsidiary drain sites to pick up water from the eastern flats to take water from these Reedy Creek flats.

Mr. Blake reports:—

North of Naracoorte.—Very little evidence of excess water in this area. Some surface water seen on the flats—which is normal in wet seasons.

I should mention that these reports were made last Friday and that there has since been over an inch of rain in the Naracoorte area, which will add to the problems of some settlers. The report continues:—

Naracoorte—Penola.—The flat country west of the main road is inundated in numerous areas—the worst being in the vicinity of Bool Lagoon. Mosquito Creek had dropped considerably, but was still flowing very freely and much will depend on further rains in Victoria in regard to the level of this stream. The property of W. A. Rodda was very wet due to recent flooding from Mosquito Creek. The settlement of Wrattenbully was looking well and is not unduly affected by the wet conditions.

South of Penola.—It was noted that flooding had occurred on the properties of R. A. Bennier and A. G. Kirk, and all swamps had been filled but I doubt whether the position is any worse than in other wet winters.

Kalangadoo District.—No evidence of flooding was seen here and the pasture position appeared to be normal for this time of the year.

Hundred of Short *via* Wattle Range Homestead.—This is a very wet area but drains appear to be functioning satisfactorily and stocks seen in the paddocks appeared to be holding their own.

Hundred of Fox.—Although some surface water was seen on the low ground, conditions did not appear to be any worse, if as bad, as in other wet winters. The plight of one settler here in particular was worsened owing to the fact that a new drain along the north of his property did not function satisfactorily and bad flooding has taken place.

I have arranged for the Chief Inspector of the Lands Department to visit the area again this week. Members of the South-Eastern Drainage Board are making a close inspection and will report to me later this week.

FRUIT FLY INFESTATION.

Mr. HUTCHENS—The fruit fly infestation has affected my district and gangs have been working there for a considerable time. I express the gratitude of my constituents for the way the department has worked. I read in a sub-leader of the *News* that the department is considering importing a beetle that it is hoped will destroy the fly. Can the Minister of Agriculture inform me what progress has been made in this matter?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I appreciate the honourable member's comments on the way the campaign has been conducted in his district. I cannot give much information about the biological control he mentioned; all I know is that there are two parasites of the Oriental fruit fly, which is present in Hawaii. These two parasites, the technical names of which are *Opius longicaudatus* and *Opius oophilus*, have been brought to Australia from Hawaii and have been released at Coffs Harbour, near Sydney, because they are known to parasitize the Queensland fruit fly. During the present science congress I have asked scientists what progress has been made in the use of these two parasites, and was told that their use is rather

a long shot, that there is no special promise of success yet, and that they are only one of the things scientists are working on. As there is no fruit fly in South Australia now and we therefore could not support parasites, the direct effect of their use here would be nil, but the indirect benefits would be great if they helped to clean up fruit fly in other States, from where there is always danger of infestation.

NORTHERN SUBURBS TRAFFIC PROBLEM.

Mr. COUMBE—The Adelaide City Council and the Prospect and Walkerville councils are co-operating in a joint scheme to overcome a serious traffic problem on the Main North Road where it joins Robe Terrace and Fitzroy Terrace at Medindie. Some time ago I approached the Highways Department asking it to assist by providing a layout plan for improving conditions at this intersection. I am now receiving almost daily complaints from residents in the vicinity about the danger at the intersection. As buses have replaced trams on this route, will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Roads if this plan is available for the consideration of the three councils concerned, and if not, will he undertake to have the matter expedited?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I will take up the matter with my colleague.

SOUTH-EAST HARBOUR WORKS.

Mr. CORCORAN—Recently I asked the Minister of Agriculture whether the building of a slipway at Beachport was proceeding according to plan, and if so, whether he could say about when the work would be completed. I also asked whether the construction of a jetty at Southend was nearing completion. Has the Minister obtained a report?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—The Harbors Board reports that the civil works on the Beachport slipway are expected to be completed by about the end of next month, subject to favourable weather conditions. The petrol-driven winch is undergoing trials at the board's dockyard, and if these are satisfactory it should be ready for installation within a few weeks. The construction of a small jetty at Southend has been completed with the exception of the installation of a small hand crane.

RABBIT DESTRUCTION.

Mr. LAUCKE—The use of such poisons as 1080 as rabbit exterminators becomes increasingly necessary as the effectiveness of myxomatosis declines. I understand that in Victoria and Western Australia the Crown Lands Departments provide a service of distribution of 1080 to landholders. Will the Minister consider encouraging the use of 1080 in South Australia by adopting distribution methods and advisory services similar to those operating in Victoria and Western Australia?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—The control of vermin is principally a matter for the Lands Department, but as the question relates to the poison 1080 I have obtained a report from the Director of Agriculture as follows:—

The position in South Australia is this:—

1. The cost of 1080 poisoned oats is 46s. per tin of 25 lb. of oats, or 24s. per tin of 10 lb.
2. These treated oats are dried and can be stored indefinitely.
3. They are available through any stock agent.

The Victorian position is:—

1. 1080 is available from Crown Lands and Survey officers, of which there are reported to be over 300.
2. The cost is 4s. per 15 lb. tin of bait supplied by the landowner.
3. The actual cost therefore per 25 lb. is 6s. 10d. for 1080 plus cost of oats or other bait which the owner must find for himself, plus cost of travelling to contact Crown Lands officer. To this must be added the inconvenience of connecting with this Crown Lands officer and carrying, storing, and using a wet, prepared, dangerous bait.
4. There must be added also the cost of the service supplied by the Department of Crown Lands Survey in the way of salary and maintenance of the staff of 300 officers. Although this service may not be a direct charge on the 1080 poisoned bait, it must be met in the cost of Government.

The alternative to the present system now operating in this State is a huge increase in personnel and equipment to distribute the 1080 as operates in Victoria and Western Australia.

The wide variation in prices quoted in the report is not as real as the figures suggest. Victorian landholders provide their own bait base and have the added cost and inconvenience of arranging for mixing at district centres. The system adopted in this State is safe and efficient and is the only practicable method in the absence of an extensive departmental organization such as exists in Victoria. In addition, the South Australian system ensures control over mixing and provides a safe method of distribution. As I mentioned earlier, we are appointing two officers for special technical advisory matters in controlling vermin, particularly rabbits. Although 1080

plays a very important part in the rabbit destruction campaign, it is only a part. We can expect a general campaign against rabbits as a result of the appointment of these two officers, who will take over the matter of baiting with 1080 for landholders.

MANSFIELD PARK SCHOOL.

Mr. JENNINGS—Has the Minister of Education a further reply to my question of last week concerning toilet facilities at the Mansfield Park Primary School?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—The Architect-in-Chief advises that tenders will be advertised in next week's issue of the *Government Gazette* for this work to be done.

VOLUNTARY OAT POOL.

Mr. HAMBOUR—My question concerns the operations of the oatgrowers' voluntary pool, to which farmers sent their oats in the face of a strong demand. Several of my constituents sent oats to the pool and I will briefly state the details of two cases. On November 1, 1957, farmer A forwarded 1,120 bags (3,777 bushels); on March 1, 1957, he received a first payment of 3s. 3d. less 7d. freight, leaving 2s. 8d.; on July 2, 1957, he received a second payment of 1s.; and on August 18, 1958, he received a final payment of 1s., making a total of 4s. 8d. His oats were of good quality—early Kherson type—and the current price at delivery was from 6s. 4d. to 6s. 6d. Farmer B has received only two payments. Farmer A called on the promoter on June, 1957, to buy at 7s. a bushel and was told that the price was 9s. a bushel. He had been promised a minimum of 6s. 3d. a bushel. The price soared to over 11s. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether contributors to the pool are entitled to a balance-sheet, as the oats were not the property of the promoter, but sold on their behalf? Is the promoter entitled to all profit made or only to salary and other costs? Will the Minister investigate the activities of this organization to see that it is in order, and can he say whether it is possible to obtain a copy of the constitution of the pool? I will give the Minister the names of the parties concerned.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—As I understand it, the voluntary oat pool is a private arrangement between the farmers and the promoter and I do not think it is the concern of my department in any way to interfere. I cannot say whether growers are entitled to a copy of the balance-sheet: I think that it is their own arrangement and if they want to find out these things their only recourse is to get legal advice. I do not think it is my concern; therefore I am unable to answer the question.

N.S.W. LIBERAL LEADER'S VISIT.

