

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.**

Tuesday, October 20, 1959.

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

**APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2).**

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of the general revenue of the State as were required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

**QUESTIONS.****FARE CONCESSIONS TO PENSIONERS.**

**Mr. O'HALLORAN**—In the arrangements made recently for concession fares for pensioners travelling on public transport in off-peak periods, was any consideration given to, or were any arrangements made for, pensioners living in the country who might be in Adelaide for various purposes obtaining a concession similar to that granted to pensioners living in the metropolitan area?

The Hon. **SIR THOMAS PLAYFORD**—No difference was made in the application of concession fares to pensioners. A pensioner may obtain the concession in the area in which he happens to be; so that, if a country pensioner is in Adelaide, there is nothing to stop him from applying for the concession while in Adelaide.

**STUART ROYAL COMMISSION: PRESS STATEMENT.**

**Mr. HEASLIP**—The following report from Sydney appeared in yesterday afternoon's *News* under the heading "Noted Q.C., Mr. Shand, Dies at 62":—

Mr. J. Doughan, former Registrar of Divorce, said Mr. Shand was a fearless advocate for those he felt were dealt with unjustly. This had been illustrated when he took up the cudgels for an unfortunate (Stuart) in another State.

Can the Premier say how this unfortunate, or so-called unfortunate, has been dealt with unjustly in South Australia, and whether the publication of this statement to the general public of South Australia is justified?

The Hon. **Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD**—This matter is before a Royal Commission and I do not wish to reply except to say that, as far as I know, the laws of the land have been applied in this case in exactly the same way as they would be applied in every other case. I know of no injustice in this instance, but as the

case is before a Royal Commission I prefer it to proceed with its deliberations and report on the matter. The facts are quite simple. This man was tried before a jury in the normal way and his conviction was upheld on appeal to the Full Court, to the High Court and to the Privy Council; but as it was claimed that additional evidence was available he was given the opportunity to have that evidence considered by a Royal Commission, and at considerable expense to the State.

**WEEKLY RAIL TICKETS.**

**Mr. FRANK WALSH**—Will the Minister of Works take up with his colleague the Minister of Railways the question of having a review of weekly tickets sold to persons who travel on the railways to and from their place of employment, particularly in view of the recent increase in rail fares. The concession I desire to have considered relates to a person who is on weekend shift, works normally five days a week, and has to travel on a Sunday evening to commence a shift. At present he has to pay a single fare to get to his employment, prior to being able to use the weekly ticket, which applies only on five days. He does not desire to purchase a seven-day ticket because he travels only on five days a week. Would the Commissioner of Railways permit such people to travel on the weekly ticket on a Sunday in order to start their first shift of the week?

The Hon. **G. G. PEARSON**—I will refer the matter to the Minister of Railways for inquiry and reply.

**BUILDING HEIGHT LIMIT.**

**Mr. COUMBE**—It is reported in today's press that moves are being made through the Adelaide City Council to have the building height limit in Adelaide increased. In view of this and the Government proposal to erect a new Teachers Training College of 13 storeys, which would exceed the present height limit, will the Government give sympathetic consideration and co-operation to any move made on behalf of the City Council or any other municipal body, through the Building Advisory Committee or any other body, to have this building height limit increased?

The Hon. **G. G. PEARSON**—Obviously that is a policy matter but, as the honourable member requests it, I will refer it in the first instance to the Minister of Local Government with a view to his bringing it to Cabinet if he so desires.

### ADVERTISING BY STORES.

**Mr. HUTCHENS**—Earlier this session I asked a question relating to furniture retailers' advertising low-priced goods that were not available at the advertised price. Later, I forwarded correspondence to the Premier, who replied that an investigation, which disclosed that there was justification for the complaints had been made. The Premier said in his reply that it had been made quite clear to the company that this unsatisfactory position would not be permitted to continue and that he had had an assurance from the company that there would be no need for further complaint. In yesterday's paper, however, I noticed that the same company was advertising, among other things, a contemporary bedroom suite, which was described as follows:—

A beautiful setting for the modern home. Modern drop centre dressing table features glass vanity shelf and adjustable mirror. Twin robes provide generous hanging space. The double bed features full size sliding door bookcase headboard. All this for only 29 guineas. It's terrific!

I have been told on the best authority that the labour cost on this suite would be more than 29 guineas and that the cost of the materials would exceed that price. In view of the Premier's assurance, will he, firstly, take steps to see that these people do not seek to advertise along these lines and, secondly, request the press to observe press ethics and not advertise when they know full well that the goods cannot be supplied at the price advertised?

**The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD**—After the honourable member complained previously, an officer of the Prices Department investigated and found that there were substantial grounds for the complaint, as the items advertised were not freely available for sale. In fact, in some instances I think it was doubtful whether they had been available for sale at all. I will have the matter further investigated.

### BLACKWOOD ESTATE BUS SERVICE.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE**—During the Address in Reply debate I drew attention to the lack of public transport facilities in parts of my district, particularly in the hills area. I have been informed that some weeks ago, after a survey of the district, Henstridge's Bus Services Limited applied to the Municipal Tramways Trust for a licence to run a service commencing in Blackwood Estate, running through Hawthorndene to Blackwood, and thence down Shepherd's Hill Road to link with its present service along South Road to

Adelaide. As I understand that the licence has neither been granted nor refused, will the Minister of Works inquire of the trust as to the fate of the application and request an early decision if none has yet been reached?

**The Hon. G. G. PEARSON**—I will certainly refer the matter to the General Manager of the trust. I think the honourable member can be assured that the fact that the request has not yet been formally answered does not mean that the trust is not giving it proper consideration. I do not quite know what is involved in the whole question, but I will ask the General Manager if he is yet in a position to indicate that the trust has finally considered the matter and is prepared to reply.

### TELOWIE CREEK SCHOOL BUILDING.

**Mr. RICHES**—I have received the following letter from the Telowie Creek School Committee:—

On behalf of the above committee may I bring to your notice a matter which is causing us some concern. Earlier this year an approach was made to the Education Department to have our present old privately-owned school building replaced with a modern departmental building of which we understood there are several in other districts at present not being used. This has been recommended by the district inspector and tentatively approved by the Superintendent of Primary Schools, Mr. Whitburn, on the condition that a suitable site could be obtained where sand drift would not cause inconvenience as at present. The committee has found a site about half a mile from the present one on heavier type soil which would be suitable and the owners are willing to transfer it to the department for a nominal sum, and we have been told that the department has a departmental building available near Burra. At present, it looks as though the scheme has been shelved which is causing us concern, as the sand drift problem is most acute in this area at the moment. On some occasions the school has had to be closed owing to dust storms, and even the slightest east wind makes conditions unbearable for teachers and scholars. The drought conditions at present prevailing have of course accentuated the trouble and I have been instructed to contact you with a view to your making representation on our behalf to the Education Department authorities to see if the transfer of a school building could be speeded up so that we can get some measure of relief from the position as soon as possible. I ask the Minister of Education whether he can have this request treated as urgent so that the efforts of the committee will be rewarded at the earliest possible date.

**The Hon. B. PATTINSON**—It seems obvious, from the contents of the letter that the honourable member has read, that the matter is being dealt with departmentally. It certainly

has not been dealt with by me but the matter having been referred to me I will investigate it and let the honourable member have my decision as soon as possible.

#### SAFETY RAMP ON MEASDAY'S HILL.

Mr. SHANNON—I recently asked the Minister of Works representing the Minister of Roads a question relating to the marking of white posts on the Mount Barker Road as a protection for motorists against fog. I now desire to raise a further matter. The safety ramp at the foot of Measday's Hill, while it is a safety ramp for vehicles that may get out of control, could be greatly improved if one or two posts were removed from the side of the road and in lieu thereof a sign, about 200 yards up the hill, were erected, pointing out that there was a safety ramp. A sign marked "Safety Ramp" could also be placed at the entrance to the safety ramp. I suggest the side marking would not be required if luminous paint were used and it would give vehicles a better chance of getting away if there were a fog.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I will refer the second part of the honourable member's question to the Minister for further investigation. I have the following reply from the Minister to the first part of the honourable member's question:—

The cost of maintaining black bands on white posts is considerably higher than the cost of repainting posts all white. As the other States with the exception of Queensland use all white posts, this Department has recently deleted the black bands from new posts or where posts needed repainting. The value of the black band, however, is realized and consideration is being given at present to the reinstatement of these bands. At the same time, experiments are being carried out with Scotch-lite delineators on these posts. The ones referred to are steel droppers with Scotch-lite delineators erected for experimental purposes only.

#### NORTHERN AREAS WATER RESTRICTIONS.

Mr. LOVEDAY—Can the Minister of Works say whether any firm decision has been reached regarding water restrictions in the areas served by the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline and, if so, the extent of the restrictions, where and when they will be applied, and how?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Yesterday Cabinet gave much consideration to the matter of water restrictions in the northern areas and on Yorke Peninsula—the areas served from the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline—and approved, hav-

ing regard to the urgent need to take some action to restrict the quantity of water being used in that section, of the preparation of a proclamation to be referred to His Excellency the Governor in Executive Council on Thursday. If approved, restrictions will operate forthwith. The method by which the restrictions will apply is in line with that which has been developed over the years where restrictions have been necessary in any one part of the State. Summarizing them briefly, the position is that all private gardens—whether they be in townships, on farms or elsewhere—may only be watered by a hose held in the hand: sprinklers and other like systems may not be used. Owners of commercial gardens may apply to the district engineer for a permit to use water that will be based on a quota of one tenth of their normal annual consumption, rationed on a monthly basis. That is to say, in any one month their quota is allocated on the basis of their normal annual consumption divided by ten. That also applies to primary producers growing lucerne, trees and vines for commercial purposes. If the permit is granted the gardener may use the water through a sprinkler if he so desires. He may be authorized to do that if it is in line with his gardening practice to water by sprinkler.

So far as bowling greens and sporting bodies are concerned, they are also asked to apply for a quota, which will be based on one eighth of their normal annual consumption. The eight is used as a divisor in this case, rather than the ten in the case of commercial gardeners, because bowling greens are usually only watered during the summer period and one eighth is considered to be a satisfactory supply for the purpose.

Corporations and public bodies may water their lawns and gardens by hand-held hose or they may, if they desire, apply for a quota, and if granted may use any instrument they like for watering up to the quota approved. There are no restrictions for stock purposes and for industry. Where water is desired by roadmaking authorities for watering down and consolidating preparatory roadworks, we have asked in every case that they seek alternative means of supply from salt creeks, streams, water holes, the sea if it is close by, from inlets or some other source. They have been asked not to use piped water for that purpose.

The Broken Hill Proprietary Company Ltd. is a large user of the water from the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline and we have made personal representations to it. The Engineer-in-Chief

says that the company has been completely co-operative and will assist in every possible way. Special cases always arise from time to time, and if the people concerned feel that they have special cases and apply to the District Engineer he will examine their requests and decide each case on its merits. In most cases requests will be made to the District Engineer at Crystal Brook, Mr. Steele.

Mr. RICHES—In reply to Mr. Loveday, the Minister of Works gave certain information regarding water restrictions in northern areas. Will they be definitely binding or will any discretion be allowed to the department to meet special circumstances? Is the Minister in a position to tell the House what effect it is expected the booster stations will have upon supplies in the northern areas, when these stations are likely to be installed, and whether we can look for relief after they are installed? Those of us who have lived through water restrictions in the north and had to depend on the catchment supplies available from local reservoirs have the unhappy feeling that if we have to wait for rain for relief these restrictions may be of longer duration than we would wish. Relief from the booster stations is of paramount importance. Can the Minister give any information?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Earlier in outlining the methods adopted for organizing restrictions I did say that where an applicant felt he had a special case it would be referred to the engineer who would investigate the request. This officer would have authority to deal with each case as he thought the merits warranted. I did not bring down the actual proclamation, which of course is in legal terms, but endeavoured to tell the House of the practical effect of the restrictions in the way they will normally be applied. Where a person feels he has a special case he should discuss the matter with the district engineer. The fact that water restrictions are necessary at this time in districts served by the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline is not because the capacity of the pipeline is inadequate, but simply because there has been no intake into any of the northern reservoirs this year, which is an almost unprecedented circumstance. That the pipeline is almost capable of supplying the needs of the area it serves is indicated by the fact that any intake, small though it may be, into the reservoirs from natural causes would have obviated what is now necessary, so the honourable member can be assured that he may not expect restrictions to be the normal order of things in coming sum-

mers, as we can expect that in nine years out of 10, or even better than that, there will be intakes into the northern reservoirs which, together with what the pipeline can supply, will prevent restrictions. The Premier has just advised me that, as far as he can remember, there have never been restrictions in the northern areas since the pipeline was installed.

Mr. Riches—That is so, but we never had the withdrawal we have now.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—That is so, and we have never had a winter like the last, with no intake. Regarding the statement that restrictions may last longer than anyone desires, I agree with the honourable member that no-one desires restrictions.

Mr. O'Halloran—You had better get your rainmakers back.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The Leader has told us before that it is not much good looking for rain when the wind is in the south, and it is no use attempting rain-making when no clouds are about. I emphasize that in my opinion—and, I think, in the opinion of the Engineer-in-Chief—the present situation is no pointer to the future ability of the pipeline to serve the area concerned—at least, not in the immediate future. As the House was informed last week by the Premier, steps are being taken to commence duplicating the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline, in the first instance, from Hanson towards Jamestown. The booster station at Hanson is a major project involving much machinery and construction and I do not think that station will be of much assistance this summer. It will be a permanent part of the pipeline and, as I said a week or so ago, it will be designed to improve the flow of water from Hanson to the pipeline immediately beyond it. The line from Hanson onward is not capable on a gravity basis of utilizing the water that can be pumped from Morgan to Hanson, and the booster station is to provide pressure further on. I am not sure about the facts, but I doubt whether this station will be ready in the coming summer—at least, not in the early part.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—As a substantial part of the water used by the residents of Peterborough is derived from local underground sources, will the Minister of Works state whether the restrictions will be applied to Peterborough?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I presume that they will apply, but I will check with the proclamation.

### NORTH PARADE BRIDGE, STRATHALBYN.

Mr. JENKINS—Has the Premier obtained a reply to the question I asked on October 13 regarding the North Parade bridge at Strathalbyn?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have received the following report from the Assistant Director of Mines:—

Initial testing of the Strathalbyn bridge site was carried out in May, 1959. It was subsequently found that further testing was necessary and on August 13 authority was received from the town clerk to undertake this further work. In the meanwhile the particular drilling plant necessary for this type of testing became fully committed to testing on the Myponga dam site. On September 11 the town clerk sought a firm date for the undertaking of the work and was advised on September 23 that every effort was

being made to expedite the drilling. Officers of the Department of Mines have been in frequent touch with the engineer concerned. A new drill has now been purchased and it is expected that drilling will be in hand by October 21, 1959. The additional drilling should be completed within three-four days of commencement.

### INCREASE IN RAILWAY FARES.

Mr. RYAN—Has the Minister of Works obtained a reply from the Minister of Railways following on my question about discrepancies in recent increases in rail fares?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—My colleague, the Minister of Railways advises that the previous and current fares between Kilkenny and Port Adelaide and between Woodville Park and Port Adelaide are as follows:—

	Charging mileage.	Previous.		Current.	
		Single.	Return.	Single.	Return.
		s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.
Woodville Park . . . . .	3	0 10	1 2	1 1	1 7
Kilkenny . . . . .	4	1 0	1 6	1 4	2 0

These fares are determined by the mileage scale of fares as specified in the by-law, and which applies for all journeys which do not involve travelling to, or from, or through, Adelaide. It is true that the percentage increases in the above fares are higher than the average, but this has come about because previous mileage fares for short distances of travel were anomalously low and the anomalies have been corrected in the new by-law. The fact is that fares for direct travel between any station and Adelaide are lower than those determined by the mileage scale, the fares to and from the city being low fares designed to encourage travel.

