

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, November 12, 1959.

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

QUESTIONS.**PUBLIC HOSPITAL CHARGES.**

Mr. O'HALLORAN—It was recently suggested that public hospital charges were to be increased and there is some uncertainty in the public mind on this matter. Can the Premier say whether it has been decided to increase charges to patients in Government hospitals and, if so, whether it will be done by regulation so that it will be possible for the House to consider the proposed increased charges?

The Hon. Sir **THOMAS PLAYFORD**—The Government does intend to raise hospital charges. This matter was referred to a committee to examine what those charges should be. The position is that in South Australia our hospitals are obliged to take all persons: we have not the system that operates in other States whereby persons who are able to pay for treatment are told they cannot enter Government hospitals but are obliged to go into private institutions. In South Australia we accommodate many people who are well able to pay hospital fees, and who, in some instances, are so well insured that they profit from being in hospital, although the State loses substantially in treating them. Action will be taken in accordance with the Act, by proclamation, but before any proclamation is made—and any decisions are arrived at—it will be necessary for the House to consider the matter. Under our present hospital legislation, if the Act is strictly observed, it is possible only to provide for one fee. Members know that in our hospitals we are more and more providing intermediate accommodation as well as ward accommodation: the Queen Elizabeth Hospital provides good intermediate accommodation, so it will be necessary to fix additional fees in that connection. When the matter is considered by the Government it will be on the basis that we will remit fees to those persons who are unable to pay in the same way as we do at present.

BREAD DELIVERIES.

Mrs. STEELE—On Tuesday I asked the Premier a question about the removal of a surcharge of 1d. on a 2-lb. loaf and a 3d. on a 1-lb. loaf on bread delivered in the Burnside area. He said action was delayed pending

the result of a conference between the Prices Commissioner and the bakers concerned. Has any decision been arrived at?

The Hon. Sir **THOMAS PLAYFORD**—The Prices Commissioner reports that he conferred with representatives of the baking industry yesterday. As a result of the meeting, the bakers concerned have now agreed to continue deliveries in the areas in which it was intended to remove the surcharge. The areas in which the surcharge will be removed are the same as those originally decided upon by the department but do not include all areas at present subject to the surcharge. The areas where the 1d. per 2-lb. loaf surcharge will be removed are Wattle Park, Erindale, portion of Burnside, Hazelwood Park, Linden Park, and St. Georges. The areas where the surcharge will continue are the top portion of Glen Osmond, Sunnyside, Beaumont, part of Burnside and Stonyfell.

Some reduction in bread prices at Elizabeth and Salisbury is also proposed and full details of the price adjustments in these districts together with the Burnside area, including boundaries, will be announced as early as practicable next week.

MEDICAL BENEFITS COMPANY.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on October 29 about the Australian Medical and Accident Company Limited?

The Hon. Sir **THOMAS PLAYFORD**—The Public Actuary, Mr. Bowden, reports as follows:—

Because the Australian Medical and Accident Insurance Company now insures medical hospital and dental business to a minor extent only as part of a general accident policy, it does not appear practicable to obtain information precisely in the regulation form. The company will submit a general income and expenditure account as well as a balance-sheet in the same form as the statutory returns to the Commonwealth Insurance Commissioner in about two weeks' time. This will be accepted for the present as being in sufficient compliance subject to any special information which will be requested under the provisions of sections 6 and 7 of the Benefit Associations Act. Particular attention will be directed to the insurance of funeral benefit business by this company to ascertain whether contracts made with the public are fully protected.

SCHOOL OF MINES.

Mr. COUMBE—Some months ago the Premier announced the expansion of the School of Mines and Industries with the object of making that body an Institute of Technology. This would raise its status and make it an

organization which could teach and initiate technological research. This field of work is of great importance to the expansion taking place in this State. The Council of the School of Mines has made recommendations to the Minister of Education and conferences have been held on the status and formation of the new institution. Can the Minister of Education say whether an amending Bill to the School of Mines Act has been prepared and whether it is the Government's intention to introduce it this session? I ask this question this afternoon because, as the House is aware, negotiations are taking place on the future of the Adelaide technical high school which is conducted by the School of Mines. In fact, a conference is to be held later this afternoon with the Minister on this matter.