Mr. LAWN—Prior to this session the local press reported that Mr. Morton (Leader of the Liberal Party in New South Wales) was in South Australia to obtain a few hints from our Premier, probably on how to gerrymander the electorate if he becomes Premier next year. Last Thursday evening's *News* contained the following report under the heading, "In Training for Election":—

Liberal Leader of the Opposition, Mr. P. H. Morton, has gone into strict training for the State election campaign. Probably with a view to impressing the Premier, Joe Cahill, with his iron constitution, he is taking a long, cold swim every morning in the sharky waters of Balmoral Beach, Sydney Harbour. After the plunge he is doing 300 skips, a series of deep-breathing exercises and a medicine ball routine.

Will the Premier say whether such training is the result of the advice he gave Mr. Morton? Does the Premier intend to follow it himself? If so, will he let me know when he intends to go for his cold swim so that I can purloin his towel?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—That is not the advice I gave to Mr. Morton, although I gave him some advice and I have no doubt he will in due course act upon it successfully.

PORT AUGUSTA FRUIT FLY CAMPAIGN.

Mr. RICHES—During the fruit fly eradication campaign at Port Augusta instructions were issued to home gardeners not to plant tomatoes and other vegetables and fruit until September. As the season is considerably earlier in the northern part of the State than in the metropolitan area and as this is the time plantings would normally be made, will the Minister of Agriculture issue a statement on the future intentions of the department concerning the fruit fly campaign at Port Augusta so that home gardeners may be advised early of its intentions for the next three months?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I will see what can be done.

WHEAT RESEARCH PROJECTS.

Mr. STOTT—Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked last week about wheat research projects and the necessity for getting trained personnel to undertake the work?

The Hon D. N. BROOKMAN—The Wheat Industry Research Committee has approved a programme of wheat research and extension projects to be conducted by the Department of Agriculture, Department of Chemistry, Roseworthy Agricultural College and the Waite Agricultural Research Institute. Arrangements are also being made for the financing of these projects through a trust fund. Certain of the staff required by the Department of Agriculture will not be needed until laboratory facilities are available at Northfield. Other field staff, including a research officer and five field officers, are required immediately and steps have been taken to have the positions advertised in all States.

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT.

Mr. KING—Has the Minister of Repatriation any further information to give the House on the question of soldier settlement?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—The honourable member indicated last weekend that he required further information on this matter and I have a report from the Director of Lands stating:—

On July 24 the Commonwealth Director of War Service Land Settlement (Mr. T. T. Colquhoun) advised by letter that the Commonwealth had fixed June 30, 1959, as the date by which all development must be substantially completed and after which no further land will be acquired for war service land settlement. He added that funds could be provided to bring to allotment stage, only those projects where the basic work would be completed by the autumn of 1959. No specific reference was made to single unit propositions. There was a further conference on August 20, when Mr. Colquhoun clarified the position. The Commonwealth decision refers to both group projects and single units. No further land for war service land settlement will be purchased after June 30, 1959, and it was unlikely that approval would be given to the purchase of any land, whether for the general scheme or as a single unit, unless any further development required could be substantially completed by that date.

This morning I brought this matter up in Cabinet, which discussed the position, and it was agreed that this State would push strongly for further consideration regarding single units.

RE-AGGREGATION OF SUBURBAN LAND.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked on August 12 about the re-aggregation of suburban land?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Applications for the issue of proclamations under section 29 of the Town Planning Act are submitted to the Attorney-General, who is the Minister administering that Act. It is the Minister's practice to obtain a report from the Town Planner on each application, and such other information as he deems necessary. Because it is recognized that local governing authorities may be affected by the issue of such proclamations, it is also the Minister's practice to notify the corporation or district council concerned that an application has been received and any submissions they care to make on the matter will be considered. After all this information is to hand the matter is then considered by Cabinet which decides whether or not to recommend to His Excellency that a proclamation be issued. In the circumstances, it is felt that the interests of all parties receive proper consideration and it is not intended to introduce legislation this session to vary this practice.

PARK STREET RAILWAY CROSSING.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked some time ago about traffic arrangements at the Park Street railway crossing?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—My colleague, the Minister of Roads, has furnished me with the following report:—

The Railways Commissioner reports that from the departmental point of view, the situation at this crossing is not necessarily related to that at the North Adelaide crossing, and no action is envisaged at present. Depending upon the decision reached concerning North Adelaide, following proposed investigations by officers of the Railways Department and the Adelaide Corporation, the Hindmarsh Corporation may desire that some adjustment be made at Park Street crossing. In accordance with normal policy, the Commissioner will be glad to make available an officer to confer with that authority on any matter of mutual concern.

SWIMMING POOL IN NATIONAL PARK.

Mr. FRED WALSH—It was reported in the press recently that the board of trustees of National Park is planning to construct scenic lakes within the park boundaries, and that they would not be used for swimming, though children would be allowed to paddle in the shallow parts. In many parks, particularly in the Perth National Park and at Yanchep

(which is only about four miles from a beach), swimming pools have been provided by the Western Australian Tourist Bureau. I believe the Premier was the originator of the plan to construct scenic lakes at our National Park. I support the scheme, but I ask him to take up with the trustees the question of providing a swimming pool within the park boundaries.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I would be happy to consider the provision of a swimming pool in the National Park as a separate project. The Revenue Estimates for this year are almost ready for submission to Parliament and it would be too late to include an amount for such a pool. I will have the matter examined and report to the honourable member in due course.

MILLICENT HOSPITAL.

Mr. CORCORAN—Has the Premier a further reply to the question I asked on August 12 relating to the Thyne Memorial Hospital at Millicent?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Minister of Health has provided me with full information concerning the capacity of this hospital and its general financial position. The report is as follows:—

Bed Capacity—

General . ..	22	Daily average	14.7
Midwifery ..	10	Daily average	4.78
Total	32	Total	19.48

The recent rebuilding and alterations for which a Government subsidy was provided, increased the bed capacity from 24 to 32. One of the chief reasons why a Government subsidy was provided for this scheme was that it would provide additional beds for the contemplated increase in patients resulting from the expected influx of population as the result of the establishment of new industries. No further requests have been received for financial assistance in order to provide additional beds to those mentioned above.

Capital subsidies provided by the Government during the last six years are as follows:—1952-53, £1,534; 1953-54, £7,600; 1954-55, £10,758; 1955-56, £5,329; 1956-57, £10,360; 1957-58, £258; total £35,839.

Maintenance subsidies.—As well as the above capital subsidies the following maintenance subsidies were provided by the Government:—1952-53, £2,200; 1953-54, £2,440; 1954-55, £2,500; 1955-56, £2,650; 1956-57, £3,150 1957-58, £3,270, total, £16,210. It is to be noted that during the last six years the Government has paid to the Thyne Memorial Hospital capital and maintenance subsidies to the amount of £52,049; that is, £8,675 per annum.

Mr. Corcoran—Are subsidies on a pound for pound basis?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Some are, but the maintenance subsidies are not. The capacity of the hospital at present is ample for the demands made on it. However, if there is any increased requirement the hospital will receive exactly the same sympathetic treatment that it has in the past.

NATURALIZATION CEREMONIES.

Mr. LAWN—At naturalization ceremonies every naturalized British subject receives enrolment cards for the Federal Parliament and for the State House of Assembly, but not for our Legislative Council. From the questionnaire which each applicant for naturalization must complete, sufficient information can be secured concerning his eligibility for such enrolment. Will the Premier examine the position to see that every person entitled to enrolment on the Legislative Council receives a card for that purpose?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have not attended many naturalization ceremonies, but at those I have attended I have always heard clearly stated the provisions that are necessary for enrolment in the Legislative Council. Obviously the circulation of a number of cards to people ineligible would only create confusion. I think the best method of dealing with this situation is to see that information is available so that those eligible to enrol can do so in the normal way.

CEMENT ROADS.

Mr. LAUCKE—Has the Minister of Works obtained a reply from the Minister of Roads to my recent question relating to the greater use of cement for road construction? If cement were used it would be in the interests both of the greater use of our local product and of perhaps highways constructed of more durable materials than those being used in many cases.

The Hon G. G. PEARSON—I think it is a matter for some gratification that there are adequate supplies of cement available for all purposes—indeed, to the extent that it could be used widely for roads—because it is not very long ago that cement was in very short supply and steps were taken by the Government and private companies to increase .output When the honourable member asked this question I told him as fully as I could the extent to which cement was being used on road construction, and the report I have obtained from the Minister of Roads bears out what I said. It goes further, however, and states:—

At the present time investigations into the practicability of using a cement stabilized base

on portion of the new pavement on the Main North Road between Pooraka and the Salisbury turn-off are being carried out. Cement concrete roads have not been constructed in this State to any great extent, mainly because of the large capital cost, but investigations are now being made into its possible use on heavily trafficked roads.

DISALLOWANCE OF BY-LAWS.