### HALBURY STOCKING YARDS.

Mr. HALL—I have received strong protests from Halbury residents regarding the stock trucking yard there, particularly the sheep section. They say that when they yard sheep preparatory to trucking them the sheep escape through holes in the cyclone netting with which the fence is constructed. Is it possible to have the situation investigated in order to have the yard made of a more permanent construction?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I will bring the question to the notice of the Minister of Railways.

### GRANGE TO HENLEY BEACH LINE.

Mr. FRED WALSH—About three years ago the Railways Department saw fit to remove the Grange to Henley Beach railway line. A few years prior to that there was a proposal before the Public Works Committee (and it was approved and accepted by the Government) for the acquisition of a certain area of land from Grange to Henley Beach Road, the object being to transfer the line from Military Road to the area to which I have referred, but nothing has been done until recently. The transfer of the line was not proceeded with because of the recommendation of the Metropolitan Transport Advisory Council. The area to which I have referred is being fenced. Does that indicate that possibly within the foreseeable future a line will be laid in the new area?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I will get information on that matter for the honourable member.

### RESERVOIR ON JACOB'S CREEK.

Mr. LAUCKE—Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question about the possibility of constructing a reservoir in the Barossa Ranges at Jacob's Creek near Rowland Flat?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I have the following report from the Engineer-in-Chief:—Proposals for a reservoir on Jacob's Creek have been made from time to time over a period of many years, and previous investigations did

not indicate that an economic storage was possible. The Jacob's Creek site was the subject of preliminary survey in 1911. A dam site was selected about one mile upstream from the present railway bridge and a study of the topographic map of the area shows that this would give the best reservoir basin available. The valley is narrow and steep, however, and the storage capacity would be small in relation to the size of dam required. To store 140 million gallons a dam of about 90 feet in height is needed, and this would cost about £550,000.

The catchment of Jacob's Creek covers 15 square miles and extends south to about the South Para river catchment, with which it has rather similar run-off characteristics. Taking the optimistic view, and assuming the useful yield of the storage to be as high as 100 million gallons per year, the cost of water would be considerably above that from other schemes now in mind. Gravity feed from a dam on Jacob's Creek into the Warren reservoir trunk main is not possible and water would have to be used locally or pumped into the main system. Since 1890, at least six reservoir schemes have been the subject of some investigation within the North Para river valley. In each case, the demand against which the investigation was made was met by an alternative scheme with better prospects. The same can be said today and alternative developments offer cheaper and better supplies. For all this, the Engineering and Water Supply Department is continuing in measuring the flows in the North Para river, and the damming of the main stream for water supply may prove necessary at some later date.

#### ACQUISITION OF LAND NEAR MURRAY BRIDGE.

Mr. BYWATERS—Recently, I asked the Minister of Lands whether he was aware that land had been compulsorily acquired by the army, and whether it had power to do so. He assured me that it did under the Defence regulations. I also drew attention to the fact that there was the possibility of some 4,000 acres of land being acquired by his Government, to see whether it would compensate these men for their loss of land. Of this the Minister had no knowledge but I assure him that there will be some approach in that regard in the near future. However, this will be applicable to only two of these people, though others are concerned. My information is that to the land transfer there would be no serious opposition from the owner of the land. For others in a like position, if we were able to find land of a similar nature that was not being used by people who held it at the moment under lease from the Crown Lands Department, would the Minister consider the possibility of acquiring the land so as to make good the loss of land taken over by the military authorities?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—Several questions are involved. I would say that any of the

land that is leasehold and leased to any nearby settlers, provided they are carrying out the conditions of the lease, we would not be able to acquire without their consent. However, I will look into the position and report back to the honourable member.

#### HIRE-PURCHASE.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Does the Government intend to introduce legislation in relation to hire-purchase this session?

The Hon. SIR THOMAS PLAYFORD—As honourable members know, the Government, in conjunction with other Australian Governments, has been working on new legislation for hire-purchase control. Some of the other States have passed legislation, and it is the intention of my Government to introduce legislation this session. The reason for the delay is that we have found that one or two firms in South Australia are carrying out perfectly legitimate business on somewhat different lines from those that have been usually adopted in hire-purchase, and we are trying to see whether it is possible to get some arrangement to enable them to carry on that type of business without infringing the Act. So far as we can see, the business is in every way reputable and desirable, but it does not conform with the present uniform Bill.

#### TOURS IN UPPER MURRAY AREAS.

Mr. STOTT—My question concerns a matter of policy. The Premier will realize that the Government Tourist Bureau is anxious, particularly in the Upper Murray districts, to give every co-operation in the arranging of conducted tours there and in extending its activities in that direction, which is appreciated by the people of the Upper Murray districts. The local government authorities and committees are also anxious to beautify various spots, ovals and caravan parks to attract tourists to their areas, but are handicapped in the raising of money for such purposes. Every Saturday afternoon is taken up with cricket, tennis and other sports, which does not give the local people an opportunity of raising money for community efforts. Sunday is the only day available for the local people to do something to raise funds, but they are prevented from doing so under the Act. Will the Premier consider (putting it to Cabinet if necessary) allowing the Chief Secretary to grant a permit in special cases where he sees fit for public bodies to raise money on Sundays? They cannot charge now for that, or for any side-show business on a Sunday. Will the Premier consider allowing the Chief

Secretary to grant a permit when application is made? If the Chief Secretary cannot do it under the Act, will the Government consider amending the Act accordingly to meet that position?

The Hon. SIR THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will have that question examined, for it greatly affects our social life. I am not prepared to say at this juncture that the Government will be prepared to introduce such legislation. The present legislation was passed many years ago and I think it has substantial support from the vast majority of the people of this State. It was designed to preserve the Sabbath Day and not to introduce into South Australia the Continental Sunday, which personally I think is undesirable. However, I will have the matter examined, without there being any assurance of an amendment of the law.

#### SAFETY SALLIES.

Mr. RALSTON—Has the Minister of Works representing the Minister of Roads a reply to my recent question regarding the use of Safety Sallies on roads?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—My colleague informs me that a Bill to amend the Road Traffic Act which is about to be introduced will contain provisions that will permit the Government to promulgate regulations regarding specific details of pedestrian crossings, etc., which would be able to cover the question of Safety Sallies.

#### SCHOOL INSPECTORS.

Mr. CLARK—My question refers to teachers who become inspectors of schools. Apparently while such men or women are engaged in teaching or in administering a school they are in the teaching service, yet once they become an inspector doing similar work in a wider sphere they are in the Public Service. Can the Minister of Education inform me of the reason for this division and why such inspectors are classed as members of the Public Service?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I suppose the reason is that it has been a decision of the Government for many years. The subject matter has been discussed in the Education Department and in the Public Service from time to time and applications have been made for the position to be reversed. However, I have had contrary recommendations both from the Director of Education and the Public Service Commissioner. The matter having been raised

again, I will be pleased to re-examine it and if necessary submit it to my colleagues in Cabinet for their opinion.

#### NORTH-EASTERN PASTORAL LAND.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Has the Minister of Lands any information relating to the question I asked last week whether the boring now being undertaken by the Department of Mines in the north-eastern corner of the State would result in any further pastoral land in that area being made available for allotment?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—The Director of Lands has informed me that the Mines Department boring party is at present operating on two pastoral blocks in the north-east which have recently been allotted under pastoral lease conditions. The object of the water search is twofold, namely, to improve conditions for travelling stock proceeding to the Adelaide market and to assist in the development of the blocks in question. No other unoccupied lands in this area will be affected by this boring project.

#### SHEEP GRAZING ON ROADS.

Mr. HALL—Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question relating to travelling stock spreading weeds when grazing on roads?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—The Director of Agriculture has supplied me with the following report:—

Under section 28 (1) of the Weeds Act 1956 the Minister of Agriculture has the power to prevent movement of any animals from place to place if proclaimed noxious weeds are being spread. The following subsections of the Act state that such measures can be taken by issuing a notice in the *Government Gazette* and in a newspaper circulating throughout the State. It would then be necessary for local authorized officers for weed control which have been appointed by local government bodies and Government authorized officers to report any breaches of this notice to the Minister. It is considered that the landowners in Mr. Hall's electorate should be advised to refer the matter to their district councils who should then immediately forward details to the Minister, so that officers of this department can investigate and report. The necessary steps can then be taken as outlined above.

#### ABORIGINAL SCHOOL CHILDREN AT COOBER PEDY.

Mr. LOVEDAY—Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question regarding the conditions that must be complied with by aboriginal children before they can attend the proposed school at Coober Pedy?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—The Director of Education (Mr. Mander-Jones) has now supplied me with a report following the recent

visit to Coober Pedy of the Assistant Superintendent of Primary Schools (Mr. Whitburn) in company with the Protector of Aborigines (Mr. Bartlett). There are now approximately 200 whites working either at Coober Pedy or at the eight mile or 12 mile field. There are about 12 white children who would attend a school when established at the community hall now in course of construction. In addition there will be between 20 and 30 aboriginal children of school-going age who are living in very primitive conditions and have a very limited knowledge, if any, of the English language. The aboriginal children who regularly attend the school at Andamooka learn English to a satisfactory extent within a short period. In the circumstances, it is considered that the Education Department might well relax the condition that the children should be able to speak English reasonably before admission to the Coober Pedy school. Consequently, I am pleased to inform the honourable member that any aboriginal children of appropriate age who conform to the normal standards of cleanliness and hygiene will be admitted to the proposed new school.

#### PORT ADELAIDE CASUALTY HOSPITAL.

Mr. RYAN—Will the Premier ascertain from the Minister of Health the total number of cases treated at the Port Adelaide casualty hospital in 1957, 1958 and 1959?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I presume that these records are kept and, if they are, I will obtain the information for the honourable member.

#### INSURANCE OF WORKMEN.

Mr. RALSTON—Under the Workmen's Compensation Act it is mandatory on employers to insure all workmen in their employ. Section 108. (1) provides:—

No employer shall employ any workman unless he has obtained from an insurance office a policy of insurance for the full amount of his liability to pay compensation under this Act to all workmen employed by him. Subsection 4 of this section provides:—

No prosecution for a contravention of this section shall be instituted without the consent of the Minister.

Will the Premier indicate what statutory authority or Government department polices this Act to determine whether the provisions relating to insurance and other matters are complied with?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will obtain a report and advise the honourable member.

#### WHYALLA PRIMARY SCHOOL LIBRARY.

Mr. LOVEDAY—Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question regarding a new library for the Whyalla primary school?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Yes, I obtained a report following on the honourable member's correspondence and his question in this House. The Architect-in-Chief arranged for his district building inspector at Port Augusta to inspect the library building, and he considers that the existing building cannot be effectively guarded against further wreckages by white ants because of the low floor line and consequent poor ventilation, and that maintenance is likely to prove very expensive. He advises that it is in such a bad condition that it should be demolished and replaced by a standard library block measuring 32ft. x 24ft. The Education Department agrees that the building should be replaced, and action will be taken accordingly. Owing to urgent commitments for standard classrooms, it is not possible to say at present when the new building will be erected, but it is hoped that it may be included in the list of wooden buildings for erection during the first half of 1960.

#### WAR SERVICE LAND SETTLEMENT VALUATIONS.

Mr. QUIRKE (on notice)—

1. In the event of a settler who has been allotted land under the War Service Land Settlement Agreement of 1945 dying before the end of the 10 years "assistance period" leaving a widow to whom he has willed the property, what provision is made for meeting all death duty charges if the widow has no separate means of meeting such charges?

2. What factors operate in making a valuation of the property as a basis of such charges?

3. What authority is responsible for making the valuation?

4. Is the widow informed of the valuation arrived at?

5. Do the work, improvements and money spent by the settler on improvements count as her equity?

6. In the event of the widow being unable to meet the demands of death charges or otherwise being unable to maintain and work the holding, is she permitted to sell the property at current values and retain all moneys in excess of total liabilities?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—The replies are:—

1. There is no "10 year assistance period" relating to holdings under the War Service



Land Settlement Agreement Act. The assistance period is the period of 12 months during which a living allowance is paid to the settler and no rent or charges are levied. In the case of a "dry lands" holding this is the first 12 months following allotment, and in the case of an irrigation holding, a period of 12 months after it reaches an agreed on standard of production. There is no specific provision under the scheme covering succession duty charges, but if the widow of a deceased settler, who intended to continue with the holding, were in difficulties, the department would no doubt find some means of assisting her.

2 to 4. A valuation for succession duty purposes does not come within the scope of the War Service Land Settlement Scheme. This is a matter for the representatives of the estate as in the case of any other citizen. It should be understood that the department, in consultation with the Commonwealth authorities, fixes a rental and a charge for improvements for each war service land settlement holding, and in the case of a "dry lands" property, a price at which the lessee may, if he so desires, apply to freehold after 10 years. Any other valuations, such as for sale or succession duties, are purely private matters.

5. Should the beneficiary decide to surrender the lease to the Crown, he or she would be entitled, in terms of the lease, to compensation

for improvements owned or effected by the settler with private funds, which were essential for the working of the property, after allowing for any amounts due to the Crown. Should the widow decide to sell, her equity or the equity of the estate would be the price she could obtain from the buyer, less any liabilities which it might be necessary to repay to the Crown.

6. On the death of a settler, no objection would be raised to his holding being sold on the open market, provided all advances, including those for the improvements, were repaid. The consent of the Minister to the transfer would have to be obtained in the usual way, if the property were sold as a leasehold.

#### PETROLEUM IMPORTS.

Mr. RALSTON (on notice)—

1. What were the total tonnages of each of the following petroleum products delivered by sea to Port Adelaide, Port Pirie, and Port Lincoln, for the year 1958-59:—(a) petrol; (b) power kerosene; (c) distillate; (d) lubricating oil; (e) other petroleum products?

2. What amounts of each of the above came to each port from—(a) overseas; and (b) interstate?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The replies are:—

1.	Port Adelaide.	Port Pirie.	Port Lincoln.
	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.
(a) Petrol . . . . .	409,266	64,996	11,991
(b) Power kerosene . . . . .	47,716	9,056	2,309
(c) Distillate* . . . . .	239,006	89,894	7,680
(d) Lubricating oil . . . . .	19,870	—	517
(e) Other petroleum products . . . . .	6,986	—	872
Total . . . . .	722,844	163,946	23,369

NOTE.—These figures include intrastate movement.

2.	From Interstate.	From Overseas.	Total Interstate and Overseas.
Port Adelaide—	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.
(a) Petrol . . . . .	322,310	86,934	409,244
(b) Power kerosene . . . . .	21,135	26,581	47,716
(c) Distillate* . . . . .	187,636	51,370	239,006
(d) Lubricating oil . . . . .	2,516	17,351	19,867
(e) Other petroleum products . . . . .	122	6,860	6,982
Port Pirie—			
(a) Petrol . . . . .	48,420	16,576	64,996
(b) Power kerosene . . . . .	2,877	6,179	9,056
(c) Distillate* . . . . .	83,451	6,443	89,894
(d) Lubricating oil . . . . .	—	—	—
(e) Other petroleum products . . . . .	—	—	—
Port Lincoln—			
(a) Petrol . . . . .	11,724	—	11,724
(b) Power kerosene . . . . .	2,203	—	2,203
(c) Distillate* . . . . .	7,163	—	7,163
(d) Lubricating oil . . . . .	—	—	—
(e) Other petroleum products . . . . .	—	—	—

\* Includes all fuel oils.