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—The Government has given detailed consideration to the future status and scope of activities of the School of Mines, but it has not concluded its deliberations concerning the long-range policy which involves the whole scope of higher education in South Australia. However, the Government has authorized me to have a short Bill prepared dealing with the immediate needs of the school, which will involve a change of the name or title of the school to the South Australian Institute of Technology, and the reconstruction of the council of the school by making it larger and more representative. There will be a few incidental amendments to follow. That Bill will be introduced this session and I hope that the change of name and status and council will operate as from the beginning of next year.

May I add that the Government is thoroughly appreciative of the excellent manner in which this school has been conducted over a long period of years by the council, the principal and his staff. We confidently anticipate that, with its increased status, the prestige of the school will be increased commensurably in the future.

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL.

Mr. HUTCHENS—One of my constituents writes:—

On several visits I have paid to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital I have found that a Sister of the nursing profession has been doing clerical duties in the out-patients department, several nurses have also been similarly occupied. This work I feel could be carried out just as efficiently by a civilian secretary, and the Sister and nurses could be relieved of these tasks and used in their true vocation. It seems stupid to have fully-trained Sisters engaged on clerical work, it is a waste of the

State's resources and of a valuable person while our hospitals are so badly staffed. The work to be undertaken in such a place as out-patients may need someone who is trained, but I doubt seriously if a fully-trained Sister is needed.

Will the Premier refer this matter to the Minister of Health to see whether there is any substance in these remarks and suggestions?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes.

YARDING OF SHEEP.

Mr. HEASLIP—My question concerns the very heavy yarding of sheep at the Abattoirs this week, where over 100,000 sheep were delivered. What will be the position next week? Will restrictions be necessary and, if so, what form will they take?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—The Operational Committee has decided that, although these restrictions will be of a comparatively minor nature, its objective is to limit the market to about 85,000, as above that number it becomes rather unworkable. The following conditions will be applied next week. First, there will be no restrictions on sheep or lambs by rail; secondly, there will be no restrictions on lambs by road. Thirdly, sheep will not be accepted by road except from (a) Eyre Peninsula and (b) Yorke Peninsula south of a line from Port Clinton to Artherton and thence due west to Spencer Gulf. Fourthly, no sheep or lambs will be accepted from country markets for export. Fifthly, no private bookings of sheep will be taken, and sixthly, private bookings of lambs will be accepted subject to confirmation by the Operational Committee. The honourable member will see that, though such conditions will restrict the market, they are not particularly harsh, the main objective being to get rid of lambs as soon as possible.

WHEAT AND BARLEY SALES.

Mr. FRED WALSH—A report appeared in this morning's *Advertiser* that yesterday Senator Laught raised in the Senate the question of preventing sales of wheat and barley from South Australia, and it was proposed that the Minister for Primary Industry (Mr. Adermann) would be asked to investigate the need for preventing sales from this State because of drought conditions. Those engaged in malting, others who are processors of barley, and I, are concerned at the possibility of a serious shortage this year because of the very low yield. Will the Premier take up with the Wheat Board, and particularly with the Barley Board, the question posed by Senator Laught

with the idea of preventing wheat and barley going from South Australia, for the ensuing 12 months at any rate?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Barley Board, as honourable members know, some time ago discontinued sales from South Australia. In fact, it made an arrangement that one cargo, which had actually been sold, be retained here for distribution for stock-feeding purposes. The Minister of Works informs me that maltsters have already bought a considerable amount of last year's barley, in addition to such action as I have mentioned.

With regard to wheat supplies the position is not so clear. I wrote to the Prime Minister about eight weeks ago, and received a communication from him last week, the meaning of which I am not quite sure of, except that I think it means that an attempt will be made to increase the charges for wheat in this State. However, I have arranged a conference with the Prime Minister on this matter next week. I hope then to be able to inform honourable members what action can be taken. The present position is that there will be sufficient wheat in South Australia for our home consumption requirements, but not sufficient easily available for overseas milling requirements. If we are to continue meeting overseas milling requirements it will be necessary to get some wheat from the western districts of Victoria into South Australia for that purpose. However, until I have further information from the Prime Minister about the Commonwealth's intention it is not possible to give a firm answer. As a matter of fact, the honourable member's colleague, Mr. Condon, has been taking up the matter in the interests of his particular union, which has been vitally affected. I have not been able to give the honourable member the information he desires, but will make it available as soon as possible.