Mr. RICHES—Can the Premier inform me whether there has been any change in policy on the part of the Government in the conferring of powers on local government bodies? An extraordinary number of recommendations for disallowance have been made by the Subordinate Legislation Committee of by-laws that a couple of years ago would undoubtedly have been passed. These by-laws have been examined by legal authorities and found to be within the ambit of the various Acts under which local government works. The only reason given for the recommendations to disallow is that provision is made in the by-laws for a discretion to be used by local government—a discretion conferred by Parliament when the Act was passed. We have the farcical situation of these by-laws, having gone through legal preparation and examination, being recommended for disallowance in the manner we have seen this afternoon. I voice a vigorous protest at this unwarranted interference with local government—

The SPEAKER—I do not think the honourable member should debate the question.

Mr. RICHES—Will the Premier state whether this is a changed policy on the part of the Government, and if it is not, can he give local government any explanation for the attitude adopted, not only at the beginning of this session, but also towards the end of last session?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I assure the honourable member that this has nothing to do with the Government. It has not taken any action either directly or indirectly, nor have any conferences been held between the Government and the Subordinate Legislation Committee, which is a Parliamentary committee operating under powers vested in it by the Constitution. Although I am not as certain of this as of my previous remarks, I believe that these recommendations arise out of an action taken in the Supreme Court some time ago, when the court pointed out that it was very undesirable for any regulation to give discretion to administration, whereby the person concerned would not know if he was complying with the regulation or not, and could not know until he got advice from a local government authority. As a result of the court action Cabinet decided to withdraw a large number of regulations; although I am not sure of the exact number, I think it was between 40 and 50. The Subordinate Legislation Committee can explain to the House when these matters come up for debate whether the court decision has a direct bearing on its recommendations. There are very many regulations that would be within the jurisdiction of a regulation-making authority, but which nevertheless might not be good regulations.

Mr. O'Halloran—I have a couple in mind now.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I notice that the Leader of the Opposition has two or three to challenge already, so I think the honourable member might address his question just as well to him. The Leader is also opposed to people making regulations not within the scope of their authority.

FRUIT JUICES FOR SCHOOL CHILDREN.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Recently I asked the Minister of Education about the possibility of fruit juices being substituted for milk in certain isolated areas where it is impossible to get milk for school children under the Commonwealth scheme, and I understand that he has obtained information from the Commonwealth authorities on this matter. Will he now give me that information?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—As promised, I wrote to the Commonwealth Minister of Health (the Honourable Donald A. Cameron), setting out the Leader's question and my reply, and asking whether consideration would be given to the suggestions contained in the question. I have now received this reply from Dr. Cameron:—

I refer to your letter of August 8, 1958, concerning the question you were asked by Mr. M. R. O'Halloran, M.P., on the possibility of the supply of fruit juices to children attending schools in the country where great difficulty is experienced in procuring milk supplies. Milk is supplied to school children under 13 years of age attending primary schools under the States grants (Milk for School Children) Act, 1950, and this Act makes no provision for the supply of alternatives to milk, such as fruit juices.

Representations have been received from time to time requesting that provision be made for the supply of fruit, fruit juices and the like under the Free Milk Scheme, but it is not proposed to amend the Act to provide for the distribution of alternatives to milk. Where bottled pasteurized milk cannot be supplied,

there is no objection to alternative forms of milk being used, such as evaporated milk or powdered milk, provided that the alternative form can be obtained at a satisfactory price. As the distribution of free milk is administered by the Education Department on behalf of the Commonwealth Government and the department is bound by the Commonwealth instruction, I believe that I cannot take the matter any further.

ACOUSTICS OF ASSEMBLY CHAMBER.

Mr. KING—Have you, Mr. Speaker, a reply to my question of July 31 concerning the acoustics of this Chamber?

The SPEAKER—This matter was also raised last year by the late Mr. Fletcher and I took it up then. I am now able to report that the officers of the Architect-in-Chief's Department have made an investigation of the acoustics of the House of Assembly Chamber. The possibility of increasing the output of the existing amplifier system was examined and it was considered that, owing to age, wear and natural attrition of certain parts, resulting in a very low efficiency, no further work could be expected from the set. Approval has now been given by the honourable the Minister of Works for the installation of a new amplifying system. This will include 36 microphone-speaker units in the Chamber (the proposed microphones to be omni-directional in operation) and eight speakers for the *Hansard*, Speaker's and Strangers galleries. I am informed by the honourable the Minister that plans and specifications are at present being prepared for calling tenders for this work.

STURT CREEK BRIDGE.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Will the Minister representing the Minister of Roads ascertain from his colleague whether the Highways Department intends to call tenders soon for work on the Marion Road Bridge over the Sturt Creek, which would allow a free flow of traffic from South Road to Marion Road?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I will request that information for the honourable member.

LONG SERVICE LEAVE ENTITLEMENT.

Mr. LAWN—Has the Minister representing the Minister of Railways a reply to my recent question concerning the long service leave entitlement of a railway officer?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The Minister of Railways has forwarded the following report from the Railways Commissioner:—

The Public Service Commissioner has informed this department that all requests for continuity of service as between the Commonwealth and the South Australian State Government departments should be submitted to the Public Service Commissioner for decision. If the name of the employee concerned is supplied the matter will be taken up with the Public Service Commissioner.

RAILWAY EMPLOYEES: BREACHES OF REGULATIONS.

Mr. HUTCHENS (on notice)—What was the total amount received from fines imposed on railway employees for alleged breaches of regulations for each of the years 1956-7 and 1957-58?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Railways Commissioner reports:—

The total amount received from fines imposed on railway employees for alleged breaches of regulations for the year 1956-57 was £328 4s. 1d., and for the year 1957-58, £335 18s. These were the total amounts recovered from a small percentage of the average staff of 11,267 employed in 1956-57 and 11,104 in 1957-58. The wages received by the employees were £10,801,813 and £10,595,969 respectively.

COUNTRY SECONDARY INDUSTRIES FUND.

Mr. RICHES (on notice)—

1. What sums of money have been paid into the Country Secondary Industries Fund since its inception in 1943?

2. How many industries have been assisted from this fund?

3. Where are these industries situated?

4. What sum is available in the fund at present?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The replies are:—

1. Pursuant to Industries Development Act Amendment Act, 1943—from Revenue Surplus, 1942-43, £100,000.

Pursuant to Industries Development Act Amendment Act, 1951—Transfer from the Loan Fund, £25,000.

Repayments of principal and interest, £23,532.

2. Six industries.

3. Port Augusta, Lobethal, Wallaroo, West Coast, Mount Barker. In addition to loans made from the Country Secondary Industries Fund, the Government has also given financial assistance to industry by loans from its own funds and by arranging bank loans guaranteed by the Government. The extent of such assistance is as follows:—Two loans have been made to metropolitan industries totalling

£94,000. Twenty-four bank guarantees have been arranged:—

12 were for industries in the metropolitan area for amounts totalling £1,574,000

12 were for industries in country areas for amounts totalling .. £1,561,000

£3,135,000

The country areas concerned were:—Millicent, Port Lincoln, Port Noarlunga, Nuriootpa, Nairne, Port Augusta, Murray Bridge, Quorn, Kapunda, Houghton, Mount Barker, and American River (Kangaroo Island).

4. £87,617.

INSTITUTIONS FOR INEBRIATES.

Mr. STEPHENS (on notice)—

1. How many premises have been licensed or subsidized for the reception, control, and treatment of inebriates under section 22 of the Inebriates Act, 1908-1934?

2. Are any of the above licensed premises operating today?

3. If so, how many inmates are in such premises?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The replies are:—

1. One.

2. No.

3. *Vide* No. 2. Eden Hills Inebriates Institution was the only place declared under section 22 of the Inebriates Act and this placed was closed on July 31, 1930.

SUPPLY ACT (No. 2).

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor intimated by message his assent to the Act.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONSOLIDATION BILLS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD moved—

That the House of Assembly request the concurrence of the Legislative Council in the appointment for the present session of a joint committee to which all Consolidation Bills shall stand referred, in accordance with Joint Standing Order No. 18, and to which any further question, relative thereto, may at anytime be sent by either House for report.

That, in the event of the Joint Committee being appointed, the House of Assembly be represented thereon by three members, two of whom shall form the quorum of the Assembly Members necessary to be present at all sittings of the Committee.

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolutions.

That Messrs. King, Millhouse and O'Halloran be representatives of the Assembly on the said committee.

Motion carried.

PARLIAMENTARY DRAFTSMAN.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD moved—

That Standing Order No. 85 be so far suspended for the remainder of the session as to enable the Parliamentary Draftsman and his assistants to be accommodated with seats in the Chamber on the right hand side of the Speaker.

Motion carried.