# PROSECUTIONS UNDER BUSH FIRES ACT.

Mr. FRED WALSH (on notice)—

1. How many prosecutions were made under Section 19 of the Bush Fires Act, in each of the years 1956-57, 1957-58, and 1958-59?

2. How many of these prosecutions were successful?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—The replies are:—

1. and 2. No records are available in the Attorney General's Office. Police Department records would have to be searched and individual files examined. It is suggested that the honourable member confers with me to decide upon the relative importance of his enquiry. Total offences against the Bush Fires Act for the last three years are as follows:—

	Reported.	Convicted.
1956-57 . . . . .	165	165
1957-58 . . . . .	146	145
1958-59 . . . . .	99	99

It is believed that there would be very few convictions under Section 19. This section is to receive special consideration during Sir Edgar Bean's survey of the Bush Fires Act.

## VICTORIA ROAD.

Mr. TAPPING (on notice)—

1. Is it intended to reconstruct Victoria Road, Birkenhead this financial year?

2. If not, will a census of traffic to and from Outer Harbour be taken?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The replies are:—

1. No funds have been provided during the current financial year for the reconstruction of Victoria Road, Birkenhead.

2. Traffic counts were taken in February and April of this year in connection with the study of the overall traffic position in this area.

## PROGRESS ALLOWANCES.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (on notice)—

1. How many secondary school students have applied for a progress allowance in accordance with the provision in the regulations that the Director of Education may approve of the allowance to students whose failure to reach the required standard was due to special circumstances?

2. In how many instances has approval been given?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—The Director of Education reports:—

Information is not readily available to enable figures to be supplied in reply to Mr.

O'Halloran's question in relation to applications for extension of progress allowances beyond the three year maximum period in accordance with regulation XXI, 2 (1) (b). In the case of book allowances, such claims would usually be included in the general claim forwarded by the head of the school. Separate applications for boarding and travelling allowances are made, but no separate record is maintained of these applications. Each application is treated strictly on its merits. Although no figures are available, it is considered that the number of applications received have not been very large.

## MEDICAL BENEFITS COMPANIES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (on notice)—

1. Is the Australian Hospital and Medical Benefits Ltd. a holding company of the Australian Medical and Accident Insurance Ltd.?

2. Is either of these companies engaged in the business of providing dental and funeral benefits?

3. If so, have they complied with the regulations under the Benefit Associations Act, 1958?

4. If so, do their returns meet the requirements of the Act?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Public Actuary reports:—

1. I have been informed that the Australian Hospital and Medical Benefits Company Ltd., by an arrangement made on October 13, 1958, is in process of transferring all its contracts to the National Health Services Association, a South Australian friendly society. This company has been managed by the same board of directors as the Australian Medical and Accident Insurance Co. Ltd.

2. The Australian Medical and Accident Insurance Company provides funeral benefits both in the form of a separate policy and as part of a composite policy. The company states that all funeral benefit contracts are reinsured with the City Mutual Assurance Company. The company also insures dental benefits together with hospital and medical benefits as part of a composite insurance policy, while the insured is in receipt of compensation from the company in respect of any illness or accident.

3. and 4. The Australian Medical and Accident Company Limited has not yet rendered the necessary returns under the Benefit Associations Act which were due on September 30, 1959. The company will shortly be reminded of its obligation to make the necessary returns.

## 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 ESTIMATES.

In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from October 15. Page 1101.)

### THE LEGISLATURE.

House of Assembly, £14,937; Parliamentary Library, £7,507; Joint House Committee, £11,548—passed.

Electoral Department, £23,818.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—At present applications for postal votes can be received until 6 p.m. on the Friday preceding an election. Ballot papers must then be posted to the elector, but in the event of their late delivery on the Saturday the elector must return the ballot papers to the nearest polling booth because, if posted, they would not bear a post-mark earlier than 6 p.m. on that day. Will the Treasurer ascertain from the Electoral Office whether it would be desirable to amend the time for the receipt of applications for postal votes to the Thursday preceding the election? This would ensure that the ballot papers could be posted back to the Electoral Department within the prescribed time and it would also enable returning officers to have more time to prepare for the election.

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

Mr. LAWN—Since the last State election there have been many letters in the press complaining about the issuing of ballot papers to those enrolled for the Legislative Council. In several booths many persons had to demand ballot papers. One letter was from a gentleman who was standing behind a lady in a queue for ballot papers. The lady was refused a Legislative Council ballot paper because her name was not on the roll. She turned to go, but as he knew her name was on the roll he protested and she received a ballot paper. I had an entirely different experience. Two officers were sitting side by side, one issuing ballot papers for the House of Assembly and the other ballot papers for the Legislative Council. As soon as I gave my name the second officer asked me to wait while he checked to see whether my name was on the Legislative Council roll. Can the Treasurer say why there is this difference in attitude in certain polling

booths? There is a strong feeling that for the Legislative Council the Government does not want people to have a vote and this feeling arises from the attitude adopted by certain officers in the booths. Is it possible for the Government to give definite instructions to all poll clerks and assistant presiding officers that when a person seeks a House of Assembly ballot paper the officer controlling the Legislative Council roll must ascertain whether that person is also entitled to a Legislative Council ballot paper?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The prime essential of any election is that it shall be held not by the Government, but by the people appointed by the Governor to do the job. I refute any suggestion that the Government is in a position to give poll clerks or returning officers any instructions about the conduct of the poll.

Mr. O'Halloran—Surely there are regulations under the Electoral Act?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Certainly, and the Government has the power to promulgate regulations which are either approved or disallowed by Parliament. Regarding the suggestion that the Government did not want persons in certain districts to have Legislative Council ballot papers, I point out that the regulations apply equally to all districts and the Government has no control over the conduct of the poll, nor is it desirable that any political Party should have. My experience has always been the same as the honourable member's experience. The officers have always checked immediately to see whether my name appears on the Legislative Council roll. In some small country districts one officer has the job of looking after both rolls and he checks both as a matter of course. I will refer the question to the Electoral Department to ascertain whether it is necessary to alter the regulations or the procedure in conducting elections. The conduct of an election is not under the Government's control and when writs are issued it becomes a matter for the Electoral Department.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Like other members I have been concerned about the conduct of the polls for the Legislative Council. I have two complaints on this: firstly, that the rolls from time to time seem to be in a strange condition. Many electors in my district have come to me in a state of high dudgeon because, for some reason unknown to them, their names have been left off the Legislative Council roll when it has been reprinted. In fact, in the 1953

State election it happened to the Mayor of Kensington and Norwood. In the last State election many people were in a similar position. They showed me where they had previously been on the Legislative Council roll and said that when it was reprinted their names had been left off. Also, many people who voted in the Assembly election received letters asking why they had not voted. It was obvious from a comparison of the marked roll and the Electoral Office roll that the position was not satisfactory and that the original marking had not been done properly. I do not blame the clerks in the Electoral Office but it is obvious that some of the clerks employed temporarily at election time had not carried out their duties as they should.

In my district and in surrounding districts, particularly those in the Legislative Council Central No. 2 District, there have been complaints that poll clerks actively discouraged voters from voting in the Legislative Council election. This applied particularly at the Campbelltown booth, where a clerk told voters that they need not bother about the Legislative Council election because it was not necessary to vote. This activity by clerks is undesirable. In all cases the clerks should search the Legislative Council roll to see whether each voter is entitled to a Council vote. No voter should have to ask for a Council vote, which he has to do in many booths in both the country and the city. I appreciate the Treasurer's reply that the Government takes no action to instruct Electoral Office employees about the conduct of elections but I think it would be proper for the Government, in conjunction with the Leader of the Opposition, to ask the Chief Electoral Officer to circularize all the employees with definite instructions on this matter to see that the things complained of do not happen again.

Mr. RYAN—Is the Treasurer aware that members of the staff of the Electoral Office tell people when they go to that office to have their names placed on the Legislative Council roll that they need not do so? I was in the Electoral Office recently when a person who presented the necessary form for enrolment on the Legislative Council roll was informed by the employee that he need not enrol because it was not necessary and a waste of time to do so.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have no knowledge that this is the position; in fact, I should be surprised if it were the case. I always feel that the electoral officers are conscientious in performing their duties.

If the honourable member will give me the name of the officer who has been giving people this information I will take up the matter with the Electoral Office to see that he gets the appropriate punishment.

Mr. CLARK—In my district, where the number of electors is becoming increasingly large—it is now between 12,000 and 13,000—we have the peculiar situation of having only one subdivision. It is probably the largest subdivision in the State. In it there are three large towns, Salisbury, Elizabeth and Gawler, and it would be better if the district were divided into several subdivisions, as are most other large districts. Will the Treasurer confer with the Electoral Office to see if there can be more than one subdivision in the district of Gawler?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will take up the matter with the Attorney-General. I do not know why there should not be more subdivisions. In some respects it is desirable to have more because a roll can become too cumbersome. In connection with our licensing laws, and the holding of local option polls, Parliament has agreed to a number of subdivisions. I will take up this matter because it contains much merit.

Mr. LAWN—I was pleased with the sympathetic way in which the Treasurer received the suggestions of Opposition members. In view of his promises to look further into the matters, and his previous statements that legislation should be of a remedial character, I suggest that the Government consider the removal of the present anomaly of two rolls of voters being necessary. It would be better to have one roll containing both Council and Assembly voters. There is only one roll for Commonwealth elections. If the Government introduced remedial legislation of this sort I think I could say that the Opposition would co-operate 100 per cent with it. I trust the Treasurer will take the matter to Cabinet, in addition to getting a report from the Electoral Office.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The questions raised by the honourable member are the subject of a Bill now before the House. Therefore, it would not be wise for me to anticipate what I may say tomorrow on this matter.

Mr. LOVEDAY—During the last election several people in Whyalla stated that they were actively discouraged from registering a vote for the Legislative Council. It was suggested to them that they would not be eligible to vote

and no serious attempt was made to ascertain whether or not they were on the roll. This was not the first time I had received such complaints. Strict instructions should be issued to all officers engaged in an election so that they may know their duties and search the rolls so that they know who are on them.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—If an elector applies for a ballot paper for the House of Assembly and his name does not appear on the roll, he may make a declaration. Will the Government consider introducing legislation so that this provision may also apply to the Legislative Council?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will have that matter examined.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Will the Treasurer take up with the Electoral Office its procedure in making enrolments? At the moment the only people invited to enrol for the Legislative Council are those for whom transfers of property are registered at the Land Titles Office. They receive a post card inviting them to enrol for the Legislative Council. The extraordinary thing is that, while officers of the Electoral Office go around from house to house to enrol people for the Assembly, the House of Representatives and the Senate they do not at the same time indicate to rental occupiers their right to enrol for the Legislative Council. Only last weekend I approached numbers of people to see whether they could enrol for the Legislative Council. Only two days before that, an officer from the Electoral Office had been there to hand them a form of enrolment for the House of Representatives and the Senate, but no word had been said about their right to vote for the Legislative Council. They had never heard of it until I explained to them that they had the right to enrol. Why this difference, this reticence on the part of the Electoral Office to tell people they are entitled to vote? Why this discrimination by the Electoral Office between property owners and rental occupiers in their invitations to people to go on to the Legislative Council roll?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have already informed honourable members that the Government has not issued orders to the Electoral Office on this matter. I personally know nothing about it. Enrolment for the Legislative Council is not compulsory. The necessary qualifications are held widely, but not by everyone, so that the Electoral Office would not in many instances know whether a person was entitled to enrol for the Legislative Coun-

cil. I do not know whether that is the reason for what the honourable member calls "discrimination" but I will make some general inquiries.

Line passed.

Government Reporting Department, £42,863.

Mr. TAPPING—The estimated cost of printing and publishing *Hansard* has risen by £219 since last year. For the past 20 or 30 years it has been the custom to allow members to send to their constituents up to 15 copies of *Hansard* each year. This number should now be increased as our population has doubled in that time.

Mr. HAMBOUR—I support that suggestion. Last year I despatched 35 copies of *Hansard* and had requests for many more. It is important that we should interest people in our proceedings, for too many regard Parliament as superfluous and pay no attention to the conduct of the business. Members always see that requests for *Hansard* are met. Fifteen is not sufficient.

Line passed.

Public Works Standing Committee, £3,117; Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement, £2,137; Miscellaneous, £42,760—passed.

CHIEF SECRETARY AND MINISTER OF HEALTH.

State Governor's Establishment, £9,530; Chief Secretary's Department, £19,173; Statistical Department, £32,594; Audit Department, £73,463—passed.

Printing and Stationery Department, £291,739.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—From time to time members have been informed that the Government is considering the provision of a new Government Printing Office. We know that the Government Printer has not adequate accommodation. I believe that the last suggestion was that the Government contemplated establishing the Government Printer at Light Square in the Produce Department building. Can the Treasurer say what is the Government's intention in regard to new premises?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The honourable member is quite correct in saying that the Government Printer has not sufficient room. The buildings are by no means suitable for a modern printing establishment, which requires, if the work is to be done most economically and efficiently, that all the plant shall be on the one floor so that there can be a flow-through of the work and that there should not be plant on various floors, as at

present. It is always undesirable to have heavy machinery on anything but the ground floor. It is necessary to have the Government Printer accommodated fairly adjacent to Parliament, particularly during the session, for the printing of Bills and so on. To provide an effective organization, probably two or three acres would be required. I assure the honourable member that the Government has investigated a number of proposals, but up to the present has not had any which it felt it could recommend to the Public Works Standing Committee for investigation.

Line passed.

Police Department, £2,302,981.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—A line is provided for a uniform reimbursement of £30 a year for the Deputy Commissioner of Police. It is a fairly long time since we have had a Deputy Commissioner of Police. I should like to know if the Government at last has made up its mind to appoint one and, if so, are we to expect an announcement in the near future?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I should think so.

Mr. BYWATERS—In his annual report the Auditor-General refers to the loss of an electric fan from the Adelaide Local Court and states that the police have been unable to trace it. I am surprised to think that a fan has been stolen or lost from the court. Has the Treasurer any knowledge of this?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I assure the honourable member that I did not take it. I have no knowledge of the matter, but can get a report if the honourable member desires.

Mr. DUNSTAN—I am concerned about the staff numbers of the police force. At Norwood we have a police station to which is attached a small number of out-stations. There are 14 police officers to cope with the district, in which there is much night entertainment and sport. The duties of the officer in charge at Norwood have already broken the health of one man, and are endangering the health of the present incumbent, who is tough physically. There are insufficient officers to cope with the work of the district. The local council has complained time and again of this. There are not enough men to do traffic duty, to patrol the Parade and to cope with duties at the local oval, where recently there was an attendance of 25,000 people, but only four officers to cope with them.