Mr. STOTT—Will the Premier ascertain from the Australian Wheat Board whether it is not a fact that it ceased wheat sales in South Australia from last September and also made provision in various depots to have adequate wheat supplies? Will he ascertain from the Australian Barley Board whether it has made provision, consistent with its forward sales, for stocks in South Australia to meet the emergency situation? Will he also communicate with Senator Laught in Canberra and request him to make sure of his facts before he asks irresponsible questions in the Senate on this matter?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Of course, a member of the Senate does his job as he sees fit and it is not competent for me to interfere with him in any way, although I may criticise him if I like. I believe it is correct that the Wheat Board has discontinued sales of wheat from the mainland in South Australia, but until quite recently—in fact at the end of last month—it was certainly shipping wheat from the Port Adelaide division, which was serious in view of the known conditions of the State at that time. The Port Adelaide division is where the big consumption takes place and where the flour mills exist, but I understand there were shipments from that division until last month. I think they have now been stopped. In respect of sales, I believe the board is still selling wheat from Eyre Peninsula. Probably that policy cannot be criticised because it would possibly be cheaper to import wheat for our requirements from Victoria rather than transport it from Eyre Peninsula. The main question, of course, concerns the supply of wheat in the metropolitan area. As far as I know a good policy has not been pursued in that respect. In this area, where stocks should naturally have been conserved, the wheat has been completely shipped out.

COUNTRY ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES.

Mr. LAUCKE—My question concerns the tariff structure in respect of country electricity supplies. On August 13 the Premier, in reply to a question I had previously asked concerning the possibility of introducing an all-purpose tariff for power and light used on farms, stated that the matter of simpler tariffs for electricity consumption on farms was then being investigated. Has this investigation been completed and, if so, does it reveal that the tariff structure can be simplified and improved in the interests of this class of consumer?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—In answer to the previous question I pointed out that this was a most complex matter and a tremendous amount of investigation would be necessary before anything could be decided upon. I discussed the tariff question with the chairman of the trust this morning, but no decision has been reached.

PRICES OF FORTIFIED WINES.

Mr. QUIRKE—Has the Premier a reply to a question I asked last week concerning a threatened price war in the wine industry?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—In accordance with the undertaking I gave the honourable member, I have investigated this matter and have held several conferences in connection with it. It is a very complex problem that is not easy of solution, but at present there will be no intensification of price-cutting pending the opportunity I am taking to have a further investigation made in connection with the industry.

SEA WATER EXPERIMENTS.

Mr. HARDING—In this morning's *Advertiser*, under the heading "Keep Eye on Sea-water Experiments," appeared the following:—

Experiments being made in the Channel Islands to water crops with processed sea-water would be worth watching, particularly by South Australia, British M.P., Sir Roland Robinson said in Adelaide yesterday.

Will the Premier state whether the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization has investigated this matter; if so, whether it is still investigating it; and if not, whether Cabinet will bring this matter before that organization?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Minister of Works has given much attention to this matter and intends later to make a statement about it. I do not intend to forecast what he will say, but I would say that all the figures I have had—and I have received a considerable number—confirm that the cost of water under those circumstances would be absolutely prohibitive. The best figure I have seen is that the water would cost about 15s. a thousand gallons.

Mr. Harding—Is there anything from the C.S.I.R.O.?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I do not know if it has done any work, but much work has been done overseas which I think would probably be more conclusive than anything done by the C.S.I.R.O. The best processes that have been brought under my notice all point to a cost of not less than 15s. a thousand gallons.

HUMBUG SCRUB RESERVE.

Mr. CLARK—The following letter was written to the member for West Torrens but, as it concerns my district in some respects, it was passed on to me:—

I was interested in your recent statement that more recreation reserves should be set aside. I consider that the time is now opportune for the creation of a reserve of similar area to the National Park in the ranges north-east of Adelaide. The Humbug Scrub area is

one of the few localities in the Mount Lofty Ranges near Adelaide where virgin bushland still exists and this area would provide an interesting fauna and flora reserve. Unless action is taken soon the land will be cleared and its chief asset as a reserve will be lost. With the development of Elizabeth, the increasing population of Salisbury and Gawler and the north-east expansion of the metropolitan area towards Tea Tree Gully, it is important that a large area for picnics and other recreations should be established nearby.

Will the Minister of Lands have the suggestion made in this letter examined to see if it is practicable and advisable?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I should be pleased to examine the position, and I ask that the honourable member let me have the correspondence.