ROAD CHARGES (REFUNDS) BILL.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—moved—

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution:—

That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to authorize the Treasurer to refund certain moneys paid under the Road and Railway Transport Act Amendment Act, 1956, as charges for the use of public roads.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It enables the Treasurer to refund road charges paid under the amending Road and Railway Transport Act of 1956. This Act imposed a road charge based on weight and mileage, but was subsequently held by the High Court to be invalid. However, when the Act was brought into force a number of carriers obeyed it, made payments, and sent in the prescribed returns. Others ignored the Act, claiming that it was unconstitutional. The Transport Control Board took steps to enforce the Act and an undertaking was given to those hauliers who complied with the Act that if the Act were subsequently held to be unconstitutional Parliament would be asked to authorize a refund of any charges paid. This Bill is introduced to give effect to that undertaking.

The Government still believes that, apart from the constitutional position, the road charge was reasonable and justified on the merits, and if the undertaking had not been given there would be no cause for refund. However, it appreciates the attitude of the carriers who observed the Act, and asks Parliament to pass this Bill. Members will

agree that it would be grossly unfair to prejudice the position of those who complied with the law while others ignored it. The amount of money involved is not great, but the principle is important.

Mr. O'HALLORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

COUNTRY HOUSING BILL.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD moved—

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution:—

That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to authorize the Treasurer to grant to the South Australian Housing Trust three hundred and sixty-eight thousand and nineteen pounds for the purpose of providing housing for persons of limited means.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—(Premier and Treasurer)—I move:—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to authorize the Treasurer to make a grant of £368,019 to the Housing Trust. This sum represents the amount received by the State as its share of a grant of £5,000,000 to the States by the Commonwealth and which was, under the Appropriation Act recently passed, appropriated by Parliament to the Treasurer for miscellaneous purposes.

It is provided by the Bill that the grant to the trust is to be expended in the construction of houses in country areas which are to be let to persons of limited income. Thus, the expenditure of the grant will have two results. It will provide in the near future about 150 good and comfortable houses in country towns which will be let to people such as pensioners, widows with children, and others who cannot afford to pay full economic rents. In addition, this building programme, which will be in addition to the ordinary country programme of the trust, will stimulate the country building industry and the many associated industries and thus have considerable effect upon employment in country towns.

The Bill provides that the houses are to be let at a rent not exceeding one-sixth of the family income of the tenant as determined by the trust but that the minimum rent is to be £1 a week. However, it is realized that in years to come it may be desirable to change the amount of the minimum rent, and it is provided that the Governor may make regulations prescribing another minimum amount. Regulations, of course, are subject to disallowance by Parliament if their terms are not in compliance with what members believe to be in the best interests of the community.

Mr. O'Halloran—Providing sufficient members so believe.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—That is so. In point of fact, £1 a week or one-sixth of the income will be the minimum rent until such time as Parliament approves of some alteration. It is not the Government's intention to alter these amounts, but with the effluxion of time it may become necessary to make some amendment by regulation. It is also provided that the rents, less any necessary outgoings, are to be applied by the trust towards the building of further houses. The trust has offered to bear the cost of administering the houses from its other funds so that, with no commitments to meet for interest and repayment of principal—and these account for a very substantial proportion of ordinary trust rents—the only outgoings will be for such as rates and taxes, maintenance costs and the like. It follows that, from the commencement of the scheme, funds representing the major part of the rents, will be accumulating so as to permit the building of further houses and that, in the course of time, more and more houses can be built. Members will appreciate that this is a wise provision because not only will we be able to provide homes for people with limited means but a circulating fund will be established from which more houses can be built.

Houses will be built in groups ranging from two to ten or more and as it is shown that there is a demand for more houses in any towns that demand can be met. It is expected that the initial expenditure proposed by the Bill will bring about the erection of houses in at least 30 towns. The designs for these houses provide for either three or four rooms and it is expected that, almost without exception, they will be built of brick, stone or concrete. Each house will be well equipped with cupboards, bathroom, laundry, septic tank and so on. The houses will be detached and have their own allotments of land. If the accommodation in a house is insufficient to meet the needs of say, a widow with a family of children, it is proposed to add a sleepout which can be removed and used elsewhere when the need for its use has come to an end.

The trust is carrying out in the metropolitan area a very successful programme of small dwellings especially designed to cater for elderly people such as pensioners and, so far, about 350 of these dwellings have been built. Heretofore, the trust has endeavoured to meet the housing needs of pensioners and the like in country areas by allotting them ordinary houses of the smaller types. The proposals in the Bill will make it possible for a great deal more to be done for elderly people in the country who, in many cases, have spent a great part of their lives in a country town and who wish to live there for the remainder of their lives. The scheme set out in the Bill will make it possible for a substantial and ever-growing number of houses to be provided for such people at rents within their means. It will, at the same time, stimulate employment in country areas. When members examine this Bill they will realize that it can be supported by all sections of the House. I believe it will give substantial relief to country people who at present are badly catered for in respect of housing. We have made some provision in the metropolitan area, but I believe this is the first occasion on which any real approach has been made to the problem in the country.

Mr. O'HALLORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

POLICE OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Works), having obtained leave, introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Police Offences Act, 1953-57. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It makes amendments to the Police Offences Act dealing with three different topics. The first proposal is to repeal that section of the principal Act which makes it an offence for a person who is not an aboriginal native as defined in the Act to consort habitually with aboriginal natives without reasonable excuse. This section was enacted in the consolidating and amending Act of 1953, but a somewhat similar principle had been in the law for 90 years before that. The first enactment on the subject was in the Police Act of 1863.

These laws were passed for the purpose of protecting aboriginals against white men who might desire to associate with them for exploitation or criminal or immoral purposes. Obviously they were not intended to retard the assimilation of natives into community life, nor to humiliate them in any way. However, in recent times it has been felt by members of associations interested in the welfare of aboriginals that the section may tend to retard or prevent the assimilation of aboriginals into the life and activities of the general community and may sometimes embarrass or humiliate them. As members know, Parliament and the Government have been requested either to amend or repeal the section.

The Government has given very careful consideration to the request. Although it is open to doubt whether all the criticisms of the section are justified, the Government is anxious that no impediment should exist to the free development of honourable and friendly associations between the natives and other sections of the community. For this reason it now proposes the repeal of section 14. It regards the repeal as an experiment worth a trial. If future experience should show the need for re-introducing some such protection for aboriginals as was given by the section the matter will be reconsidered in a sympathetic and humane spirit.

There has been a wide divergence of opinion on the question of this repeal. As we have seen from press reports and from discussions on the matter, no one has yet discovered any clear procedure which will meet a problem that is very much with us at present. The Aborigines Protection Board has reported to me that it does not favour the repeal of this section, and in fairness to the members of the Board I make that fact public. The problem of the assimilation of our aborigines requires the very deep sympathy and goodwill of the community and their willingess to do their best to effect this assimilation. Otherwise, any such attempt will be doomed from the outset.

We have a problem which is probably unique in the world. Because of the instinctive nomadic habits of the Australian aborigine it is extremely difficult to fit him into domestic civilization, and in using the word "domestic" I want to hark back to the Latin *domesticus,* from *domus,* a house. During no time of their history has this been part of their daily living. As far as I am aware, nowhere else in the world do people exist who have the nomadic habit of the Australian aborigine. In the islands north of Australia, Malaya, North America and South America and, indeed, wherever native people exist, they have some kind of village life, but such does not apply to the Australian aborigines.

Mr. O'Halloran—What about their tribal life?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—That is a well-defined characteristic of these people, but it does not help them when it comes to living in one locality for a long period and living in some kind of habitation which is an essential part of civilized life. Their habits are nomadic, whereas our civilization is based on domesticity. Because there is such a wide divergence of opinion on this question the Bill is not introduced as a Party measure. It is in a form more closely related to social legislation, and the Government has indicated to its members that it desires them to express their opinions completely freely, as indeed they do on any legislation. This part of the Bill is not considered as being strictly a Government measure. The Government desires that it be accepted by the House on an experimental basis, and it asks that support be given to it on that understanding.

It is not desired at this stage to open up other aspects of our relations with aborigines. I think all will agree that this is a problem in which haste is best made slowly. I could refer at length to steps which are already being taken to assist in the matter. As members are well aware, the Government has done a considerable amount over the years towards the welfare and protection of aborigines, and other organizations have interested themselves similarly in this problem. Church missions have done very valuable work in regard to aboriginal welfare over a long period, and are still doing it. The Aborigines Friends Association, a very old-established organization, has also performed valuable work in this regard. Next Wednesday week that Association celebrates its 100th Anniversary, and a function has been arranged in the city for that day to celebrate the occasion.