It would appear from the Grants Commission's report that South Australia has been spending substantially less than the Australian average on its police force. According to the last report this State spent less than any other State on keeping law and order, and under the heading of "Police" we spent less than any other State *per capita* except New South Wales, and substantially less than the average. It seems to me that we are not spending according to Australian standards. If the Treasurer says that he cannot find extra money to staff the police force, I suggest that the safety of the public is more urgent than the maintenance of two sections in the police force which are very pretty and provide entertainment, but at the same time are not essential to public safety. I refer to the maintenance of the police greys and the Police Band. We have bands in this community able to assist on ceremonial occasions, and police officers could use motor cycles for such occasions. Although it is nice to have police officers cantering around looking pretty on horses, these officers should be engaged on basic police duties in view of the shortage of police officers. A number of police officers agree with this view. This would relieve some of the officers who are now over-burdened, as they are in some parts of the metropolitan area, and particularly in my district. I should be glad if the Treasurer would inform me how the Government proposes to cope with the present lack of sufficient police officers for basic duties in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Many South Australians, and I must confess that I am in the number, would be sorry if that most excellent organization, the Police Band, were to be disbanded, as it has given much pleasure to many people and it gives an assembly corps to the police and serves a good purpose in the community. These remarks apply also to the police greys. These horses have won the affection of the crowd and, incidentally, are the most effective means to control a crowd. I agree that the police force is not up to strength, but I do not agree entirely with the honourable member's conclusions regarding the stationing of officers in any particular places. I voluntarily spent several days at Scotland Yard to investigate modern trends in crime detection and law enforcement, as I think Scotland Yard is still one of the most effective organizations of its type in the world. The modern trend is for the police force to be highly mobile. That is more important than building up big numbers because, when separated,

officers sometimes become completely ineffective whereas more effective use can be made of them if they are mobile. I commend the present Commissioner and his predecessors for altering the methods of the police force so that the police have modern means of transport instead of having to walk or use pushcycles. Nearly two years ago Cabinet approved a much bigger establishment of police officers and the Commissioner is now building up his establishment as and when he can enlist suitable men. Last year he was not able to obtain the number provided for in the Estimates, but I think he will probably be able to do better this year.

We are proud of our police force, and I think it would be a mistake to lower the standard merely to obtain numbers. Once it was necessary to have almost a college education to be a police officer and a policeman had to attend the training college for three or four years before going on the beat. This has been broken down a little because of the big increase in population, but I still feel it would be inadvisable to lower the standard merely to get recruit numbers. On several occasions I have been privileged to see how effective is the co-operation between the public and the police. Last year in this House I mentioned an incident in which a policeman was in difficulties with a larrikin and the public immediately came to his aid. This does not apply in some other Australian States, where the police are left to get out of trouble as best they can or, in some instances, the public assist the larrikin. The situation here is that the public trusts the police and the police are good, conscientious officers. I do not agree with two suggestions of the honourable member, but I agree with his suggestion that the police force should be built up. This has been approved by Cabinet, and funds will be made available.

Mr. LOVEDAY—This year £37,500 is provided for the net cost of fleet replacements for the police force, which is an increase of £19,455 over last year's expenditure. Will the Treasurer state whether this will apply to cars only, or to both cars and motor cycles? When the local government authority in Whyalla successfully applied recently for a motor cycle patrol there was a tremendous improvement in the behaviour of motorists, and I am satisfied that the use of such patrols in townships and elsewhere would assist to reduce our accident rate. Will the Treasurer state what this expenditure is for, and whether

it is proposed to increase the number of police patrols on our roads in an attempt to reduce the number of traffic offences?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The general policy of the Police Department is to introduce more modern equipment to deal with the types of offences encountered today, but that is not the entire explanation of this line. When preparing the Estimates last year, I found that many police officers were using vehicles that had done an excessive mileage. Many vehicles had done well over 100,000 miles and some had travelled more than 200,000. Although the vehicles were being maintained in what appeared to be a serviceable condition, they had been subject during their long life to all sorts of strains and stresses and it was impossible to maintain them for police work where they may have been required to maintain high speeds. To overcome this a system was introduced by which the vehicles were to be traded in after doing a certain mileage. We are, as rapidly as possible, bringing our vehicles into a much better state and the number of vehicles on the road is being increased.

The main increase noted by the honourable member arises from the fact that the system of control of motor vehicles is now being altered to comply with this new trade-in provision. The method of accountancy has been changed to the Loan account and vehicles are purchased by a Loan account debit and sufficient money is paid from revenue each year to amortize the life of the vehicle over the Loan account debit. It is an elimination of the Loan account debit rather than the purchase of a vehicle. However, the increase has been brought about mainly by the reduction in what is regarded as the useful life of the vehicle. The mileage decided on is between 40,000 and 50,000 miles; additional vehicles are available and the standard of vehicles has improved.

Mr. JENKINS—The sum of £495 is being voted for the purchase of band instruments for police officers. I am glad to see this. This band with the orchestra and the police judo team, led by a very efficient army P.T. instructor (Mr. Hearnés) have visited towns in my district. Their standard of entertainment has always been very high and I hope they will continue in the same way as this activity goes a long way to improve public relations.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Last year £162,000 was the Government contribution under the

Police Pensions Act, whereas this year it is only £105,000—a decrease of £57,000. Why is the amount provided against this line substantially less than that provided last year? The sum of £270 is to be spent on fire-fighting equipment. I do not know if that amount is to provide the police with equipment to fight fires generally or whether it is a provision against fires in police buildings. I know that the police officers go out to assist the voluntary fire-fighting organizations and they have rendered excellent service in fighting disastrous bush fires. If the provision is for this purpose I think it is little enough, but if it is for internal use it may be merely to supplement existing equipment.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The procedure under which pensions for retired police officers have been paid is to be altered. Previously the Government paid in each year the Government's anticipated contribution required to build up the fund, and as a result a fairly substantial fund has been built up and it is invested in various ways. In future it is proposed to provide for the actual pensions required, which is more factual. That is the same policy followed under the Superannuation Act for Public Service pensions. Provision will be made under the Police Pensions Act each year for the actual pensions payable to officers and we do not set out to build up a big fund. No disability will be suffered by police officers. Replying to the second question, £270 is to be used mainly to provide necessary arm bands and other means of identification to give the police officers the necessary authority required in fire-fighting operations. There has not been the necessity to replace these items to such an extent this year as there was last year.

Mr. LAWN—Within the last 12 months I have received complaints from residents in the Thebarton subdivision of Adelaide that they must be fast sprinters to be able to cross the South Road near Fisher Terrace and Rowlands Road because of the way vehicles speed there. I referred the complaints to the Treasurer and the police made one visit of inspection and subsequently the Treasurer forwarded me a report which I passed on to the people who had complained. However, they are still not satisfied. There are many instances of speeding throughout the metropolitan area. The Marion Road is virtually a speedway in the morning, particularly the stretch from the tram line to Anzac Highway—a distance of about 300yds. Accidents frequently happen

on the Marion Road, but not so many would happen if there were a more adequate police traffic patrol.

Many traffic offences go unnoticed because of the inadequacy of our police traffic force. Last Friday evening I was travelling down North Terrace towards St. Peters and was delayed at the corner of Pulteney Street by a stationary vehicle in the middle of the roadway. The lights went through a complete cycle and, with other motorists, I had to pull out to pass the stationary vehicle, the driver of which was either drunk or ill. On another occasion when I was driving on Anzac Highway in the third lane and only about 2ft. from the plantation kerbing a motor cyclist rode up beside me and told me to pull into the kerb. He was not a police officer but a man pretending to be. There are many clowns like that on the road nowadays, and not only in the metropolitan area.

I have frequently reported instances of motorists parking their vehicles across gateways on Marion Road, thus preventing people from entering or leaving their own premises, but by the time police have arrived from Angas Street the offenders have disappeared. With this offence it is necessary for the police to catch the offenders in the act. One traffic unit patrols the area from the western side of Marion Road to Glenelg and the other the area from the eastern side of Marion Road to Glen Osmond. That is a terrific area to be patrolled by only two officers and when offences are noticed they must be reported to Angas Street. The Government should seriously consider increasing the complement of the police traffic division. The Treasurer said that he believed police vehicles were traded in after 40,000 or 50,000 miles, but I suggest it would be cheaper to replace them after 20,000 miles. A police vehicle travelling 50,000 miles would require three or four sets of tyres and heavy maintenance, but if it were traded in after 20,000 miles it would not cost so much to obtain a replacement.

Mr. TAPPING—An amount of £2,260 is provided for the purchase of motor launches, an increase of £1,610 on last year. Can the Treasurer say where those launches will be used?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—No, but I should imagine they would be used in patrolling the metropolitan beaches, which are the only places where police boat services



are provided. Provision is made for the purchase of two 17ft. fibre glass boats complete with engines and for the replacement of an engine in another police launch.

Mr. QUIRKE—When the complement of the police force is adequate I would like attention to be given to the Main North Road, particularly now that the tram lines have been removed. This work has been of tremendous benefit to motorists travelling to and from the city, except that far too many travel on the road at not more than 20 miles an hour and stick fast to the yellow line. When a truck travels on the left hand side of them it is impossible for following vehicles to pass. The law says that a vehicle must be driven as near as practicable to the left hand side of the road, but many drivers do not attempt to do that. Such an offence is committed many times on the Main North Road. A speed of 35 miles an hour is allowed through Elizabeth but at times it is impossible to travel at 25 miles an hour because of vehicles sticking to the middle of the road. I suggest that there should be a special patrol to watch the position. It might even be a good idea to have mounted police on the road to shunt off offending drivers.

Line passed.

Sheriff and Gaols and Prisons Department, £450,222.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—The proposed salary for the Superintendent of the Cadell Training Centre is £1,403, whereas the salary of the keeper at the Gladstone Prison is £1,704. Is there much difference in the duties of these two officers to explain the difference in the salaries paid?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Under the Public Service Act officers are appointed on a salary range, and on appointment a new officer is paid at first the lowest salary in the range and then receives yearly increments until he reaches the top salary. This applies to the Cadell officer who has been transferred from another position.

Mr. SHANNON—Mr. Allen, the Sheriff, is greatly interested in the Cadell Training Centre and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition can rest assured that what the Treasurer said is correct. The salary of the officer is fixed by the Public Service Board. When the Public Works Committee investigated the establishment of this centre much evidence was given by Mr. Allen and other expert officers. The centre will be not only an adjunct to our

prisons but also a farm training school. It is intended that the persons sent to Cadell shall be specially selected in the hope that they will gain some benefit and come back to the community as useful citizens. I have no doubt that the centre will be a success and that Mr. Allen will see that the staff sent there is the right type. The superintendent will have fewer men to handle, and there will be a farm manager on the staff, whereas the keeper at Gladstone will have a larger staff to control and will have no farm manager.

I commend Mr. Allen for the work he has done in the establishment of block C at Yatala prison for men who have served the major part of their sentence and who are approaching the time for release. In my opinion the conditions there are first class for the rehabilitation of prisoners for civilian life. The clothing, the sleeping and eating arrangements, and the freedom of action have a vital bearing on the reaction of the men on their release. The men in the block realize that they have privileges and it all helps to make them useful citizens when released. The Sheriff saw the scheme in operation elsewhere and recommended it for South Australia. Although the block has been in existence for about one year only one prisoner has escaped. I understand that that is regarded as an excellent result because the block accommodates 60 men and is full at all times. The men who leave there will probably readjust themselves successfully to civilian life. I have a high regard for the Sheriff.

Mr. HAMBOUR—I hope that the prison farm at Cadell opens soon. I am concerned at the amount of land that will not be developed immediately. Although 1,100 acres is available, in the first stage only 200 will be used. Persons nearby have complained about rabbit infestation. It is an offence to have vermin, but unfortunately, the neighbours have to suffer from rabbits on Government land. I join with the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) in expressing my appreciation of the work done by Mr. Allen.

Mr. NANKIVELL—Is there now any justification for maintaining the Kyeema Prison Camp?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—It will probably be closed down. I am not sure whether a decision has been reached, but when Cadell was considered by the Government it was anticipated that Kyeema would be closed down.

Mr. DUNSTAN—I appreciate the plans made and the development that has taken place, but from time to time prisoners committed

to Yatala could benefit by psychiatric treatment. Sometimes persons on the Bench tell them they will get psychiatric treatment, but they do not get any. Some people could be called kleptomaniacs; they seem to suffer from some sort of mental disease which, without rhyme or reason, makes them light-fingered. They ask for treatment but none is available at present. Others, subject to alcoholism, while they are forcibly driven off alcohol for a period in gaol, would benefit from psychiatric treatment. I know a tragic case of a man who undoubtedly has some diminished responsibility and seems to be alcoholic. As soon as he consumes alcohol he commits an offence connected with stealing. Time and time again he has gone to prison, yet no psychiatric assistance is given to people of this kind.

It is essential that psychiatric help be available to those who can benefit from it. In addition to the class I have mentioned, there are sexual offenders imprisoned who could benefit during their imprisonment from psychiatric assistance but it is not provided while they are in gaol. It is something that is vital, but lacking in our present prison system. What plans has the Government for giving psychiatric assistance to prisoners in gaol?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—From time to time, as appears necessary, officers make recommendations in this matter, which are always given effect to. It is not easy to know whether a person is really requiring psychiatric treatment or whether he is merely pretending that he has a particular deficiency at that moment.

Mr. Dunstan—A psychiatrist is the best person to find out.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—He cannot always find out. He may express an opinion, which may be fairly accurate, but I do not think he would be at all certain that he could pick him out. When it appears desirable, reports are made and the Chief Secretary gives these matters great attention and the necessary approval for whatever course is decided upon. At present it is not easy to get trained officers for that particular branch. Other mental institutions require technical staff, so we cannot be lavish with officers. However, we try to give such matters prompt attention.

Mr. CLARK—I was pleased to hear, and agree with, the remarks of the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) about the Sheriff who, on every appropriate occasion, has been of great assistance to me. Although these

men are offenders against society, the Sheriff is always prepared to regard them as human beings. He knows their history and he is only too anxious to help them. His decision in a recent case was of great advantage to the family of the man concerned. He is filling a very difficult job and doing it perfectly.

Line passed.

Hospitals Department, £5,231,651.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I am perturbed because members cannot ascertain the cost of treating patients at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. In his last annual report the Auditor-General had this to say about the hospital:—

The payments' on account of Consolidated Revenue for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital during 1958-59 (less recoveries and cost of out-patients) totalled £761,664. That amount, however, cannot be used as the basis for determining the annual cost relevant to maintaining patients as it includes considerable payments in the nature of establishment expenses, mainly for original equipment, furnishings, medical supplies, etc., for the general section of the hospital. The department has again failed to distinguish in its records between such payments and those attributable to maintenance. As a result, an accurate cost of maintaining patients is not ascertainable.

I draw attention to the words "has again failed." Honourable members are well aware of the cost of the establishment of this hospital, but I should hope that the Treasurer could give some information as to the amount recoverable from patients since the matter was investigated by the Auditor-General. I do not say that we should unduly levy patients who have to go to this hospital, but I am concerned that we have not a proper appreciation of its running costs, and therefore cannot make a comparison with other similar institutions maintained by the Government.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—As honourable members know, this hospital is being gradually staffed and is taking patients into the various sections. It is a teaching hospital and is beginning to take up its teaching functions. It would be extremely costly at this stage to try to work out precisely how much of the cost is directly associated with the treatment of any particular patient or number of patients, and how much of it would be establishment costs. It could be worked out by the employment of a large number to apportion the time to the various staff members, but extremely costly, and I doubt very much whether it would provide anything useful to members. The Government did take costs out for establishing the midwifery section and I believe the figure of £71 a week

per patient was arrived at. Everyone knows that that is not a true cost of the patients in that section because it is overloaded with enormous establishment costs that were inherent in the establishment of such a hospital. Steps are being taken to segregate the costs so that from the point of view of comparison of this hospital with other hospitals it will be possible for the Auditor-General to supply Parliament with figures. Those figures, however, will never be on a strictly comparable basis. They cannot be. Costs at the Royal Adelaide Hospital are much higher than at any other hospital because it is a teaching hospital and must have all kinds of special equipment that would not be warranted in an ordinary hospital. Many things in a teaching hospital are debited against the patients which normally would not be supplied, because it is a teaching institution. I will do my best to see that comparative figures are supplied to the Auditor-General as soon as possible.