Mr. LAUCKE—This question follows one asked by the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) about the reservation of land for a national pleasure resort and recreation in the areas north-east of Adelaide. Concurrently with the presentation of the honourable member's correspondence in this matter, may I submit a firm offer by Mr. Lance Rasheed of land in the very location to which the honourable member refers? Mr. Rasheed owns a large tract of land there and is most interested in its preservation in its natural state as a national reserve. He is prepared to make what I regard as a very generous offer in respect of part of this land, which is magnificent, typical Australian bushland, commanding outstanding panoramic views across the South Para Reservoir. It is attracting up to 60 car-loads of visitors each Sunday by its natural enchantment and attraction. Will the Minister of Lands consider a firm offer from Mr. Rasheed in this respect?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—Yes, certainly.

SAW MILL AND GOVERNMENT TENDERS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—In this morning's *Advertiser* appeared a report of a Parliamentary debate yesterday in which the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) is quoted as follows:—

I, personally, would like to know in some detail something about the Housing Trust's purchase of a sawmill in Victoria recently and the burning down of it without an insurance cover.

Under the subheading "Fish Supply" appeared the following:—

Mr. Dunstan said he would also like to know why the Government had not accepted the lowest tender for a supply of fish to Government hospitals, when, "according to people in the trade, there was no reason why

the lowest tender should not have been accepted.''

As these statements seem to imply grave allegations that have been given much publicity in the press, has the Premier any information as to their accuracy or otherwise?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I did not hear the honourable member's remarks, but I saw the report in the paper this morning with much surprise because in neither case had any inquiry in connection with these matters been directed by the honourable member. If he wanted the information, of course, one would naturally have expected that some inquiry would have been made, but no inquiry has been elicited with me, nor can I find any inquiry in any department in connection with these things. The following is a report from the chairman of the Housing Trust in connection with the first allegation made by the honourable member:—

The South Australian Housing Trust purchased the Badger Creek saw mill at Healesville, Victoria, in December, 1947, for £4,500. This was done with the knowledge and consent of the Victorian Government which supplied logs to the mill. The mill was sold by the trust in 1952 for £6,000. When the mill was purchased in 1947 difficulty in obtaining timber from other sources was having an extremely serious effect on the building industry in this State and the housing programme of the trust. The supply position later improved to the extent that it was no longer necessary to retain the mill, and it was sold. Mr. Dunstan has not been in touch with the trust concerning this matter and has evidently been misinformed, as the trust does not now own a saw mill in Victoria or anywhere else.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Is the Premier prepared to answer the second part of the question regarding tendering for fish for Government hospitals?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I regret that I forgot to reply to the second part of the question, but I assure the honourable member that the fish does not smell either. I have received the following report from the Government member on the Supply and Tender Board:—

Contracts let by Supply and Tender Board for two years ending January 31, 1961. The board accepted the lowest tenders for fresh fish, imported fillets, flake, cod and hake. For fresh fish there were lower tenders for four out of the 11 lines called for. The board accepted the tender which was lowest in total.

BOTTLE MENACE ON ROADS.

Mr. CORCORAN—The week before last I asked the Minister of Works if he would obtain information from the Minister of Highways regarding the bottle menace on roads.

It has been said that this is a pet subject of mine, but that is not so. True, I may have been in the habit of raising it here, but I have done so because of representations made by local government organizations. I was merely trying to act in accordance with requests made to me, and I do not want it to be thought that I was only expressing my own ideas. Has the Minister of Works yet received any report from the Minister of Roads on this matter?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—If at any time in answer to the honourable member on this matter I left the impression in his mind or anybody else's mind that I thought he was being unnecessarily persistent in this matter, I apologize because no such intention was in my mind. I have always agreed with the honourable member that this is a matter that has caused many of us much concern, and I am sure he has no need to apologize for being persistent. Glass is so permanent; it does not disintegrate with the passage of time and therefore there tends to be a continual accumulation of the menace, rather than a diminution of it, over a period of time. Unfortunately, many factors tend to intervene in this matter, most of which are beyond the control of any Government instrumentality. The only remedy under any legislation is that people may be proceeded against if a charge can be sustained that they have littered up the roads with debris or with obstacles to road users. It may be that the Minister of Roads has supplied me with a further answer on this question, because this morning he handed me several replies which I inadvertently neglected to bring with me today. I will look for a reply again on Tuesday, and when I receive it I will advise the honourable member.

ASSISTANCE TO NEW SETTLERS.

Mr. BOCKELBERG—With the drought conditions existing in this State, has the Minister of Agriculture any means to suggest by which settlers who have just started on new blocks or young share farmers—not men who have been established on the land and enjoyed bountiful seasons—may obtain assistance to enable them to continue next season?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—Settlers can be assisted in several ways, as the honourable member will be aware. I suggest that any settler who has communicated with the honourable member may approach the State Bank to ascertain the various ways in which he can

be assisted. Should the honourable member like me to obtain a schedule of the various avenues for assistance, I should be happy to do so.