The Government, as the years have gone by and particularly recently, has stepped up its contribution from public funds towards aboriginal welfare, and this year's Budget will show a very steep increase again on top of previously steep increases for this purpose. Despite some criticism we sometimes hear, a very great deal is being done by a sympathetic community and a sympathetic Government towards a solution of this difficult problem. I commend this experiment to the House with a request that it should support this provision on an experimental basis so that we can determine whether the step now proposed to be taken is a step in the right direction. If it is, then possibly we may in a short time move further ahead towards removing any of those sections in our legislation which may distinguish our native people from the rest of the community.

Mr. Riches—Can you tell me whether this has been asked for by anyone working among aborigines?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—If the honourable member would take his mind back to the correspondence in the press he would see that some people who I think are considered authorities among aborigines have requested that this step be taken.

Mr. Riches—Are they people working among aborigines?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—If any person's name is to be mentioned I would mention Dr. Duguid's, and I have no doubt there are others. I did not see who were the signatories to the petition that was presented.

Mr. O'Halloran—There were 7,000 of them, weren't there?

Mr. Shannon—All "Do-gooders."

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I think there were 6,000 or 7,000, and some of those people would have a thorough knowledge of this matter. I will now continue with the other clauses of the Bill which I have indicated are of a different nature from the clause I have been discussing.

Clause 4 deals with a class of conduct which was formerly thought to be punishable, but has recently been held by the Supreme Court not to be so. The offence may be described in popular language as faking death or other events which appear to call for police action. There have been two or three examples of this class of conduct in the last few months. In one case two persons lost their lives in the search for a man who had faked a disappearance from rocks on the south coast. At present there is an offence created by section 62 of the Police Offences Act which consists of knowingly making false verbal reports to the police as to the occurrence of circumstances calling for police investigation.

The class of conduct with which clause 4 deals is similar in principle to this existing offence. The main difference is that section 62 applies to false verbal representations, whereas clause 4 deals with false representations made by conduct. It used to be thought that this kind of conduct was one form of the crime of "doing an act to the public mischief" which was punishable by imprisonment or fine of any amount which the court might think appropriate. It is undoubtedly a matter which deserves severe punishment and for this reason the Bill provides for a penalty of a

fine not exceeding £100 or imprisonment for not more than one year. In addition the defendant may be ordered to pay the costs of any police investigation resulting from his crime.

Clause 5 deals with the power of members of the police force to board ships for the purpose of preserving peace and good order and preventing and detecting the commission of offences. This power is conferred by section 69 of the Police Offences Act. The section, however, only confers power on members of the force in charge of a police station or holding a rank not lower than sergeant. A constable cannot act under the section except when accompanied by a superior officer. The Commissioner of Police has asked that the section should be altered so as to remove the limitation on the power of constables. The shipping police at Port Adelaide consists of 10 constables and a sergeant, and the constables work in pairs. Obviously it is not possible for a sergeant to accompany every pair of constables and thus the present law is an impediment to the efficient use of the available police. It is desirable that the powers conferred by section 69 should be exercisable by constables. There seems to be no strong reason for restricting their powers in this matter, because in most statutory provisions conferring powers on members of the force, constables are authorized to act equally with non-commissioned officers. It is true that section 70 of the Police Offences Act, which also confers powers on the police in relation to ships, is limited to ranks above constable. But there is a special reason for this because section 70 confers the drastic power of stopping a ship. There is no similar justification for limiting section 69. It is therefore proposed by clause 5 to confer the powers mentioned in section 69 on any member of the police force.

Mr. O'HALLORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

LIBRARIES (SUBSIDIES) ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. B. PATTINSON (Minister of Education) moved:—

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution:—That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Libraries (Subsidies) Act, 1955.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to extend the purposes for which subsidies for libraries may be given under the Libraries (Subsidies) Act, 1955. The scheme of the 1955 Act is that, if the Treasurer is satisfied that a council or a body recommended by a council and approved by the Treasurer will establish a library in premises of the council or approved body and that the furniture and fittings necessary for the library will be provided, the Treasurer may, in any financial year, subsidize the cost of maintaining and managing the library. Thus, there must be library premises in existence complete with furniture and fittings and the subsidy is limited to a contribution to the annual cost of the library.

It is provided that before the Treasurer grants a subsidy, he must consider a report on the matter by the Libraries Board of South Australia, which may recommend conditions upon which the subsidy should be paid. In addition, it is provided that the Libraries Board may establish a lending service of books to subsidized libraries. The amount of the subsidy is, in the case of a library operated by a council, not to exceed the contribution of the council. In the case of a library operated by an approved body, the subsidy is limited to that provided by the council to the library so that, before such a library can be subsidized by the Treasurer, it must be supported by the council. The Government is of opinion that, in order to give further encouragement to the establishment of libraries, the power to grant subsidies should be extended. The Bill therefore provides as follows:

It is provided that the Treasurer may subsidize the capital cost of the library premises up to an amount equal to that provided by the council or approved body. The subsidy will be limited to premises owned by the council or approved body and, if the library occupies part of such premises, the subsidy will apply only in respect of the capital cost of that part. In addition, it is provided that the Treasurer may subsidize the capital cost of the furniture and fittings necessary for the library up to the amount contributed by the council or approved body.

A further result of the Bill will be that, as regards libraries operated by approved bodies,

there will be no necessity for the council to contribute towards the annual cost of management before the Treasurer can grant a subsidy for this purpose. It is considered that the existing provision requiring a council contribution could operate adversely as it might mean that, by reason of a council refraining from contributing to such a library, the approved body could not be subsidized and, in all probability, the library would not be established. The existing provisions of the Act requiring any application for subsidy to be reported on by the Libraries Board will continue to apply. Thus, the Bill will broaden the purposes for which a library subsidy can be granted and should considerably assist in the establishment of further libraries in the State.

Mr. JOHN CLARK secured the adjournment of the debate.

FRUIT FLY COMPENSATION BILL.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Agriculture) moved—

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution:—That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to provide for compensation for loss arising from measures to eradicate fruit fly.

Motion carried. Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to enable the Government to pay compensation for losses arising from the campaign for the eradication of fruit fly during the period since the passing of a similar Bill during the 1957 session. Six proclamations relating to areas in the vicinity of Port Augusta, Croydon, Clarence Park, Edwardstown and Walkerville were issued during that period to prevent persons from carrying away fruit from the infected areas. Following the practice of other years, the Government proposes that compensation shall be given for loss arising from these measures, and is accordingly introducing this Bill.

The explanation of the clauses is as follows:—Clause 3 provides for compensation for loss arising by reason of any act of the officers of the Department of Agriculture on any land within the areas defined by the proclamations and provides also for compensation for loss arising from the prohibition of the removal of fruit from any such land. Clause 4 fixes the time limit within which claims for compensation must be lodged by February 1, 1959.

That concludes the Parliamentary Draftsman's report. For the interest of honourable members, I might mention that on taking over the appointment of Minister of Agriculture I asked a question about fruit fly control the answer to which I thought might be relevant today. Not wanting to take anything for granted, I asked a question: What would have happened had the control measures been half-hearted or not taken at all? Following that question, we studied the matter fairly closely and I have a statement from the Director of Agriculture that may interest the House. It gives an approximate reply to such questions and is as follows:—

1. Expenditure.—Details of yearly expenditure on fruit fly eradication are shown in the attached statement;—

To June 30, 1958, such expenditure totals £1,594,637-£1,194,182 on eradication measures and £400,455 on compensation.

An estimate of the loss which would have been sustained by the State if eradication had not been undertaken or half-hearted control measures employed must be speculative. However, if certain assumptions are made we can arrive at an approximate figure of the cost of letting the pest establish itself. It is reasonable to assume that in the absence of the measures taken since first discovery of fruit fly in 1947, the pest would have become completely dispersed and variably established in all fruit areas within about three years. Such circumstance would have led to the following consequences:—

(*a*) There would have been a complete loss of the New Zealand citrus export market by about 1950, and a further indirect loss to the citrus industry through depressed Australian prices arising from local marketing of unexportable quantities.

(*b*) Restrictions on the export to Victoria of citrus, tomatoes and other fruits. At a minimum, these restricitions would involve 100 per cent inspection and condemnation of the whole of any line in which infestation was found.

(*c*) Total exclusion by Tasmania of tomatoes and other fruits which we now export to that State.

(*d*) Diversion of fruit from canning to drying in those districts where the pest was not controlled efficiently. No cannery can take the risk of even odd pieces of maggot ridden fruit getting through to the canning line, because on cooking, maggots in the fruit emerge and float in the syrup.

(*e*) Addition of onerous and costly control measures to the orchard programme with consequent increases in production costs.

(*f*) Necessity for home-gardeners to engage also in troublesome control measures, which in most cases would fail for mid-season and late-ripening fruits.