Mr. RYAN—I cannot criticize the Port Adelaide casualty hospital for the treatment given, because I believe it is of the best, but I criticize the Government for its apathy towards the conditions under which the staff has to work. I realize that, as a casualty hospital, it is a clearing station for other hospitals, but it handles accidents in an industry noted for a high rate of casualties. The workers in this industry are not eligible for life insurance because of this high rate, and the employers have found it necessary to employ a full-time safety officer and to provide three ambulances. When major accidents occur the men are taken to the Port Adelaide casualty hospital, and we have the disgraceful position that they are compelled to stay on the verandah while awaiting medical attention. The establishment of a better casualty hospital is an urgent necessity, as the present hospital is one of the oldest buildings in Port Adelaide, and was once a home. The amount provided is for wages, but it is necessary to bring this hospital up to modern standards.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have no knowledge of this hospital, but I will see that the honourable member's remarks are drawn to the attention of the Minister of Health.

Mr. HAMBOUR—I accept the Treasurer's statement that a teaching hospital must have a higher daily cost for in-patients, but I cannot accept the position at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, where the cost is £5 5s. 5d. a day and the fourth highest. I think Wallaroo has

the highest cost, then Barmera and then Port Pirie. These hospitals should not have a much greater cost than other Government hospitals and, in particular, Government country hospitals, where the cost is generally between £3 and £3 10s., and an investigation is warranted to see why these particular hospitals—and the others are nearly as bad—should have such high costs. Are they managed by local boards or by remote control? I ask for an investigation into the costs, because they reflect on the money available to other institutions.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—As far as I know, they are all controlled by the local boards. I know that on occasions the appointment of the Port Pirie Hospital Board has come before Cabinet.

Mr. Hambour—They have done it to find the money.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—That may be one reason, but the Government Hospitals are base hospitals and difficult cases are often handed over to them. Also, as base hospitals they must always have surplus accommodation if possible. I would think the Wallaroo figures are high because that hospital keeps a considerable amount of surplus accommodation.

Mr. O'Halloran—And these hospitals have to provide for a certain amount of research.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes. It is necessary to have base hospitals, which must provide more accommodation than would be necessary on the daily average number of patients. I will obtain some facts about these hospitals for the honourable member, whose attitude I appreciate, as he desires to see that the taxpayer gets the best value for his money. It is inevitable, however, that a hospital catering for emergencies will have a somewhat higher daily cost than a hospital taking care only of the local daily requirements.

Mr. KING—Can the Treasurer obtain figures of admissions of aborigines to the Barmera Hospital, which would have a bearing on the daily cost for each patient at the hospital?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The honourable member has just mentioned another reason for the higher rate. I would think that the Government hospitals in the main would have far less recoveries in fees than private hospitals, as a number of people admitted cannot pay anything for treatment.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—The Treasurer said that it is necessary to have a certain number

of beds vacant in base hospitals. When he is making the investigation he promised, will he take into consideration that Wallaroo is a sea port and that there could therefore be justification such as waterfront and road accidents for having emergency accommodation? Probably this may have some bearing on the higher costs mentioned by the member for Light.

Mr. RALSTON—I wish to have clarified the position regarding the salaries of the Chief Radiographer, Radiotherapy Technician and other officers at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Prior to April 1, 1959, the position of Chief Radiographer carried a salary range of £1,611 to £1,776 but since then the range has become £1,315 to £1,490, which means that the highest salary the occupant of the office can now receive is less than the minimum previously fixed. Prior to April 1, 1959, the Chief Radiotherapy Technician had a salary range of £1,391 to £1,556, but the present range is £1,315 to £1,490. A similar reduction seems to have taken place throughout the Hospitals Department regarding these technicians, the radiologists and radiotherapists. Why do these positions carry lower salary rates now than they did previously?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Government does not fix salaries: that is the responsibility of the Public Service Board, which inquires into the various classifications. Possibly some new appointments have been made and the people appointed have been placed on lower classifications because they have been newly appointed. I will obtain an explanation for the member.

Mr. HAMBOUR—I suggest that the trouble with the Wallaroo Hospital is not the impact of patients, but the lack of patients. The member for Chaffey suggested that the Barmera Hospital figure may be higher because it admits aborigines, but that would have no bearing on costs because the more it admitted the lower the cost would be as they would be accountable as admissions and taken into the daily average. The whole matter revolves on the fact that these hospitals have to submit to the central office for their requirements. In each case they have a secretary-manager and the local board acts purely in an advisory capacity and does not pay the same attention to matters as a responsible country board of management would pay to them in a country hospital. I suggest that, if the Government could get a board of management to take over the hospital, the Government should give it a

grant as it does the Children's Hospital. These hospitals are managed by remote control and because of that, when requisitioning for anything, it becomes common for them to ask for twice what is required, and often it is supplied. I suggest that the local board of management should have more say in the management of the hospital and should not be just an advisory council.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I dissociate myself from the remarks of the honourable member for Light that Government hospitals in the country should be turned into subsidized hospitals.

Mr. Hambour—I did not say that, but I should like that.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I do not like that idea and register my protest against the suggestion. I have, for many years, believed that hospitalization in South Australia has been on a completely wrong basis; instead of having fewer Government hospitals we should have more with proper control and management and with proper interchanging of staff. From what I know of Government hospitals generally, the local boards of management take an active interest in running the hospitals and, while it may be said that they have not the power to spend money or recommend the spending of it the same as subsidized hospitals have, I doubt if that is so. Any hospital board wishing to incur expenditure is required to provide an estimate to the Hospitals Department and the expense has to be approved by the department before the hospital becomes eligible for subsidy of that expenditure. There is little or no difference between a subsidized hospital and a Government hospital.

I refer to the salary payable to the Superintendent of Mental Institutions, Dr. Birch. I have spoken of my admiration for this officer during the debates on previous Estimates and I repeat now that anyone who has any understanding of what this officer has done must be filled with admiration for the excellent work he has been responsible for over the years in healing the afflictions of the mentally sick. He has been one of the great men in this field of healing medicine in South Australia and I hope that, when it becomes necessary for him to relinquish his position, there will be someone capable of taking his place.

It is extremely difficult to find out what salary Dr. Birch receives. A sum of £1,964 is provided as salary for him as Superintendent of Mental Institutions (also Northfield Mental Hospital, Enfield Receiving House, also house

provided, and £140 per annum reimbursement of motor car expenses); £1,467 is provided for salary for him as Superintendent of Mental Institutions (also Parkside Mental Hospital and Enfield Receiving House) and £491 is provided for him as Superintendent of Mental Institutions (also Parkside Mental Hospital and Northfield Mental Hospital). I am not suggesting that that is not set out fairly clearly but it would require much less effort if one could see at a glance the total salary received by Dr. Birch. At first glance I thought he was underpaid when I compared his salary at Parkside—shown as £1,964—with that of the Deputy Superintendent—shown as £3,279, but Dr. Birch apparently receives a total salary of £3,922, made up of £1,964 from Parkside, £1,467 from Northfield and £491 from Enfield. He also receives £140 for reimbursement of motor car expenses.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—That is not a salary.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—No. It probably does not recoup him for the cost of running his motor car in connection with his work. I do not suggest that Dr. Birch is overpaid because I am full of admiration for his wonderful work, but it should be possible to set out clearly his total salary. I realize that it is necessary to show the apportionment to the various institutions to illustrate the cost of running those institutions, but it should not be impossible to show, possibly in brackets, in the first line relating to an officer, his total salary.

Line passed.

Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department, £750,797.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I suggest that the board of this department should re-examine the allowances it provides for destitute persons. Apparently when the Commonwealth Government increases social service payments the Welfare Department, in some instances, deducts the amount of that increase from the allowance it pays to a destitute person. For example, an invalid pensioner with a wife and a number of dependent children may receive almost the basic wage, but where a husband is unable to work and is 85 per cent incapacitated he can receive the invalid pension of £4 15s. a week and his wife an allowance of £1 15s. a week, provided she remains at home to look after her invalid husband. They may be living in the lowest form of rental accommodation—a Housing Trust emergency home. If the Commonwealth Government increases the amount payable to this couple by 7s. 6d. the Welfare

Department reduces its allowance by 7s. 6d. Will the Treasurer ascertain from the Welfare Department whether, in such cases, it would consider paying the rent of people on such small incomes?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—This matter, of course, must be considered in association with the amount of assistance given by the Commonwealth Government. I attended the first conference when the Commonwealth Government agreed to take over various social services from the States and said that it would look after them in the future, but it has not looked after them adequately and most States have always provided assistance over and above that provided by the Commonwealth. The Children's Welfare Department is not lacking in looking after these cases. I obtained a report some time ago on one particular case which clearly indicates the manner in which the department considers these matters. In this case the man was granted relief in 1956. He was then an invalid pensioner with a wife and five children. The allowable income, according to the department's scale of relief, was £13 10s., plus £2 contribution for rent—a total of £15 10s. In this instance the department did what the honourable member suggests. As far as I know, the scheme is administered by the department with much sympathy. At one conference in another State, following on a comparison of the amounts paid in South Australia and in other States, it was found that with one exception the amounts paid in South Australia were the highest. Each case is dealt with on its merits and the State has to do the best it can with the money available. In the case I mentioned an allowance of £2 was made.

Mr. BYWATERS—When a person is an inmate of the Yatala Labor Prison his wife and other dependents receive a payment from the Welfare Department in addition to a widows' pension payment to the wife from the Social Services Department. Upon the release of the man the repayment of the money paid by the Welfare Department is demanded, but there is no similar demand by the Social Services Department. This demand for repayment creates a hardship. In his last report, under the heading "Public Relief," the Auditor-General said:—

Public relief includes payments to necessitous persons including widows, deserted wives, guardians, or orphans, and, where necessary, to unemployed or sick persons and their dependents to supplement Commonwealth Social Service payments. Recoveries are made where circumstances permit.

I am doubtful about the meaning of the words "where circumstances permit." Is it the general practice of the Welfare Department to demand repayment of money paid to the wife and dependants whilst the husband was in prison?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—This is a new matter to me. I did not know that there was a request for repayment. I will get a report for the honourable member on how the department handles the matter and what standards are observed.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Last year £193,449 was spent on State public relief. This year the proposed expenditure is £161,250, or a substantial reduction of £32,199. Is it due to complete repayment being demanded when increases are made in Commonwealth social service payments, thus leaving the people concerned no better off than they were previously?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Applications for relief in the last period have been considerably lower than in 1958-59. In addition, taxicab fares payable on behalf of destitute persons attending Government hospitals are being paid by the Hospitals Department. When the amount of the relief is increased following on increased grants from the Commonwealth, the State must carefully consider the matter. Our employment figures this year are significantly better than they were last year, which also has a bearing on the matter.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—In his report under the heading "Acts and Regulations Contravened" the Auditor-General drew attention to the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department's not obtaining the approval of the Minister to enter into a private contract involving expenditure of more than £250, and said that in pursuance of section 37(b) of the Audit Act he was obliged to report the matter to Parliament. Can the Treasurer indicate the details of that Act?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—It is purely an Act governing administration. It sets out a limit for the expenditure of money by authorities without their obtaining the approval of a higher authority. For instance, no Minister will increase expenditure in excess of £1,000 unless the expenditure has been approved by Parliament in the Estimates or the matter has been taken to Cabinet. Ministers give various officers authority to approve the expenditure of small amounts without their getting special approval, and under the Audit Act expenditure of more than £250 must first

be approved by the Minister. In this instance evidently the department entered into a contract involving expenditure of more than £250 without getting the Minister's approval. I do not think that the Auditor-General wanted anyone to infer there was anything improper.

Mr. DUNSTAN—With reference to the case I raised recently involving an alteration to the amount of the Children's Welfare Department grant upon an increase in the Commonwealth pension my calculations are that the individual was getting £4 11s. a week from the department; he was getting £4 7s. 6d. pension, his wife was getting £1 7s. 6d. wife's allowance, and child endowment amounted to £2 5s., making a total of £12 11s. a week. I understand that the amount from the Children's Welfare Department, which was paid fortnightly, was £9 2s. and that 15s. a fortnight was taken off that amount immediately the Commonwealth pension was increased by 7s. 6d. a week. I appreciate that the Treasurer says, "We have to take into account what the Commonwealth is doing," but it appears not that the Commonwealth is substantially increasing the standard and the real value of the pension, but that the recent increase in the pension has been designed merely to keep pace with the loss in real value of the money paid. There is no substantial increase in real value over a period in the invalid pension.

In those circumstances, where an adjustment is made to bring the invalid pension up to a standard comparable with the previous ratio to the basic wage standard, it seems to me a strange practice to deduct exactly that amount from what is given in Children's Welfare Department grants, because it seems that what is being handed to one invalid pensioner who is not getting a Children's Welfare Department grant is nevertheless taken away from an invalid pensioner who is getting such a grant in respect of the children for whom he is getting assistance. As I understand it, the Children's Welfare Department gives relief in cases of pensioners who have children.

What is the basis of these deductions, which have occurred in the case not only of invalid pensioners but of widows? Widows in my district have had the amount of their widow's pension increase deducted when they get Children's Welfare Department grants in respect of children whom they educate, which seems extraordinary.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The department has not altered the basis of its payments. There has been no reduction in the

allowable amounts it makes up; they are the same. If a person earns or receives more from another source, it affects the amount that the department pays. In this case, prior to the recent increase of 7s. 6d. a week in the Commonwealth pension, this person was receiving £4 11s. from the department, whose scale has not been varied following the Commonwealth increase, so that the amount of relief was reduced by an equivalent amount. It will be noted that the present basic wage of £13 11s. and child endowment, for this family, of £2 5s. make a total of £15 16s. So, if this person had actually been working and getting the basic wage and child endowment, he would be getting £15 16s. The scale that the department brings it up to in this case is £15 10s. but, in addition, the person concerned gets other privileges of some monetary value to him. So, it has brought him up to a standard appropriate to the basic wage standard plus child endowment.

**Mr. TAPPING**—Can the Treasurer explain the line "Cottage homes, cottage mother and assistant, £1,250"?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—We are starting rather a different type of home for some of the children committed to us. Instead of having institutional homes we propose cottage homes. This is the commencement of that plan. I do not think the positions have yet been filled and I am not sure that the building is yet ready. One or two church institutions have been doing this type of work, which is rather impressive. Instead of having one big institution for all the children, there is a cottage home with usually a married couple in charge of it. They give the children what is much more like a normal home environment. In addition to that, we have made a slight diversion in children's welfare, in that we have offered to assist the church institutions that have a number of children in their care who would normally be under our charge if those institutions did not look after them. If those children are committed, we are arranging for them to be formally committed without any difficulty, and then we pay what we would pay to a foster mother for their maintenance at the institution concerned. I think this will be of some assistance.

**Mr. RYAN**—I am confused about the Treasurer's answers first to the Leader and then to the members for Edwardstown (Mr. Frank Walsh) and Norwood (Mr. Dunstan). I do not dispute the Treasurer's facts, but the confusion arises in this way: the amount paid by the

Welfare Department is brought to a certain standard, but I am led to believe that the amounts payable proportionately have been shifted from the State to the Commonwealth owing to the recent increase of 7s. 6d. a week in the Commonwealth pension rate. The amount received by the individual remains the same. Will the Government consider increasing the basic rate of the State department grant so that the recipient can then receive 7s. 6d. a week more than allowed by the Commonwealth?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—A big majority of pensioners receiving the additional 7s. 6d. a week from the Commonwealth are not eligible to receive any assistance from the State, so they are unaffected by the line now being discussed. However, some people because of their particular circumstances are getting assistance from the State on the ground of hardship. Some Commonwealth pensioners, particularly those with families, get additional assistance from the State in the form of a relief grant. There are three classes involved—some get Commonwealth assistance and no State assistance; some get Commonwealth pensions and some State assistance; and some get State assistance but are not eligible for any form of Commonwealth pension. The Welfare Department decides what the standard should be in the appropriate circumstances and provides relief accordingly. Whether the amount is increased would depend on economic factors and a number of other things. It is not determined by what the Commonwealth gives, nor should it be, because in many instances it provides a totally inadequate amount. The position is considered on the economic circumstances.