YOUNG PATIENTS AT ADELAIDE HOSPITAL.

Mr. BYWATERS—I have received a very distressing letter from a constituent of mine whose daughter aged 12 years died in the Royal Adelaide Hospital from leukaemia. That man spent much time with his daughter in the hospital during her illness. As he is held in very high esteem in Murray Bridge and occupies a prominent position in that area, I feel that the information he has given me would be reliable. He referred to the unsatisfactory situation of children of 12 years of age being in the same ward as adult patients, many of them elderly and some reaching senility. In fact, he complained that some of the suffering this child had to witness was a severe strain on her in her illness. He also claimed that the amenities for the children were inadequate, the facilities provided being mostly for adults. As the child had to receive many injections, she was too sore to use an ordinary bedpan and had to use a rubber one, but this was not available and he purchased one and left it at the hospital for future patients of that age. He also claimed that in the ward she occupied were people who suffered severely in the night; there was much noise, and it was difficult for the child to sleep because of the people in distress with their various complaints. Can the Premier say whether it would be possible, in the reconstruction programme, to provide specific wards suitable for children between the ages of, say, 12 and 20 years, rather than to allow them to be in the same wards as elderly patients?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—A general segregation takes place between two hospitals as far as age groups are concerned. The Adelaide Children's Hospital normally takes children, and the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital normally take adults. I should like to know the history of the case mentioned by the honourable member, and if he will make the letter he referred to available I will follow up the complaints he mentioned and obtain a full report. I receive many letters from people who are patients in the Royal Adelaide Hospital expressing great pleasure at the way the hospital looks after them and the standard of service given. I should like to check on the reason this particular child was at the Royal Adelaide Hos-

pital rather than the Children's Hospital, where I would have thought she would normally attend.

COONALPYN WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. NANKIVELL—A report of the *Border Chronicle* of November 5, regarding the water supply at Coonalpyn, states:—

Concern was expressed at Monday's meeting of Coonalpyn Downs District Council regarding the water supply at Coonalpyn. The chairman (Councillor M. C. McIntosh) said the plant was working 17 hours a day at the maximum capacity of the bore to maintain present supplies. With new consumers being added, and summer coming on, it seemed certain that the supply would be inadequate, and Councillor McIntosh suggested that the Engineering and Water Supply Department should be contacted immediately, pointing out the danger of over-taxing the present supply.

Can the Minister of Works make a statement upon this matter?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I took up this matter with the Engineer for Water Supply (Mr. Campbell), and I now have the docket in which he forwarded his report to the Engineer-in-Chief on this matter. The reports indicate that until at least October this year there had not been any heavy demands on the supply, but during October the demand naturally increased. However, even then the number of days on which the pump worked for the month of October was only 22, so it was not working on every day of the month by any means. The reports also disclose that the average daily pumping was 10.5 hours a day, with a maximum of 17 hours on one day only; so there appears to be some misconception in the minds of people who, I agree, are naturally concerned about the water supply. The engineer points out that the pumping hours will naturally increase as the weather becomes hotter and consumption increases. The pump and engine have recently been overhauled, and the result since these things were put in first-class order is that the output of the pump has increased considerably; and that, together with the reserves indicated in the ability of the plant to supply water, which I have already indicated, would suggest that there is still a good safety margin in respect of the township's requirements in the coming summer. I do not anticipate that there will be any real difficulty. Problems do occur from time to time in the smaller schemes and for that reason this particular plant has been put into first-class order to ensure a supply during the summer.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION.

Mr. RALSTON—Yesterday I received a letter from Mount Gambier which caused me some concern. My question concerns accidents to workmen during the course of employment when their glasses, and possibly their false teeth, are broken. Under the Workmen's Compensation Act should the workman receive personal injury he is entitled to replacements of such articles but if there is no personal injury there is some doubt about the employer's liability to make replacements. I have been assured that in some industries replacements are made, but will the Premier ascertain the position of Government employees, particularly those employed in the timber industry, where accidents of this nature sometimes frequently occur?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Damage of that description is always dealt with in accordance with the circumstances that are reported to the management. If the honourable member will supply me with the name of the person concerned I will have the matter examined and advise him accordingly.

FINANCE FOR HOME PURCHASES.