It is estimated that back yard fruit plantings in Adelaide and country towns aggregate the equivalent of 7,000 to 8,000 acres. Establishment of fruit fly would result in loss of much of this home production and because of increasing demand for commercially produced fruit, prices would inevitably rise. It is certain that dispersal and establishment of fruit fly in South Australia would have involved enormous direct and indirect losses to the fruit industry and to the community generally. Such losses could easily have amounted to several million pounds annually, representing over the last ten to twelve years a total loss of £30-40,000,000.

2. Fruit Fly in 1957-58.—During the year outbreaks of fruit fly occurred at Port Augusta and in the suburbs of Adelaide. These were all caused by Mediterranean Fly, *not* seen in South Australia since widespread suburban occurrences were eradicated about eight years ago. Queensland Fly, the species involved in Adelaide in past seasons, was not encountered last year. This changed pattern indicates that last year's outbreaks were the result of introduction of infested fruit from Western Australia. It is also the first firm indication that recurring trouble with the pest is due to fresh introductions from outside the State, and not to carryover from local outbreaks. This pinpoints the importance of quarantine and publicity measures aimed at preventing the casual introduction of dangerous fruits by interstate travellers.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

FIRE BRIGADES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) moved—

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution:—That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Fire Brigades Act, 1936-1944.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

Second reading.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to increase the borrowing powers of the Fire Brigades Board under section 26 of the Fire Brigades Act. Section 26 of the Act provides that the board may, with the consent of the Minister, borrow money upon the security of any freehold or leasehold lands of the board for the purpose of enabling the board to carry out its powers and duties under the Act. The money borrowed under the section is not at any time to exceed £25,000. Additional borrowing powers are given by sections 27 and 27a.

Section 27 authorizes the board, with the consent of the Minister, to borrow up to £25,000 on the security of debentures for the purchase of plant, machinery or apparatus. Section 27a provides that the board may, with the consent of the Minister, borrow up to £100,000 for the purpose of providing housing accommodation for the board's staff. These loans can be secured by the issue of debentures or by mortgage upon the land of the board. At June 30, 1958, the balance on loans raised by the board was as follows. Under section 26, £9,275 was outstanding whilst £8,220 was owing under section 27. No loans were outstanding under section 27a as, under existing conditions of employment, it is now not considered necessary to provide residences for employees.

The board's future building programme includes the building of a number of new stations in country towns and the re-siting of other stations in the metropolitan area. The board has suggested that, in order to finance this programme, its borrowing powers under section 26 should be increased and that the present borrowing limit of £25,000 under the section should be increased to £100,000. The Government is of opinion that, in view of the building programme proposed by the board, its borrowing powers under section 26 should be increased as suggested by the board. Accordingly, the Bill provides that the borrowing limit fixed by section 26 is to be increased from £25,000 to £100,000.

Mr. TAPPING secured the adjournment of the debate.

OIL REFINERY (HUNDRED OF NOARLUNGA) INDENTURE BILL.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD moved—

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution:—That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to approve and ratify an Indenture made between the State of South Australia and Standard Vacuum Refining Company (Aust.) Pty. Ltd. relating to the establishment and working of an oil refinery in the State, and to provide for carrying the provisions of that Indenture into effect, and for other purposes.

Motion carried. Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

Second reading.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its introduction marks an important milestone in the development of the State. The establishment of the refinery is proposed because the economic market in South Australia has grown sufficiently to justify the large expenditure involved. In itself, that is an indication of the growing strength of the State's economic position. Only a short while ago its economic importance was not sufficient to justify an oil refinery. Now one can be established, and that will give members on both sides of the House considerable satisfaction. However, behind the establishment of this refinery are other implications that we would find equally entertaining. When the discussions for its establishment were commenced it became clear that the company was not interested in any site that had only a very limited depth of water available. The original suggestions by this Government had to be discarded because, although we were told that the refinery would be established primarily for the refining of petroleum products for South Australia, that was not the ultimate plan of the company, for it desired soon to be able to accommodate large tankers at the site. Since the Suez crisis almost every report has brought information of the construction of larger tankers. When the company indicated that it was anxious to get a berth with water 60ft. deep at low tide, it was seen that the implications of the industry were very much more important than those of one to supply only our local requirements.

This Bill relates to the establishment of an oil refinery about the size of that at Altona (Victoria) and capable of meeting South Australia's requirements; but that could be done by a refinery with a limited depth of water. One significant thing in the development of Australian refineries is the fact that most of them have very limited depths of water, and already one refinery near Sydney contemplates the enormous expense of running a pipeline further into the ocean to enable it to get a deeper berth. The refinery established under this Bill, however, will be established at a place where the berth will be capable of accommodating every tanker coming to Australia. In this way not only will the future be taken care of, but the project will be progressively developed.

Mr. Quirke—How deep is the water there?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Sixty feet at low tide, whereas most other Australian refineries have a depth of only between 30ft. and 33ft. Further, the depth of water at the South Australian site is ample within 4,000ft. of the shore. It also has an extremely good anchorage; for two days the company carried out investigations with a large tanker at the anchorage. Apart from that, the area is free from any obstacles, so it is naturally a good place for navigation.

Mr. Jenkins—There is plenty of swinging room?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Nature has provided a site ideal for the purpose and I believe that is one of the things that influenced the company in planning this huge expenditure.

Mr. O'Halloran—What other sites were considered and discarded?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have no direct knowledge of that, and I pass on any information on the distinct understanding that it is hearsay. At one stage I was informed that South Australia was being considered, together with two other sites: one at Honolulu, the other in Queensland.

Mr. O'Halloran—How about other South Australian sites?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—At the outset the State Government suggested a site at Port Adelaide. In the Parliamentary Library members may see an extremely good plan of prospective development by the Harbors Board for the Port River area. That includes a site for a refinery and oil berths. Other sites were mentioned by the company, but not with so much confidence because of the enormous transportation problems involved in bringing oil to the metropolitan area from an outside site. It would entail much expense to transport such a huge tonnage. In my opinion, other sites would be uneconomic and impose an unjustified charge on the many consumers required to use this fuel.

The Parliamentary Draftsman's report on the Bill will show that no embargo is placed on the petroleum products of other companies being imported into Port Adelaide, Birkenhead, or any other port in the State. This means that any refinery established away from the consuming areas would be unsuccessful, because rival companies could undoubtedly import directly into those areas and be able to undercut prices. The report shows that some slight difficulty still prevails concerning that matter, even at Port Noarlunga.

In dealing with the company I received the impression that it did not want a whole host of concessions or something for nothing. In the main it desired that the necessary public utilities that go to support an industry would be established, but in asking for assistance to establish those facilities it was prepared to pay proper charges for them. Therefore, the Bill shows that we have not had to buy this industry: it has been provided by free negotiation carried out on behalf of the company with remarkably good intent. The company made it clear from the outset that it did not want to be subsidized by the Government, but desired the refinery to be established under conditions that would enable it to operate successfully. It was prepared to pay adequately for all services provided. Of course, a number of matters involved financial considerations, but I pay a tribute to the company's management and the shareholders' representative (Mr. James). I found in negotiations with them that it was not a question of South Australia having to buy the industry but of being prepared to establish fair and equitable conditions. The company was quite prepared to make a reasonable contribution for the services we had to provide.

I believe the fact that an oil refinery is to be established here will have important effects on the economic development of this State. An oil refinery often leads to the establishment of many other secondary industries. South Australia has always been up against it for fuel supplies, and it is extremely important that we have within our State resources for the development of power other than those provided by nature. I believe that the establishment of an oil refinery could easily lead to our being able to provide bunkering facilities for ocean-going ships. At present there is a considerable amount of political unrest in the near East, and this has already led to considerable difficulty in Suez. Therefore, it is of the utmost importance to Australia to have an alternative route for the transportation of oil, such as *via* the Cape of Good Hope. One important aspect is the question of freight rates in time of tension in the near East, and I believe that will be even more important in the future.

Mr. O'Halloran—Where will the refinery get the crude oil?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Probably from the Persian oil fields, which is on this side of the Suez Canal, and there are alternative sources in our immediate north.

Mr. Jenkins—How do our bunkering chances compare with those at other places?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—At present ships going *via* the Cape of Good Hope or Suez almost inevitably bunker in Western Australia, where the Kwinana refinery has been established. However, the ocean route to London from Port Adelaide *via* the Cape of Good Hope is almost as short as that from Perth *via* the Cape of Good Hope. Therefore, if a ship could bunker at Port Adelaide it could save many hours of steaming by not having to call at Western Australia if it did not have to pick up additional cargo there.

I will now deal specifically with the provisions of the Bill and if any honourable member has any supplementary question I will do my best to answer him. The Bill has been introduced to ratify the indenture made on August 14 between the Government and Standard Vacuum Refining Company (Australia) Proprietary Limited, relating to the establishment of an oil refinery.