**Mr. Ryan**—Will you alter it because of the economic circumstances ruling today?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—There are many fewer requests for assistance today than at this time last year. The department is very humane and is doing an extremely good job. I assure honourable members that this would be the last line that I should desire to cut unwarrantedly.

**Mr. DUNSTAN**—In the case I mentioned, the Treasurer said that the amount to which the department is making this family's income up is £15 10s. a week, and that the amount the department pays is £4 11s. a week. If it is paying £4 11s. a week I am at a loss to understand how the income could reach £15 10s.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The statement supplied to me by the department shows that the amount is made up as

follows:—Invalid pension, £6 15s. a week; wife's allowance, £2 6s. 6d.; child endowment, £2 5s. and relief from the State Government, £4 3s. 6d. The standard the department has fixed for this type of family is £13 10s., plus a rent of £2, making a total of £15 10s.

Mr. DUNSTAN—I will get the figures from the Social Services Department because those given by the Treasurer are quite unlike those provided by the gentleman concerned. It seems that there is an extraordinary procedure adopted in the recovery of public relief payments. The Treasurer said that the Welfare Department was humane. Frankly, because of some of its actions in regard to recovery, I do not think it is humane, nor do some of its officers. This sort of thing happens. A wife has an order for maintenance and the husband defaults on the order so she must go on public relief for a while. The husband is then made to pay a certain amount off the arrears, which is usually £1 a week or even 10s., and has to start his maintenance payments over again. Anyone who knows anything about the payments ordered in the Maintenance Court will know that the amount a wife and children will get is not very great, but when the maintenance recommences the department proceeds to deduct week by week from the amount of the maintenance being paid the amount of relief that has been paid to the wife in the interim. In many instances there are considerable hardships to the wife, arising from the action of the department. In the most recent year the department has been much tougher on this kind of thing than ever before, according to its officers. I draw attention to the following comment in the Auditor-General's report under the heading of "Payments to necessitous persons":—

Payments on account of the relief of persons in necessitous circumstances fell by £52,000 to £221,000, and recoveries increased by £7,000 to £12,000.

That has been due to a change in the attitude of the department to make recoveries tougher. In recent months people have come to me in dire distress and unable to make ends meet, and I have told them to go to the department for relief, but they have said that the department will demand repayment and that they will not be able to make it. Many members, like myself, have had to help constituents by giving them money out of their own pockets. This is not a proper attitude by the department and, if the Treasurer inquires, I dare say officers of the department will be as frank with him as they have been with me about the

department's attitude towards recoveries. I think it is scandalous that it should be as tough as it is towards people in dire distress. If the Treasurer is not aware that recoveries are being made, I ask that an investigation be made into this matter, as I think the present situation is most unsatisfactory.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I would be quite happy to make the investigation suggested and to obtain the information requested by the honourable member, as I am confident that, perhaps, one case would not represent the policy of the department.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—An invalid pensioner receives only £4 10s. a week and his wife 30s.—a total of £6, which is a small amount. Could this matter be investigated?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will have that investigated too.

Line passed.

Department of Public Health, £224,268.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—For school health services, £45,817 is provided. I am concerned about the provision of dentists under this service, as I have had complaints that a number of schools have not seen a school dentist in years. Is that due to a shortage of dentists and, if so, why is it that an attempt is not made to fill the gap? Associated with this question is whether any dental assistance is provided for independent or private schools. I understand that this service is provided in most other States.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—We are very short of dentists. We have not been able to secure them either from overseas or from other States, and the number coming through the University has been small. Last year I think only three presented themselves for the final examination, so the numbers have been significantly bad from the point of view of maintaining a service to the public. The Dentists' Association is concerned about this and this year will try to ensure that the necessary numbers enter the course, which is a long and hard one and, for some reason or other, is not attractive. A second matter that has probably caused the Leader's complaint arises from an alteration in policy. For many years the school dental service was purely and simply an inspection service, the dentists merely going into the schools, looking at the children's teeth and giving a note to be taken to the parents setting out what was required, which the parents, if they saw fit, took notice of.



Mr. O'Halloran—It was not easy when there were no local dentists.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—That is the point I am coming to. Many places in the country, particularly the outback areas, have no local dentists.

Mr. Quirke—You do not have to go far outback, either.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—That is so. The Government has established a travelling caravan service that actually gives treatment in outback areas where no dentists are available but, of course, it has the corresponding disadvantage that the dentists cannot carry out so many inspections. I assure the Leader that the Government is anxious to fill the vacancies. It has tried overseas and in other States to fill them and has had a number of conferences with the dental authorities, but this service is six dentists short. I believe the association in this State realizes the necessity for some special action to be taken.

Line passed.

Public Service Commissioner's Department, £73,291—passed.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

Miscellaneous, £2,283,237.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—An item under this heading relates to the Ashford Community Hospital. I understand that the Government provides two-thirds to every one-third of cost provided by the hospital. One patient I know was in a community hospital for 15 weeks and his family was then asked to find other accommodation for him. I do not know whether that was because that community hospital did not have the facilities necessary to deal with his particular type of complaint, but I believe the patient had a stroke and further medical attention was necessary. Another community hospital was willing to admit that patient. As the Government provides assistance towards the capital cost of the hospital and its additions, patients should be admitted to such hospitals provided they can pay the charge involved. Once a patient is admitted to a community hospital subsidized by the Government and he can pay for the service he should be entitled to remain there. The necessary hospitalization should be the responsibility of the hospital and there should be no need to transfer a patient to another community hospital. There should be no limitation of this kind on hospital patients.

Mr. LAUCKE—A sum of £10,000 has been voted as a special grant for country ambulance services. That amount was voted and spent last year so I would have expected that there should be some variation in the amount granted. There is probably some formula under which the amount is allocated and I ask whether this would indicate whether the £10,000 allocated last year was insufficient to meet all the requirements under that formula.

Mr. KING—I note that £5,500 has been voted for the Resthaven home for the aged at Leabrook. No amount for this institution appeared in last year's Estimates and I ask the Treasurer for what purpose the amount is voted and is it all that will be required.

Mr. HUTCHENS—As a member of a community hospital board, I understand that under the Commonwealth agreement certain community hospitals are approved if they can prove they are general hospitals and do not carry a predominance of pensioners covered by social services. I understand that when such patients are carried more than 13 weeks, that hospital is not considered an approved hospital in regard to them and the Commonwealth grant is withdrawn. Is that the position?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Community hospitals do not get an annual subsidy from the Government. They are non-profit making and the Government at the outset made a grant to them of 50 per cent of their establishment costs. More recently the policy was liberalized and a grant of £2 for £1 was made for their establishment costs, but the Government does not run the hospitals and is not responsible for their management. They are run by a local authority—usually a board or a committee appointed locally—and they are eligible under the Commonwealth hospitals scheme for payments.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Provided they are general hospitals.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes, but we do not run them or subsidize their annual working costs: we give them a grant for their establishment. As I said, that grant was on a 50/50 basis, but more recently it has been liberalized in respect of further establishment costs incurred and the Government is giving a £2 for £1 grant. That liberalized grant is not given to church hospitals which still receive grants on a 50/50 basis.

Replying to the member for Barossa, in addition to the grant to the St. John Ambulance—some of which is available to the country—we also made the Society a grant of

£10,000 a year, which is earmarked for the country as additional assistance to country ambulance services and for the purpose of establishing such services. The Government does not undertake the distribution of that amount. The St. John Ambulance Brigade receives a total of £40,000 annually.

With reference to the subsidy to Resthaven, I point out that when many old folks' homes were experiencing difficulty in becoming established the Government recommended and Parliament agreed that a pound for pound subsidy on capital cost should be paid to these institutions. The State Parliament was the first to provide such a subsidy and in the first year the grants totalled about £300,000. This was of great assistance in the establishment of old folks' homes; so much so that the Commonwealth announced that it would provide a similar subsidy. It did so and more lately increased the subsidy to £2 for £1. However, the Commonwealth will not subsidize anything in the nature of an infirmary or hospital at an old folks' home. The State Government does not now subsidize the establishment of purely old folks' homes, as they are being subsidized by the Commonwealth, but it provides for subsidies for hospital services at old folks' homes. I took great exception to the remarks of a clerical gentleman at an official opening at Resthaven on Sunday when he pointed out that the State Government was only giving £5,500. The position is that the Government has been most liberal to old folks' homes. It introduced the scheme that has now become Australia-wide and in the first year it made a total grant of almost £300,000. I greatly regret that at an official opening of an old folks' home a comment should be made to the disparagement of this Parliament which, in point of fact, established the whole system of subsidizing such homes and I do not mind if my remarks are referred to the reverend gentleman because they will reveal to him that I have some knowledge of this particular topic. The amounts the Government now provide for old folks' homes are to cover those activities that do not qualify for the Commonwealth subsidy.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I join with the Treasurer in his remarks about the assistance this Parliament has given to the establishment of old folks' homes, but I point out that before the Government took a hand in the matter and asked Parliament to vote money for this purpose I moved a comprehensive motion in this House in favour of it, but at the time the Treasurer and his supporters amended the motion so

that it did not mean very much. However, I was pleased that the seed had fallen on fertile ground and not among the tares or the rocks or by the wayside or that it had been eaten up by the fowls of the air and that shortly afterwards the Government adopted this desirable subsidy proposal.

An amount of £40,000 is provided for ambulance services under an agreement with the St. John Ambulance Brigade. I am pleased that under that agreement the St. John Ambulance Brigade has been able to co-ordinate ambulance services in the metropolitan area and also extend assistance to services in country districts. In most country districts there are efficient ambulance services, some of the cost of which has been provided by local people who are quite happy to know that the provision of such services has been placed on a firm basis. I understand from officers of the St. John Ambulance Brigade that in the near future all country areas that warrant ambulance services will be provided with them under this agreement. Some of the men employed by the brigade are paid. We cannot have a staff of drivers available for duty 24 hours a day unless we provide for their livelihood, but the great work of charity in succouring those who are injured is still carried out by men of the brigade without fee or reward, and I pay a tribute to them because they are entitled to encouragement.

Amounts of £18,900 and £58,500 are provided for pensioners' rail fares and for pensioners' bus fares respectively. I understand that is in accordance with an arrangement made at the request of the two pensioners' associations recently. It was arranged that the Government should provide fares at half rates for pensioners travelling during off-peak periods. I have been informed by both associations that they are most appreciative of what has been done for them. There are, however, still pensioners in small groups in parts of the metropolitan area which are served only by private buses. Up to the present there have not been the same concessions to these pensioners as to pensioners in areas where there is public transport. They should receive the same consideration as the others. I understand that the association of private bus owners is sympathetic towards these people and would be pleased to make an agreement on the matter. I intended to raise this subject earlier but decided to await the implementation of the main scheme. I do not ask for immediate action but that the

Government should give sympathetic consideration to the people I have mentioned.

Mr. JENKINS—It is proposed to spend £5,410 on the Strathalbyn and District Hospital. Can the Treasurer say whether it is to be spent on new staff quarters?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The amount is provided for nurses' quarters. Earlier I did not answer fully the question raised about the grant of £5,500 to Resthaven Home for the Aged. This is a subsidy towards the cost of furnishings at the institution. The Commonwealth Government subsidized the building. Policy is involved in the matter raised by the Leader of the Opposition and I would not like to commit the Government at this stage, but I will have the matter examined.

Mr. RYAN—Can the Treasurer indicate which formula was used in arriving at the amount to cover concession fares to pensioners? Will a record be kept during the next 12 months to show how much money has been spent in this way?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The economist at the Treasury, who is associated with the Tramways Trust, took up the matter with tramway and railway officers in order to arrive at an estimate of the number of people who would travel at concession rates and the amount of money to be spent. The estimate arrived at has been accepted by the parties concerned. Perhaps it is not so generous for the railways as for the tramways, but the amount will be sufficient to meet all claims made for concession fares.

Mr. KING—It is proposed to spend £60,000 as a special subsidy to the Berri Hospital. I thank the Treasurer and the Minister of Health for the consideration given to the Berri District Council and the hospital committee in this matter. The increase in the subsidy to £2 for £1 made the position easier. I do not agree with the view expressed by the Leader of the Opposition that we should have all Government hospitals. If we did, it would take away the interest of local people in their own institutions. In the granting of this £2 for £1 we are getting much closer to the responsibility being accepted by the Government, whilst the direction of the service is left in the hands of people who require the service and who are ready to work for their own institution. It was said that improved services would follow if we had Government hospitals. The staffs of the subsidized hospi-

tals are jealous of their reputation. There is a difference between a Government hospital and a subsidized hospital. The subsidized institutions are a complete form of decentralization whereas Government hospitals are necessarily centralized. The subsidized hospitals submit their requests to the Hospitals Department for approval. They know what is best for their own areas.

Mr. Bywaters—There is another difference, that in Government hospitals pensioners are admitted free, but not in subsidized hospitals.

Mr. KING—That is not so. One of the conditions of the subsidy is that they take indigent cases.

Mr. Bywaters—The honourable member should read what the Treasurer said last week about indigent cases.

Mr. KING—I can speak only for my district. There is a great incentive for local people to work for their own hospitals where they are subsidized. In the case of Berri, last year the local committee raised £4,000 as a contribution towards the building of their hospital—without any Sunday function to raise that money. This year we had a citrus festival raising another £4,000 for another project. Again, in Barmera, there was a successful spring festival that raised £2,000 in two or three months. So, where the interest is, the people will work together to raise funds but, if it was completely State-controlled, they would say, "Let the Government do it." I pay my tribute to the Treasurer in making available the subsidy.

Mr. COUMBE—The Adelaide Children's Hospital is being granted a sum of £607,800 for its running expenses and towards the capital expenditure on expansion. The hospital is doing a magnificent job. "Adelaide" is a misnomer because the hospital caters for the whole of South Australia, even though it is situated in Adelaide. I pay a tribute to the work of that board and its efficient administration. It is a large hospital with moderate fees. In many indigent cases it remits much of the fees to those who cannot afford them. It caters splendidly for children in a special way. It has the services of a great many honoraries, who specialize in various phases of medical work concerning children's complaints. At the moment the hospital has an ambitious plan of expansion, forced upon it by the increase in our population. It is hoped that, when the building programme is under way and its equipment is introduced, it will be one of

the most modern hospitals in Australia, in its medicinal treatment, its surgery, and other respects. In addition, it will continue to be a teaching hospital for those concerned with children's complaints. The board has commenced one of the largest public appeals in this State, running into millions of pounds, in which it seeks our co-operation. It will have a ready response. Which of these amounts on the Estimates go towards the new expansion of the hospital? Do any come within the ambit of the £2 to £1 subsidy the Government has promised for this type of work?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The first grant of £482,000 is towards management costs, as in previous years. The second grant, £13,000 (towards services block), is towards the cost of the new services block. The other ones are set out quite clearly and do not require any special explanation. I do not think the Children's Hospital has started yet on its buildings, the cost of which will be subsidized on a £2 to £1 basis.