Mr. RICHES—During this session members have expressed the opinion that it is desirable for young couples to purchase homes and some have said that, if they wanted to, there is nothing to prevent young couples from buying their own homes. In Port Augusta a young couple desires to purchase a home which was built by school teachers who have since been transferred. The house is two years old and is in a good situation. The couple have approached several institutions. The Bank of New South Wales has advised them that it is not lending money for that purpose; the State Bank is not receiving applications for a long time; the Savings Bank advises that it will be nearly seven months before it can give the young people an answer; and the Commonwealth Savings Bank advises that it would prefer, if it made any advance at all, to make advances on new homes rather than for the purchase of homes already constructed and that, in any case, it would be confined to people who did other banking business with that bank. All the inquiries that have been made up to the present have failed to find any institution that is prepared to lend money in the country for the purchase of a home already built. Does the Premier know of any institution that could be approached and, if not, will he examine the situation to see if something can be done to help couples to become

prospective home owners rather than rent payers?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—As I pointed out when presenting the Loan Estimates to the House this year, the Government has made available, either directly itself through the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement or through semi-governmental activities, approximately £21,000,000 for housing. I also pointed out, and reiterate now, that the Government's money has been, and will continue to be, directed principally to the erection of new houses. Merely changing the ownership of a house from one person to another does not in any way relieve the housing shortage. It only spends public money to change ownership, and so the Government has never been anxious to undertake the obligation of financing everyone who wants to sell or buy a house. What we have concentrated upon particularly is arranging finance for persons wanting to build a house, because then at the end of the year we have more to show for our activities. If the honourable member will let me have the names of the persons concerned I will see whether I can find a suitable lender to enable them to be financed.

RAILWAY LOSSES.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Yesterday, in reply to a question by the honourable member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) in which he expressed concern at the facts disclosed in the Railways Commissioner's report about the loss that the railways had sustained owing to competition from road traffic, the Premier said:—

Recently the Government has been rather perturbed to find that a great deal of licence has been taken in the use of these vehicles, which were primarily designed to undertake certain functions. They are now openly undertaking other functions which have today been criticized by the Railways Commissioner and for which they do not pay adequate taxes. It is the Government's intention to watch the position, but not to take any action at present.

Can the Premier elaborate on that and say what type of ancillary vehicle he had in mind?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I had a number of different ancillary vehicles in mind. For example, it was always traditionally understood that the petrol companies would deliver from the depots but that the railways would undertake the main obligation of shifting heavy tanks of petrol over long distances from one place to another. Recently, however, there has been a tendency, although the railways had given special concessions to

certain petrol companies, for petrol companies to undertake long-distance haulage with their ancillary vehicles, which would be rather outside what were normally the conditions. Another company I have in mind is proposing to put large carriers on the road to undertake heavy bulk carriage, which normally could well be done by the railways and probably more cheaply than by road, if the heavy wear and tear on the roads and the rather excessive hours that the drivers work were not eliminated. That is the sort of thing I had in mind.

I reiterate that the Government is examining this matter but does not propose to rush in to set up wholesale control over ancillary vehicles, which would be detrimental to the best interests of the State as a whole. We must use some judgment, remembering that one swallow does not make a summer. Sometimes an odd carrier rather abuses his privileges, but if we try to legislate for him, we bring under general control hundreds of people who are carrying out perfectly good and normal functions.

REGULATIONS UNDER BENEFIT ASSOCIATIONS ACT.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Has the Premier a reply to my recent question concerning regulations under the Benefit Associations Act?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes. The Public Actuary's report is as follows:—

A proportion of some claims intimated to a benefit association transacting medical, hospital and dental business, and to a lesser extent funeral benefit business, may not be passed for payment wholly or partly by the association because some disqualifying circumstance such as claims incurred during a waiting period or disqualified because of some ailment existing but not disclosed at the inception of the contract. The words "admitted but not paid" were inserted because a definite known liability is stated in the accounts. An association shall however estimate any probable liability for claims intimated but not admitted, as well as claims incurred but not notified, which can be quite substantial, under the heading "Other liabilities." When the Public Actuary makes an investigation or requires more information, under the provisions of sections 6 and 7 of the Benefit Associations Act, the need for these special reserves is carefully investigated.

EXTRA GENERATING CAPACITY.