As the Bill deals with a private company it will have to be referred to a Select Committee, so I suggest to members that they do not take an unnecessarily long time in debating the second reading. The Government will nominate three members for the Select Committee and if the Leader of the Opposition will nominate two the Bill can go before the Select Committee fairly quickly for report. Negotiations concerning this project were commenced by the Government nearly three years ago, and came to fruition in the early part of this year when the company made a definite decision to proceed with the establishment of the refinery. The indenture is for the purpose of granting to the company some rights and services which it requires for the refinery. The company, on its part, binds itself to build the refinery and also to construct at its own expense the anchorage and other marine facilities which will be required for the tankers bringing in the oil.

Mr. Riches—Will other ships be able to use the anchorage?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—No. The facilities will be provided solely for the purpose of the refinery. The anchorage will enable the company's ships to tie up to a pipe going out from the shore. There will not be any wharf, so it will not be a port, but an anchorage from which oil will be pumped ashore. I think the cost of the installations will be about £500,000.

Mr. Fred Walsh—The anchorage could be used for bunkering ships travelling to London *via* the Cape of Good Hope?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes, but the company may install a pipe from the refinery to Port Adelaide. Therefore, I think it would be more likely that ships would take on oil at Port Adelaide or Outer Harbour, though I think it would be feasible to bunker ships at the anchorage. However, I do not believe it would be a normal occurrence. The requests made by the company are moderate and reasonable, while the project will be of very great benefit to the State and undoubtedly lead to further important undertakings.

The explanation of the Bill and the indenture is as follows:—Clause 3 provides that the indenture is ratified and approved and will have statutory effect. Clause 4 provides that the Electricity Trust shall have power to supply steam to the company and to build plant for that purpose. At one stage the company thought it would require steam from the Electricity Trust, but it is now uncertain whether it will be required. However, the clause has been retained as it can do no harm and may ultimately be necessary. The Government investigated the possibility of the Electricity Trust establishing a power station adjacent to the refinery to generate steam to be used by the company. The refinery would require steam of low pressure and it appeared to be rather an attractive proposition to combine the generation of steam with the provision of power from a site close to the refinery.

Mr. O'Halloran—It would be an oil-fired power plant?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes. The only catch in the project was that the trust would be dependent upon oil from the refinery at all times and in the event of oil not being available the plant would go out of commission and perhaps when most needed. Economically it would be a cheap project, but it does have this drawback. However, this provision is retained to enable its establishment if it becomes justified.

Clause 5 deals with the Local Government rates payable by the company. It is always difficult to determine a fair basis for rating a large industrial undertaking which occupies a considerable area of land inside a council's area and comprises much valuable plant, but does not use services provided by the council to a large extent. The oil company was desirous of knowing what its liability for rates was likely to be, and as the result of negotiations between the Government, the company and the district council of Noarlunga, it has been agreed that the company will pay £5,000 a year for the first two years and for each subsequent year the sum of £10,000. The company has an area of approximately one square mile. The amount collected in rates from the remainder of the district is about £15,000 so members will realize that the company has no desire to neglect paying a fair apportionment of rates. It did, however, desire to have clearly stated what its commitment would be because in some other countries after establishing refineries it has become the chief and only ratepayer for the whole district.

Mr. O'Halloran—Its liability for rates is limited to £10,000?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes.

Mr. Jennings—For how long?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—For ever in respect of this square mile of land. For the first two years it will pay £5,000 and thereafter £10,000. Clause 6 gives the company the right to use and occupy the foreshore adjacent to the refinery site for the purpose of the operation of the refinery. The company has already bought the land for the refinery at a site in the hundred of Noarlunga north of O'Sullivans Beach, and proposes to construct an anchorage for tankers in the gulf west of the site. A submarine pipeline will be laid from the anchorage across the seabed and the foreshore to the refinery. For the purpose of laying and maintaining the pipe and the conduct of other operations connected with the unloading of tankers it is necessary that the company should have exclusive rights to use and occupy the foreshore and to maintain structures thereon. The foreshore in question is between Halletts Cove and O'Sullivans Beach and is for the most part rough and rocky.

Clause 7 is ancillary to clause 6. It makes it an offence to trespass on the foreshore adjacent to the refinery site, or on any berths, wharves, jetties or landing places on or adjacent to the foreshore, or on the waters within 50 yards of any such berth, wharf, jetty, landing place or foreshore. Clause 8 provides that any proceedings or arbitrations arising out of the agreement may be taken and carried on by the Government under the name of "The State of South Australia."

These are all the matters dealt with in the clauses of the Bill. I turn now to the indenture which is in the schedule to the Bill.

The first operative clause is clause 2, which binds the Government to introduce a Bill to approve and ratify the indenture. If such a Bill is not passed before January 1, 1959, the other clauses of the indenture will not come into operation.

Clause 3 provides that the indenture is subject to the company's being able to obtain import licences for any plant, equipment and materials required to be imported for the construction of the refinery, and also to the provision by the Commonwealth Bank of the foreign exchange required to make payments for such imports, and payment under contracts for the design and construction of the refinery. I have it on good authority that the company will have no difficulty in getting these facilities provided by the Commonwealth. As a matter of fact, early in the negotiations the Prime Minister's office forwarded a letter to the company stating that this project would have the support of the Federal Government. I have been assured by the Prime Minister's office that the application which has been made to the Commonwealth has been received sympathetically and there will be no difficulty in connection with it.

Clause 4 sets out the obligation of the company to build a refinery within five years after the passing of the Bill. The refinery must have a designed capacity of between 30,000 and 40,000 barrels of crude oil a day and must comply with modern oil refinery practice and standards. The refinery is designed to handle 1,000,000 gallons of fluid a day. I believe the five years mentioned is rather longer than the company expects to take and that it plans to have the refinery finished by 1961. The company will not be liable for delay in constructing the refinery if the delay arises from causes beyond its reasonable control. Although this provision has been inserted, the Government is informed that after the construction of the refinery commences, operations are likely to proceed very rapidly and there is no special reason to anticipate delays.

Clause 5 sets out some obligations of the State in the provision of facilities and services. The first is that within three years after the building of the refinery commences, the State will arrange that the houses required by the company, not exceeding 250, will be built in the proximity of the refinery, and that they will be available to refinery employees as tenants or purchasers on the usual terms offered by the Housing Trust. The Government has frequently used that provision in country areas to assist in the establishment of an industry and it is not unique in this agreement. At present the Government is proposing to build houses at Millicent for a somewhat similar proposition. The Government also undertakes to provide a suitable heavy duty road to connect the refinery site with a main road running north towards Adelaide. I believe that about 1½ miles of road is involved. Another Government obligation is to construct and maintain a line connecting the refinery with the railway system. From an economic point of view, it is expected that all the refinery products will go by rail to their various destinations, and I understand that about 60 tank cars a day will be required. Probably about two miles of line will be involved. I understand that the Railways Commissioner, in the interests of efficiency, will probably, outside of the agreement, make a deviation to shorten the present line considerably, so that it will be used more effectively.

Mr. Frank Walsh—Who will make the rollingstock?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I believe it already exists. For many years the Government has had contracts with the oil companies for the distribution of their petroleum products. If the rollingstock required by the refinery is not available it will be made available under the usual conditions—the Railways Commissioner will make it and charge for its use.

Mr. Jenkins—Is there any indication what the freight rates will be?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—They will be the normal freight rates and there will be no concessions.

Mr. O'Halloran—And they can be varied from time to time?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes. The refinery will require electricity up to a maximum load of 10,000 kilowatts and may require steam not exceeding 150,000lb. an hour at a pressure of 150 lb. per square inch, and it will be the duty of the Government to arrange that the Electricity Trust will meet these requirements under the same conditions applicable to other consumers of similar magnitude. The Government also promises to supply the company with its reasonable requirements of fresh water not exceeding 2,000gall. a minute on the terms and conditions laid down by or pursuant to the Waterworks Act.

The company will have the right to construct a pipeline, but it must not obstruct

other interests. Clause 6 sets out the right of the company to lay pipes on roads and railways, and to construct an anchorage, submarine pipelines and other marine installations, and take and use sea water. The provision as to laying pipes gives the company, in effect, an easement over roads and railway lands for the purpose of laying and operating pipelines between the refinery site and Birkenhead and Osborne. Where pipes are laid on any road, the work must be done in accordance with plans and specifications approved in writing by the Minister of Roads after consultation with the council in whose area the road is situated. Where pipes are laid on railway lands the work must be done in accordance with plans and specifications approved by the South Australian Railways Commissioner.