Mr. HEASLIP—I pay a tribute to the hospital committees and boards carrying on country hospitals and making it possible for them to function as they do. The system of a £2 to £1 subsidy by the Government is wise and cheap, for thereby we get the co-operation of the local people, which results in efficient management. As regards the Booleroo Centre Hospital, is the grant of £8,893 for the extension of the hospital itself? Also, is the grant of £2,740, in respect of the Orreroo Hospital, for the new wing?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Regarding the Booleroo Centre Hospital, the subsidy towards the balance of the extensions is £3,700; installation of gas for obstetric theatre, demolition of wall, and the installation of the covered way, £193; and nurses' quarters, £5,000. As regards the Orreroo Hospital, the subsidy towards the cost of additions to nurses' quarters is £2,500; rebuilding of underground tank, £240.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—The member for Chaffey (Mr. King) said he was most grateful that £60,000 was being provided by the Government towards structural work at the Berri hospital. If I were the member for Chaffey I should be most grateful too, more particularly in view of the fact that only a few miles away there is a Government hospital which can be used to handle quite a number of patients and thereby place the newly erected Berri Hospital in a very good position. He said that these subsidized hospitals brought about

the decentralization of industry and population. If they did that we should have much more decentralization than we have today. Government hospitals are fairly widely dispersed. There are two in the metropolitan area, namely, the Royal Adelaide and the Queen Elizabeth Hospitals and six in the country, namely, at Mount Gambier, Barmera, Wallaroo, Port Augusta, Port Lincoln and Port Pirie. At Peterborough we had to establish the hospital on a pound for pound subsidy and that was in bad times when many difficulties arose. The same position obtained at Quorn and Hawker, both in my electorate. These hospitals, which have been established for some years, are fine institutions but they cannot participate in the newly devised benevolence of the Government.

Mr. King—But they can for additions.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—There is no need to build additions because, unfortunately, owing to the Government's policy, the population is leaving most of these areas. The question of annual maintenance comes into it. The member for Murray said that pensioners have to pay in subsidized hospitals. As I understand the position, it is suggested that pensioners should be charged 10s. a day, but if they can show that this would result in undue hardship then at the discretion of the board they can get free treatment or treatment for a lesser fee; but if they have property I find that with most subsidized hospitals the position is that whereas they are not charged the full amount, and in some instances may be granted free treatment, the amount is debited against their name and if they die and leave a house a claim is made against that property, so the hospital is fully reimbursed. Mr. King in the course of his remarks implied a criticism of those who are members of hospital boards.

Mr. King—I did not mention it.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—There was the implied criticism that boards of subsidized hospitals were more concerned with the efficient running of their hospitals than the boards of Government hospitals. Have we reached the stage where the only spur to decent community effort is responsibility? I do not think we have. The men and women who form the boards of Government hospitals render a very excellent service, not only to the hospital, but to the community, and I resent any suggestion that would pit their services against those rendered by members of boards of subsidized hospitals. I agree that those who are on the boards of subsidized hospitals render a great service too.

I believe that the hospitals should be run by the Government. Public health is the responsibility of all the people and not necessarily the few unfortunate people who may become ill. Some people go from the cradle to the grave without illness, but cheerfully contribute towards the cost of an institution to help the less fortunate citizens who suffer from ill-health. I visualize a series of Government hospitals strategically placed throughout the country which would be able to give efficient service and attract more medical practitioners than the smaller hospitals can attract today, and then we would have the smaller institutions to deal with the minor illnesses and accidents and act as clearing houses for the Government hospitals. That is my idea of what should prevail and one day it will be given effect to.

Mr. HAMBOUR—The honourable member knows that I cannot accept his views on hospitals. I believe that the Government is moving in the right direction and has gone a little further this year by providing an additional £8,000 for subsidized hospitals. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that all supporters of hospitals do magnificent work, which is appreciated by the community, but certain communities have to extend themselves to a greater effort because they do not get a maintenance subsidy. I want the Government to reconsider its present policy of not giving maintenance grants to community hospitals and non-profit-making hospitals. I do not know what classification Whyalla Hospital is in. It gets a maintenance subsidy of £14,000, although it is not a subsidized hospital or a Government hospital. I am not suggesting that that is not a good thing. It is an effort to help the Whyalla people to establish a hospital to meet their requirements, but there are instances where the people have to find all the money and consequently the charges are high to enable the hospitals to keep solvent. The question of whether pensioner patients have to pay or not does not come within the ambit of Parliament. The hospitals have to manage their finances, and if a patient dies and leaves an estate why should not the hospital get the fees owing from the estate? Will the Government consider giving maintenance grants to community and non-profitmaking hospitals?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—These hospitals are not under any obligation to treat indigent patients and have the right to charge full fees to their patients. They are mainly working quite well at a profit: as a matter of fact, I do not know of one

making a loss. There is no need for the question of subsidies to arise for community hospitals or non-profit hospitals. They have always been treated well as regards equipment and payment for pensioners and, in some cases, although approval for a £1 for £1 subsidy was given a long time ago, we extended the £2 for £1 subsidy to them although we were not under any obligation to do so. They are not obliged to treat indigent cases, as they are mainly operating in areas where there are Government hospitals for these people.

Mr. JENKINS—I pay a tribute to Dr. Rieger and his board, and to the 71 auxiliaries that work so diligently for the welfare of the Adelaide Children's Hospital. As the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) said, the name is a misnomer and causes some people to believe that this hospital serves only the people in the metropolitan area, whereas it caters for children from all over the State. Often children are sent there from other hospitals that have not been capable of treating them. There is a move to alter the name in an effort to dispel that fallacy. At a conference of auxiliaries held in September it was unanimously agreed that Dr. Reiger would approach subscribers regarding the alteration of the name to "Royal Children's Hospital of South Australia." This would probably help in raising funds from country areas. Members of the auxiliaries have often come up against people who think the hospital takes only city children. I believe 263 children came from Port Pirie, 65 or 85 from Naracoorte, and 16 from my own town last year, and in many cases these children have gone back two or three times in the year. I also pay a tribute to the Public Relations Officer (Mr. Don Dyer), a hard worker who has been of great assistance to the board and the members of the auxiliary.

Mr. CLARK—An amount of £1,000 is provided for a training centre for guide dogs for the blind. I have heard a great deal about this work, and I am glad to see this amount has been provided. Can the Treasurer give additional information on this?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—This amount is for a training centre that will be established in Victoria. Previously there was a centre in Western Australia, but as that State has some prohibition against Alsatian dogs—one of the best breeds for this work—and as it is somewhat remote from the bigger centres of population, it was decided to shift the centre to Victoria. The Victorian Government made a generous grant of land and the other

States are all making some contributions towards the establishment of the centre. These dogs become attached to a person, they are extremely efficient and, in fact, they become almost a second sight for the person concerned. When the Government was requested to start a fund here, I agreed to put £1,000 on the Estimates. I think it is well warranted and that it will result in giving much comfort to many afflicted people.

Mr. HAMBOUR—I am afraid I cannot accept the Treasurer's explanation that all community hospitals are doing well. One in my district has a revenue of only £6,000 a year, it is 19 miles from the nearest Government subsidized hospital, and it certainly is not a public hospital. This hospital has to treat indigent patients, as it is not so callous as to send them off. The Treasurer said the financial positions of these hospitals was quite good. However, despite the fact that last year donations amounted to £796, of which £286 came from the Government—for which I thank it—the overdraft increased from £393 to £1,191. For no reason other than that the Government will not pay maintenance subsidies for other than subsidized hospitals, this hospital has been left out of the Estimates, yet other hospitals get a maintenance subsidy. Why is one paid to Whyalla hospital?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—There appears to be some confusion in the names of hospitals. As far as I know, the community hospitals are all established in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Hambour—There is one at Strathalbyn, one at Hamley Bridge, and there was one at Freeling.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I am not speaking of district or public hospitals. The first community hospital was established on LeFevre Peninsula, another at Glenelg, and a number have been established in the metropolitan area. These were established with a half grant by the Government, and they have always been grouped as community hospitals. The hospitals the honourable member mentioned are those that have been established in country districts, in the main without Government assistance.

Mr. Hambour—No, in the main with Government assistance, pound for pound.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I beg to differ; in the main, they have been established without Government assistance. The Whyalla Hospital was established as a

district hospital but, as Whyalla is a big industrial town, it was obvious that it could not be maintained without Government assistance. If the honourable member tells me what hospital he is talking about I may be able to give him some information.

Mr. Hambour—You know the hospital—Hamley Bridge.

Mr. LOVEDAY—For the Ceduna Flying Doctor Service, £1,000 is provided, and for the Flying Doctor Service of Australia (S.A. section), £3,000 is provided. I wish to refer to the small increase in the amount to be paid to the Ceduna service. I am pleased that the amount has been increased by £250 to make the total grant £1,000, but I draw attention to the fact that the Flying Doctor Services of Australia (S.A. section) has received an increase of £2,000 to take the amount voted for it from £1,000 to £3,000. I do not cavil at that because both these services do a wonderful job and both operate in my electorate, but the amount provided for the Flying Doctor Service at Ceduna seems to be out of all proportion to that provided for the other service bearing in mind the respective work the two services do.

I previously drew attention to the fact that the Flying Doctor Service at Ceduna operated over an area of country similar to that operated over by the Royal Flying Doctor Service and it served about the same number of people. The Ceduna service serves hospitals at Cook and Tarcoola, and the people generally on the East-West line. It also helps Coober Pedy and the fishing fleet operating off Eyre Peninsula. The School of the Air is operated from Ceduna and the pilots in the area and the sisters in the hospitals and others associated with the service do so at tremendous sacrifice and do not receive the same reward for their services as they would receive if employed in other services. I ask whether this matter could be viewed in a different light. The Royal Flying Doctor Service receives financial assistance of about £5,000 a year from the Commonwealth Government, whereas the Ceduna service receives nothing from the Commonwealth. I suggest that the South Australian Government approach the Commonwealth Government to see that the Ceduna service gets its share of Commonwealth money. A press report dated September 26, 1958, stated that, notwithstanding the assistance given by the Commonwealth Government for 1957, the expenditure of the Royal Flying Doctor Service, totalling £23,000, exceeded

its income by £1,793. If, with all that assistance, that service is running at a loss it shows under what stress the Ceduna service, which receives nothing from the Commonwealth Government and a very small grant from the State Government—at that time £750—must be operating. The Ceduna service saves the State Government a tremendous amount of money in providing this service.

Mr. HUTCHENS—The amount voted for "Meals on Wheels"—£3,000—represents an increase of £2,000 on the amount voted in the previous year's Estimates. If it had not been for the work of "Meals on Wheels," our hospitals would have been packed to a greater extent than they are today. The increased amount is an indication of the Government's appreciation of the work done by the people associated with "Meals on Wheels" and, representing a district such as mine, I am in a position to appreciate that service. I pay a tribute to the sponsor, Miss Doris Taylor, and to the people who have rallied around. They range from professional people to pensioners, and their efforts have resulted in comfort to the recipients of the meals and also to their relatives and families. This organization will spread to other major towns in South Australia and will save the State much more than any other grant that could possibly be made.

Mr. BYWATERS—I should not like it thought that I was opposed to subsidized hospitals, because I have the utmost respect for these hospitals. I have worked with them and also with a cottage hospital which, because of its importance, has grown. I refer to the Lower Murray District Hospital. During the last year people associated with that hospital have raised about £10,000 towards the building of a new hospital and quite an effort will be required to raise the balance as hospitals of that type today cost from £70,000 to £80,000. Great respect must be paid to people who make many sacrifices in building such hospitals. Most Government-subsidized hospitals are announcing that in future they will set a certain amount as a fixed charge for pensioner patients, and I do not blame them for that because they must break even; but that practice creates anomalies between city people and country people. City pensioner patients are given free hospital treatment, whereas country people have to pay. One hospital in my district has announced that it will not charge less than £2 6s. a day for pensioners. Although pensioners can arrange for insurance

to meet portion of this charge there is still an anomaly between subsidized hospitals and Government hospitals. I know that in some instances concessions are made to some pensioners because of their circumstances, but the anomaly still exists that in purely Government hospitals they receive free treatment, whereas in subsidized hospitals they are charged.

Mr. HALL—I point out that the Hamley Bridge Hospital, although not in my electorate, treats many of my constituents who are also irate because the hospital does not receive any council or Government help.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I am not conversant with the position of the Hamley Bridge Hospital and I do not know why an amount has been excluded this year, but I will ascertain the reason for its exclusion. If the member for Whyalla examines the various lines he will see that quite apart from the amount provided for the Flying Doctor Service a number of subsidies is provided in one way or another for the medical services in that particular area.

Mr. Loveday—For hospitals?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Some are only depots for the Flying Doctor Service. A flying doctor service is not required where there is a hospital.

Mr. Loveday—The flying doctor has to visit those hospitals.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Quite a substantial amount is provided for these various organizations. Sometimes the grant is paid to the district hospital and sometimes to committees. I point out that we have a special obligation to the Royal Flying Doctor Service which provides an extensive and regular service to Radium Hill where, because it is a mining centre, accidents frequently occur. I am not familiar with the Commonwealth grant of £5,000 mentioned by the honourable member, but I assume it relates to the whole of the Northern Territory.

Mr. Loveday—No, it is for the South Australian section only.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Commonwealth grant is made without any consultation with the State, but I will check on it. I point out that all of these grants are made only after a careful investigation of all aspects of the matter.

Mr. LAUCKE—I am grateful that the Treasurer will examine the position of grants to the Hamley Bridge Hospital which receives no

council payments, being located on the extremities of the Mudla Wirra and Riverton council districts. It serves many of my constituents and it is disturbing that no grant is provided for it this year.

Mr. McKEE—Grants are provided for many organizations including the Boy Scouts and Girl Guides, but no grant is proposed for either the Y.M.C.A. or the Y.W.C.A., which perform a wonderful service in providing physical training and organized sport for the youth of various cities and towns and which play a prominent part in combating juvenile delinquency. Will the Treasurer consider giving financial assistance to these organizations?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will have that examined. This question has been raised on a number of occasions, but I believe there has been some difficulty concerning the religious activities of these organizations. Where a religious activity is directly associated with an organization it has not been the Government's policy to contribute towards that activity. The honourable member will notice that the amount provided for the Salvation Army is for a specific work and not for the work of the Salvation Army as a whole.

Mr. LOVEDAY—I draw the Treasurer's attention to the fact that in 1957 I pointed out that the Commonwealth subsidy for the Royal Flying Doctor Service was £3,268 and its subsidy on account of capital expenditure £2,003. In 1958 it received subsidies totalling over £4,800. I do not quarrel with the Government's responsibility in assisting this service in view of its activities at Radium Hill, but the hospitals on the East-West line are also doing a great service for the Commonwealth Government in respect of its employees there. The State has a good case to get some assistance for the Flying Doctor Service of Ceduna because the hospitals are based on the East-West line. The Treasurer pointed out that money is provided for the Cook Hospital towards maintenance, for the LeHunte District Council and the Murat Bay District Council towards the maintenance of hospital services, for the Penong Memorial Hospital towards provision of medical attendance, and for the Tarcoola District Hospital towards nursing assistance. This is a matter that needs to be considered because I am satisfied that the Commonwealth Government has a responsibility to assist the Flying Doctor Service at Ceduna.

Mr. Quirke—Who would do the work if the service were not available?