Mr. COUMBE—Some time ago it was announced that, in order to increase the power-generating capacity of the State, investigations should be made into the possibility of generating power by pumping water from the southern end of St. Vincent Gulf to a height

and running it down. What investigations have been made into this possibility? Are experiments being undertaken in this matter by the Electricity Trust? Can the Premier indicate what progress has been made in this direction?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Consultants from overseas have been engaged in connection with it. They have been to South Australia and are furnishing a report to the trust. I am not quite sure whether the trust has yet received it. The consultants were favourable to the proposal. Surveys have been made of two sites, if not more, and much preliminary work has been undertaken, but I do not think a final decision has been made in connection with either the site or the procedure.

MURRAY BRIDGE POLICE STATION AND COURTHOUSE.

Mr. BYWATERS—Has the Minister of Works obtained a report regarding the Murray Bridge police station and courthouse about which I asked a question recently?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The honourable member suggested that it appeared that £1,600 had been spent on renovating a house that had since been demolished and that additional money had been spent in the erection of offices and other accommodation. He also suggested that increased garage facilities were to be built and that they would also be demolished in due course. The position is that only £550 of the £1,600 was spent in renovating the old premises; the £1,600 was the total amount spent on that project and some other police residences in the town. This amount has been spent to make the house habitable until the major programme is undertaken some time in the future. When the original proposal was considered by the Public Works Committee, it was suggested to the committee that the building was old and should be remodelled but, if that was impractical, it should be pulled down. In its report, the committee did not recommend this action, so it was decided that the house should be renovated temporarily, and the £550 was for that purpose. True, a small additional amount of garage accommodation is required and for that purpose a temporary steel-framed building is being erected at a cost of £144. This will remain until the site is required for other building works, when the garage will be demolished and there will be virtually a full recovery of the cost.

Mr. Bywaters—Do you know when it will be demolished?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—No, and I do not think the department could say at the moment.

DISPOSAL SALES.

Mr. HARDING—Recently I have received many inquiries for surplus land, and more inquiries on when it is likely that disposal sales will be held by the Lands Department of war service land settlement surplus tractors, motor vehicles, buildings and agricultural machinery. Will the Minister of Lands ascertain when a sale is likely to be held and where it is likely to be considered?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I will ascertain that.

INDUSTRIES FOR PORT PIRIE.

Mr. McKEE—Earlier this session I asked the Premier a question regarding unemployment at Port Pirie, and in his reply he said that some industries were negotiating to go to the country. Can the Premier say whether any progress has been made regarding the establishment of any industries at Port Pirie?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—No, I have nothing to report.

COOMANDOOK AREA SCHOOL.

Mr. NANKIVELL—Recently I referred to the Minister of Works a letter I had received from the secretary of the Coomandook area school committee asking if I could ascertain from the Architect-in-Chief when preliminary work would be commenced on the school site. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The Architect-in-Chief reports that the principal difficulty tending to hold up the work at the moment is water. Supplies available on site are scanty and of a high saline content, and may even be too salty to be used in septic tanks. Investigations are being made into a suitable water supply. When the water supply matter can be clarified we will be ready to proceed with the work.

Mr. Shannon—Has Yumali been considered.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—That is a probable solution.

Mr. Shannon—There is a main there now.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—It will be considered. We will be ready to proceed with site works later this financial year so that the school will be ready for occupation in 1961.

ROAD MAINTENANCE TAX.

Mr. RALSTON—On the front page of yesterday's *Advertiser* appeared an article dealing with the annual report to Parliament by the Railways Commissioner in which reference was made to the unfair or unequal competition between interstate road hauliers and the State railways. This article brought an immediate response; in yesterday's *News* appeared the following article:—

A road maintenance tax would place S.A. manufacturers at a distinct disadvantage, S.A. Road Transport Association President, Mr. K. Cole, said today. He said it would make it difficult for manufacturers to market S.A. products on a competitive basis in eastern States.

On the same page appeared the following article that I think could be the crux of the matter:—

The organizer-acting State secretary of the Transport Workers' Union, Mr. E. J. Harris, said today that whereas the South Australian Railways had to pay award rates for all its employees, the union had become aware for many years that road hauliers, both intrastate and interstate, in many cases were escaping the obligations of provisions of appropriate awards, he said. Many reputable firms who were paying award rates were also being hit by this unfair competition, he said. He claimed the South Australian Government could largely remove the "unequal competition" complained of by the Railways Commissioner if it policed award rates paid by road hauliers. This might need the appointment of additional inspectors, but their employment would be more than justified.

I know that the statement made by Mr. Harris was substantially correct and, if the Premier would like some private information, I should be pleased to supply it. Will the Premier take up with the Minister of Industry the matter referred to by Mr. Harris and obtain a report?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I ask the honourable member to put that question on notice.