The company is not given any easements over private lands. If these are required the company will buy them. As regards marine installations, it is given the right to construct and maintain, in proximity to the refinery site or on land owned by it, offshore berthing accommodation, wharves, jetties, landing places and submarine pipelines in accordance with plans and specifications approved in writing by the South Australian Harbors Board. The jetty required will probably be used only by small craft taking out personnel to the tankers, which will be anchored about 4,000 feet from the shore. They will not be substantial installations.

Clause 7 deals with the possibility that a new road may be found necessary on the eastern boundary of the refinery site. The company asks that if such a road should be constructed, it should not be asked to pay for it. As any such road would probably not be within a municipality or township, it is not probable that the company would be legally liable to pay any share of the cost, but it asked to be protected against such liability, and the Government considered the request reasonable.

An area has been purchased by the Housing Trust much closer to Port Noarlunga and in my opinion it will be necessary for about 1½ miles of good quality road to be built to connect the town with the refinery. It will not be on the refinery land and I do not believe there could be under any circumstances an obligation on the company to pay for it.

Mr. O'Halloran—That road will be constructed by the Government and not the district council?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Government looked at the proposition and said that as this was something normally outside the district council's activities, the Government itself, through the Highways Department, would provide the road because it would link an important industrial area with a new town area. The cost of the 1½ miles of road is quite infinitesimal and will be met by the Government.

Clause 8 provides that ships using the company's marine installations will not be subject to the compulsory pilotage laws. As the company's anchorage will be in the open sea, there will not be the same need for a pilot as in the close waters of a port. Clause 8 also provides that ships using the company's marine installations will not be chargeable with tonnage rates but will be chargeable with port dues. Tonnage rates are levied against ships when they berth at wharves and jetties provided by and maintained at the cost of the Harbors Board. As the company's tankers will not be using any such wharf or jetty it seems reasonable to exempt them from tonnage rates. The company will bear the whole cost of looking aftter its marine services, and there will be no cost whatsoever to the Government in this regard. The ships will, however, be chargeable with port dues, which are a general contribution towards the cost of maintaining ports and aids to navigation including such as beacons, buoys and lights. Although the port will be established and maintained by the company, it will still pay port dues in respect of ships that are using it.

Clause 9 provides for the payment of inward wharfage on the crude oil which will be imported by the company. Wharfage is ordinarily payable not only on goods landed at a wharf or jetty, but also on all goods landed on or over a foreshore within a prescribed distance of any wharf or jetty. The obligation to pay does not therefore depend on using a wharf. At present, the Government collects wharfage on imported petrol and if no wharfage were charged on imported crude oil the establishment of the refinery would result in a large loss of revenue. The Government has therefore stipulated for the payment of wharfage on crude oil landed by means of the company's marine installations, but it will only be payable on an amount of crude oil equal to the volume of petroleum products manufactured from such oil and distributed directly from the refinery by land or shipment to Port Adelaide. This is

very important from the point of view of the future development of the refinery. It will have a tremendous effect, not on this refinery but on the extensions which we hope will result from it. It will mean that if the company brings in crude oil to the refinery, refines it, and sends it out of the State, it will not have to pay wharfage. That is very important to the refinery. Wharfages are necessary to keep up our revenues on our present level, but what we want is a tremendously big industry and the ancillaries that will come from the establishment of a major refinery.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—The company will not pay wharfage on re-exports?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—That is so. It will pay wharfage on the amount of material that is issued out of bond into the metropolitan area. If it re-exports the product to Port Pirie or Port Lincoln, for instance, it of course pays the normal wharfages going into those ports, but it pays nothing at the refinery site.

Mr. Fred Walsh—What about exports from Port Adelaide?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—There is no refinery at Port Adelaide, so there could not be any re-export of refinery products at Port Adelaide. If the company at some subsequent date desired to re-export from Port Adelaide, I think the Government should give the same facility with regard to that re-export. That would not be detrimental to the Government; in fact it might be advantageous to it. The basis on which the wharfages are provided is that anything that comes into the refinery area purely for the purposes of going out to New Zealand, Tasmania or to the eastern States, which we hope will be quite a regular thing in the future, will not be the subject of a wharfage due. What will stand a wharfage due will be the material issued from the refinery for use in South Australia. If it goes from the refinery by sea to Port Pirie or Port Lincoln, as it will do, the company will pay the normal wharfage when it arrives at those ports.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Actually the terms of the agreement only apply to the material which is exported from the site of the refinery?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes.

Mr. O'Halloran—The company will not pay wharfage on the material re-exported to Port Lincoln or Port Pirie; the consumer will pay it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—At present wharfages are charged at all our ports. The position at Port Lincoln and Port Pirie will not be any different from what it is today.

Mr. Jenkins—The company will be meeting other companies on fair terms.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes. The other companies will be in a position to import into Port Lincoln or Port Pirie on exactly the same basis.

Mr. Riches—The only charges to be paid will be paid by the South Australian consumer.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The South Australian consumer always stands the charge. When a Government raises revenue—and I am glad the honourable member has got this rudimentary fact into his head—it can only be at the expense of the people. We frequently hear the suggestion that we can raise revenue without any cost to the consumer, but any revenue that is raised must be provided by the people. That is fundamental. The establishment of the refinery will not increase the charges to the South Australian consumer. It will, in point of fact, tend to lessen them, and that in itself will find some favour in the honourable member's eyes. Products shipped to ports other than Port Adelaide will be charged with wharfage at those ports. The proposed rate of wharfage at Port Adelaide is 4s. 6d. a ton so long as the wharf and jetty facilities for unloading oil at Birkenhead continue to be used by overseas tank ships. Thereafter it will be 4s. 9d. At present oil installations at Port Adelaide are inside the port. This has caused concern to the Harbors Board for years, and in its development plan for the port it has a scheme to shift them some distance away, because, owing to fire risk, it is not desirable to have oil installations mixed up with shipping installations. That has been taken care of by this company. The reason for the increase in the rate when the Birkenhead facilities cease to be used is that if these facilities are no longer used the Harbors Board will incur a loss of revenue from tonnage rates without a corresponding reduction in expenses, because it will still be chargeable with interest and sinking fund on the cost of the facilities.

Clause 10 provides that outward wharfage will not be chargeable on petroleum products shipped from the company's marine installations. This is a concession which the Government considers justified by the importance

of the industry and the fact that the company is providing its own marine installations. If I am correctly informed, when the oil refinery was established at Kwinana the company was given complete freedom from all these charges. I have been informed that wharfage charges were completely waived.

Mr. O'Halloran—The company provides its own wharfage.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The proposed company for this State will provide its own facilities, so it will be providing facilities and still paying. The Western Australian Government faces an expenditure of several million pounds for dredging at Kwinana. I want it to be appreciated that the company does not require a great deal of payment to come here: it has been prepared to deal very fairly indeed with South Australia. We shall get approximately the same amount of revenue as we previously did from oil. Clause 11 deals with the question of inward wharfage at ports other than the company's anchorage. It is provided that petroleum products produced at the refinery and transported by sea to Port Adelaide will not be chargeable with inward wharfage at that port unless the Harbors Board is required to provide special facilities for unshipping or landing the products. The reason for this exemption is that the shipment of petroleum products by sea from the refinery to Port Adelaide is regarded merely as a means of local distribution of a product on which wharfage has already been paid. Petroleum products produced at the refinery and transported to other South Australian ports—*e.g.*, Port Pirie and Port Lincoln—will be chargeable with inward wharfage at those ports at the rate for the time being in force (7s. 6d. a ton at present). As I indicated earlier, an amount of crude oil equal to those products will not be chargeable with wharfage when pumped from tankers at the anchorage to the refinery.

Clause 12 provides that except as expressly provided in this Indenture the company will not be exempt from wharfage and other like charges. Clause 13 contains an undertaking by the Government that when purchasing stores for public use it will give preference to products of the refinery in accordance with the Government's usual policy of giving preference to goods manufactured within the State. Clause 14 deals with the prices at which the products of the refinery will be sold. It provides that the prices for these products will not be higher than the landed cost at Adelaide of comparable products available to the company from its overseas supply sources in the Persian Gulf. That is the present method of fixing prices for petroleum products—we take the world price and add to it the freight charges.

Clause 15 provides that any assignment of the company's rights or liabilities under the agreement will require the consent of the State, but such consent must not be unreasonably withheld. However, no consent will be required for the assignment of any of the rights of the company to another company more than 50 per cent of the issued shares of which are owned directly or indirectly by Standard Vacuum Oil Company of the State of Delaware, U.S.A. The reason for this is that the parent company in U.S.A. may decide to form a new company to build and operate the refinery. In such a case the new company would need to take over the benefits and duties conferred or imposed on the Standard Vacuum Refining Company by the Indenture.

Mr. O'HALLORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

KINGSTON AND NARACOORTE RAILWAY ALTERATION BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

LAW OF PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.50 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 27, at 2 p.m.