Mr. LOVEDAY—I do not know. The pilots and the sisters receive salaries of only about half what they could get elsewhere. The pilots service their own machines, and always two machines are ready for use with a third in reserve. More consideration is deserved than has been received in the past. Mr. Hambour was under a misapprehension when he said that the maintenance grant to the Whyalla Hospital was too large. This hospital was built with most of the money coming from the Broken Hill Proprietary Company and people in the town, with some assistance from the State Government. There is an increase of £3,500 in the maintenance grant for the hospital, but this year the maintenance cost will increase by more than £6,000, £4,000 of which will be for increased electricity charges, so the increase in the grant will not meet the additional money required this year for hospital maintenance.

Line passed.

ATTORNEY-GENERAL.

Office of Minister, £35,595—passed.

Registrar of Companies Office, £13,262.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Has the Government reached any conclusion about the amendments to the Companies Act that have been mentioned from time to time by the Attorney-General? I understand there are weaknesses in the legislation dealing with companies that require correction. The Registrar of Companies and his staff should be able to provide the necessary protection for the public.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—There have been conferences between the States in relation to uniform company legislation and considerable agreement has been reached, but there is one outstanding matter in which South Australia is out of line with the other States. It concerns the establishment of private companies. In this State a large number have been established without any disability to the community, but in the other States they are not permitted. I can see no objection to their establishment. In fact, I believe they are a convenient way for people to arrange their affairs, and so long as it is clear that they are private companies I can see nothing wrong with them. Uniform company legislation will not be ready for consideration this session: I hope it will be ready next year.

Line passed.



Crown Solicitor's Department, £39,774; Parliamentary Draftsman's Department, £6,873; Public Trustee's Department, £90,726—passed.

Supreme Court Department, £87,489.

Mr. DUNSTAN—As matters stand in our Supreme Court at present it is almost impossible to get urgent business done with sufficient despatch to do justice to the community. The position has been aggravated by the activities of the Stuart Royal Commission, but in ordinary circumstances when a case gets into the civil list of the Supreme Court about 18 months to two years elapse before it is heard, and the position is not improving. It is true that as the list is gone through a number of matters are settled and from time to time judges are suddenly left without business for a particular day, but the fact is that the average citizen cannot get a major case heard with despatch. It is not because the judges are slow, and I offer no criticism of the way in which the judges do their work. In fact, I think they are grossly overworked at present and we ought to have more judges in order to cope with the volume of work now in the Supreme Court. I do not think there is a solicitor who has not had matters in the list for up to 18 months. I have, and I believe the member for Mitcham and his firm have had matters on the list for many months waiting to be heard. As an example, I know of a case that would take a court only 20 minutes to deal with. It is a matter in the defended divorce jurisdiction, but it will become undefended at the trial. It was referred into Court from Chambers last December, but it has not yet been heard although it is urgent. It does not seem that it will be heard this year. Several cases likely to take three or four days have been in the list for two years.

That means that we need more people to do the work. We ought not merely to replace the able judge whose death we all lament (Mr. Justice Piper) and the judge who is shortly to retire (Mr. Justice Abbott), but to have at least one more permanent judge. I am amazed that no action has been taken before by the Government to remedy the position. It is well known that the Court has been grossly overworked, and the judges themselves with the enormous burden of work on their shoulders have been in difficulties with their health. I have little doubt that some judges who have been ill have been so because of the

present burden of work placed upon them at the Supreme Court.

Mr. Quirke—Can the court accommodate more judges?

Mr. DUNSTAN—We could make court accommodation available, if necessary. Not every court-room is used every day. For instance, the overflow could be taken in the Industrial Court, which is not used every day. More accommodation is being provided at the moment in the court facilities being built. As things stand, there is room for two extra judges to sit.

There is urgent need for an amendment to the Supreme Court Act because it is likely that the uniform Divorce Bill will be passed shortly. The Treasurer, as acting Attorney-General, will have been informed of the effect of the passing of that Bill upon the Supreme Court. If it passes without our Supreme Court Act being amended and without the Masters, in effect, being made part of the Court, those matters ancillary to divorce applications that are now dealt with quickly by the Masters must go to the judges. It will be an extraordinary situation if our judges deal with every petty maintenance application that comes along. Indeed, it is consuming unnecessarily of the court's time now to have the judges sitting on the number of undefended divorce cases that they do.

The English practice has been to appoint commissioners in divorce, who sit on undefended divorce cases and can deal with them with dispatch, without holding up the court's business. If the judges have to deal with all sorts of interlocutory applications and every application for maintenance in the courts, it will become almost impossible for the court as now constituted to work. Therefore, we must get through here some amendment that will make the Masters part of the court so that they may continue to deal with the applications with which they are able to deal at the moment. So, during this session we must amend the Supreme Court Act because if, as the prophets have it, the Divorce Bill goes through in the Federal Parliament this session, we shall probably be caught napping, and constitutionally it will be difficult for us to amend the Supreme Court Act thereafter.

The Treasurer may know that Dr. Wynes dealt with precisely the situation that might arise at this time in his work on the Constitution, for which he was awarded his doctorate, and attention has been drawn to this matter

in recent issues of the *Australian Law Journal*. I hope the Treasurer will see that an amendment is brought forward this session.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The few matters mentioned by the honourable member, as I realize he knows, are closely associated. We have had some difficulty because of the untimely death of one of our respected judges and through others being taken away from their normal work, which is placing a heavy strain on the Bench now. Those matters are being considered. I hope it will be possible to take appropriate action in this connection and remedy the position quickly.

On the second matter, the solution is not easy. We can make no amendment in this House to produce the effect the honourable member has mentioned. It is not possible for us to amend the Australian Constitution by an alteration of our Supreme Court Act. The Australian Constitution says that all of the judicial functions of the Commonwealth shall be carried out by a court, and it does not provide for any lesser function being carried out by some person who is not a judge. I know that the Commonwealth Government has come up against this matter in other States, because other State Premiers (and particularly Mr. Cahill) have discussed it with me. In the event of the Commonwealth passing the uniform Divorce Bill, I believe it will not be possible for the Masters of our court to perform the functions they have been doing until now. That view is now shared by the Commonwealth Government and, I am certain, by some other State Governments, because they have drawn the Commonwealth's attention to the fact that the judicial functions of the Commonwealth can be performed only by a court, and particularly by a person appointed for life, only removable by resolution of Parliament.

Mr. Dunstan—Could we not make the Masters part of the court?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I suppose one could make a Master a judge; that would have to be done. It would be legal, possibly, to do that but the judicial functions of the Commonwealth cannot be undertaken by any officer; they can be undertaken only by a judge. That has been held in other States and I believe it is being accepted at present by the Commonwealth Attorney-General. I am of opinion that the uniform Divorce Bill will not pass through the Commonwealth Parliament this session, so there is not so much urgency about this matter as might otherwise be the case. The best

advice I can get—and I have discussed this matter with competent authorities both in this State and in other States—is that it is not possible for us to remedy the defect because, if there is a defect, it can be remedied only by the Commonwealth Constitution itself being altered. I presume it would be possible for judges to take the responsibility for work that they personally did not supervise, but I doubt whether they would be prepared to do that. Our judges would be most scrupulous in carrying out all the functions personally. I doubt whether the Commonwealth divorce legislation will be passed this session.

Mr. Hambour—Would we have to supply the judges?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have informed the Commonwealth Attorney-General that we should be prepared to supply the judges, but that if we have to appoint additional judges the Commonwealth Government would have to pay for them. If this work had to be done by a judge much work would be involved. At the moment the Masters do much work in these cases, particularly undefended cases. If the procedure is altered, as I believe is not unlikely, additional judges will be necessary, and I have informed the Commonwealth Attorney-General that my Government will be prepared to co-operate and provide the additional judges, but that we should expect a reimbursement from the Commonwealth, because it would be additional expenditure arising purely from Commonwealth legislation. I assure Mr. Dunstan that the matter he mentioned is being anxiously examined at present.

Line passed.

Adelaide Local Court Department, £43,755; Adelaide Police Court Department, £39,602; Country and Suburban Courts Department, £74,814; Coroner's Department, £5,896; Registrar-General of Deeds Department, £153,145—passed.

Miscellaneous, £27,399.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—An amount of £5,800 is provided this year as a grant to the Law Society of South Australia for the cost of administration in connection with legal assistance to poor persons, an increase of £800 on last year. What is the reason for the increase? The Treasurer might also consider whether the scheme should not be amplified to provide a fund whereby witnesses who are required by the legal men assigned by the Law Society may be brought to court and

their expenses paid. We had discussions recently about witnesses who were required to come from another State. The counsel who had been allotted for the defence of the accused had no access to funds to bring these witnesses to the court to give evidence. Consideration should be given to the provision of such a fund, which could be used to recoup the cost of witnesses in such cases.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The payment referred to is made under a long standing arrangement. I understand that the additional £800 is because of additional expense incurred by the Law Society owing to the increase in the number of persons receiving assistance through the society. The matter generally is being examined in the light of a recent case and probably will be the subject of discussion between the Attorney-General and the Law Society. I understand the Law Society now holds that certain types of cases should be outside the arrangement of assistance now being given, and I believe we shall be able to reach some conclusion. Mr. O'Halloran is not entirely correct in his assumption regarding witnesses. In such cases as the Stuart case, where murder is involved, the obligation is upon the Crown to provide the witnesses at the trial and take all the necessary steps to see that they are available; and the obligation is also on the Crown to make inquiries through the police to find evidence that could be given in the interests of the person concerned.

Mr. O'Halloran—Is that interstate or only in this State?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—It is not limited only to the State. In the case the Leader of the Opposition has in mind a Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into special features of the trial, and in that instance there was no hesitation by the Government in saying that the cost of bringing the witnesses to Adelaide would be borne by the Crown. I do not think there is any problem regarding witnesses. I have never heard the question raised at any time or of its being raised. In ordinary trials it is dealt with as a matter of course. I assure the honourable member that there is no difficulty about the attendance of witnesses, the search for information, or the production of information if it is desired by the counsel. It has always been readily supplied to the best ability of the department concerned.

Mr. SHANNON—I notice that an amount of £10,000 has been provided for the expenses of the Stuart Royal Commission. I do not

know whether the costs of the commissioners, the Crown Solicitor or Mr. Brazel have been included. Was this sum placed at random on the Estimates to cover certain costs and, if insufficient, was it intended to pay the balance by means of excess warrants?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—This amount was the cost estimated by the Crown Solicitor. The term "cost" in this instance obviously does not include any salaries for the Crown Law Officers, who are in another place on the Estimates, nor does it include salaries for the judges or people normally in the employ of the Government. It represents the additional cost. I would think the estimate is now out of date because, since it was made, Mr. O'Sullivan has brought counsel from Melbourne at Government expense. Also, the proceedings were prolonged for three weeks and counsel had to be paid for the whole of that period while the Melbourne counsel acquainted himself with the facts of the case. Witnesses were recalled, which resulted in additional expense. It had been claimed that an injustice had been done to the man concerned, and every member would realize that if we had proceeded with the execution and subsequently it was found that an injustice had been done, the State's reputation would have suffered. On the other hand, I believe the investigation we are making will have the effect of showing that we do not wantonly hang people, but that we try to administer justice fairly and squarely and give an opportunity for every matter that may be in the interests of the person concerned to be considered.

Mr. HAMBOUR—The Leader of the Opposition said that the £5,000 granted to the Law Society last year was obviously spent, and asked why the grant was of that amount. Does the Law Society submit a statement of the way in which the money is spent, or is a grant made to the Society to spend as it thinks fit? Is the grant given yearly whether it is spent or not?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The amount is given to the Law Society under an arrangement that sets up the office of the Society to administer its particular function. I do not believe the solicitors receive any payment for the work they do; this grant is simply a reimbursement to the Law Society for office expenses and the costs of investigations carried out in administering this scheme. The arrangement is most generous to the people of South Australia, as it means that each solicitor is rostered to take his share of cases involving indigent people who cannot pay legal costs.

On a number of occasions I have heard complaints that because a person was not a paying client his case was not looked after by the solicitor concerned, but on no occasion have I found these complaints were justified. The practitioners in this State have given conscientious service in respect of the cases assigned to them.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Does the Law Society roster them in turn?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I understand that the Council of the Law Society rosters solicitors or assigns cases. I do not know the system, but I understand it assigns cases among the people qualified to deal with the types of cases under consideration.

Mr. DUNSTAN—I can inform members that the Treasurer's understanding of the position is correct. The £5,800 granted this year is for administration expenses of the scheme in running the office, to which the members of the Society also contribute by their subscriptions. The members of this Society are not reimbursed by the Government, and Law Society members in South Australia are in a somewhat different position from lawyers in other parts of the Commonwealth, where the Government pays a set proportion of taxed costs under the scheme. I understand that the British Government pays 80 per cent of taxed costs.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—Would that be in addition to the administration of the scheme?

Mr. DUNSTAN—Yes, but this is not so in South Australia. On my understanding, when people can pay a certain amount towards their costs, their cases are generally allotted to junior practitioners unless they call for the experience of a senior but, when a man has been a practitioner for some time, he gets almost entirely non-paying cases. In murder cases, however, it is normal for senior counsel to be assigned; in fact, the Stuart case is one of the few cases of murder that I can remember that has been taken by someone who is not a silk. It was taken by a junior who had had considerable experience at the criminal bar. In a number of cases of murder recently, Queen's Counsel have been assigned. For instance, Mr. Pickering, Q.C., gave his services without fee in the Bailey case, which was very burdensome; Mr. Nelligan, Q.C., has appeared in a number of cases without fee; and there are many other cases of this kind. The situation is rapidly arising when this scheme is going to become too burdensome for the

profession to carry. In South Australia we have about the same number of lawyers as in the 1930's but the population is now much larger. Sufficient lawyers have not been coming into the profession to cope with the amount of work arising because of the increased population. Lawyers have been required to take in more Law Society cases because of the population increase and a steadily heavier burden of non-paying work of this kind falls on the members of the society who do the work willingly, but who will in due course find the situation too burdensome.

Mr. Travers, Q.C., when a member of this House, raised the matter of the return to other professional men in this State compared with the return to South Australian solicitors. The return to solicitors does not compare with the return derived by other professional men required to do the same work to gain their professional qualifications. The law is a burdensome and responsible profession and while the leaders of the profession undoubtedly get a very fair return for their work and can make extremely high incomes, comparatively speaking, this is restricted to the top few and the average member of the profession in South Australia gets substantially less in return than professional men like dentists, doctors and many accountants, and substantially less than the same profession in other States of the Commonwealth.

Mr. Quirke—Why is that?

Mr. DUNSTAN—In other States there is a sliding scale for real property work. That is what raises the professional returns in other States. There it has been held, in fixing the scale for work in connection with real property, that if a man takes the responsibility for a real property deal, he ought to be remunerated in proportion to the heaviness of the responsibility taken because he renders himself liable to an action for negligence if he is negligent in his dealings or does something wrong in his dealings, and I point out that real property transactions may involve very large sums. In this State there is no such scale and, in fact, most fees for real property work are quite ridiculous and do not cover the solicitor's costs.

Mr. Hambour—Who fixes them?

Mr. DUNSTAN—They are fixed in the schedule to the Real Property Act. The charge fixed for attendance, preparation of documents, stamping and registering transfers is 30s. The

sum of £5 5s. is usually charged, though not legally recoverable.

Mr. King—Do you know whether any solicitor has been charged with negligence on such transactions, either before the Law Society or the courts?

Mr. DUNSTAN—Yes, but not many have come before the courts. I can tell the member of some that have not gone before the court, but been settled. We are not getting people in the profession because the remuneration, compared with that derived from other pro-

fessions, is not as attractive as it should be. I suggest that some examination should be made to give a basis for justice and also some assistance to solicitors doing charitable work for the community.

Line passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.40 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, October 21, at 2 p.m.