ELECTRICITY FROM SEA WATER.

Mr. RICHES—This afternoon the Premier referred to the proposal, to which publicity was given, of generating electricity from sea water during off-peak hours. Will the Premier state whether any such proposal will be submitted to the Public Works Committee for inquiry so that evidence can be submitted by the public and whether any consideration has been given to the possibility of generating electricity from the movement of tides in Spencer Gulf?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—In reply to the first question, the Electricity Trust is not directly a Government instrumentality and is not subject to reports by the Public Works Committee. For example, the big power stations built at Port Augusta with the honourable member's support were not subject to reports by that committee. Regarding the second matter, a considerable time ago the movement of tides was considered. Investigations have been made on this subject in other parts of the world but, generally speaking, except in exceptional circumstances where there is enormously high tide movement, schemes have not proved to be economical. I do not think that a scheme of this type would be possible in any of our waters. If it were possible, I believe there is probably another inlet more advantageous than the place mentioned.

BULL'S CREEK AND PROSPECT HILL LAND.

Mr. STOTT—Can the Minister of Lands inform me what has happened to the section of land held by the Lands Department that I understand was used as a prison farm in the Prospect Hill and Bull's Creek area? I believe this has now been vacated. Is that land to be held by the department or will it be subject to application for soldier settlement or be thrown open for application for general settlement?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I will obtain a report.

RAILWAYS COMMISSIONER'S REPORT.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Will the Minister of Works ascertain from the Minister of Railways the types of traffic mentioned in the Railways Commissioner's report? I understand, from memory, that he said there was a loss of 22 per cent in freight traffic for the 12 months and that it represented a loss of revenue of over £1,000,000. If it is possible to secure this information, I should like to know whether that loss was due mainly to interstate traffic or to intrastate traffic, and whether the Minister could indicate the form of traffic where the loss was greatest.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Yes.

HIGHBURY AQUEDUCT.

Mr. LAUCKE—Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question regarding a concrete decking for the Highbury aqueduct in the interests of public safety?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I have not a conclusive report, but I did discuss this matter in a preliminary way with the

Engineer-in-Chief, who, I think, assumes that it will be necessary to take some steps to prevent persons from inadvertently falling into the aqueduct and injuring themselves, but just what form the protection may take has not been decided. As soon as I obtain a complete report I will advise the honourable member.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF POLICE.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Can the Premier confirm whether a well-known police officer—Geoff Leane, as I believe he is generally known—has been appointed Deputy Commissioner of Police?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—An appointment of Deputy Commissioner has been made.

SOCIAL EVIL FILMS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Yesterday I asked the Premier if he had been successful in obtaining a precise report from the Chief Secretary about social evil films, and he was kind enough to say that he had a copy of a letter and that if I desired to have it on record to ask him a question on the matter today. As I desire that information on record, will the Premier tell the House the contents of the letter?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The letter that was sent by the Chief Secretary to Sir Herbert Mayo, who had taken up the matter on behalf of the S.A. Film and Television Council, reads as follows:—

I acknowledge receipt of your letter of 1st instant regarding social evil films. The delay in forwarding this reply was occasioned by the necessity to obtain information from sources outside this office. The first two paragraphs of your letter make general complaints about social evil films, but do not name any specific films. In the absence of particulars, I am not in a position to ascertain whether your complaint is or is not justified. The Inspector of Places of Public Entertainment maintains a constant watch on the exhibition of motion pictures in South Australia and carries out the following procedure:—

1. A synopsis of all films released for exhibition is perused by a departmental officer.
2. If the synopsis indicates a possibility that the film may be of doubtful propriety, the film is viewed by me and censorship action taken if thought necessary.
3. All film advertising material must show the classification of the films in accordance with the Commonwealth Film Censorship Classification.

In December, 1958, Sir Edgar Bean, as committee chairman, reported that resulting from various conferences between members of the motion picture industry and the National Council of Women, arrangements had been

made to increase the number of programmes which would be wholly suitable for screening to children. These arrangements were carried out and no further complaint has been made to this committee concerning the screening of undesirable films. Motion picture advertisements sometimes tend to overstate the amount of sex and suggestiveness of the films. In a letter to the secretary of the South Australian Theatre Proprietors Council on October 9, 1959, the council were informed that unless motion picture exhibitors took immediate action to eliminate the over-emphasis of sex, vice and corruption from their film advertising material, consideration would be given to action for complete control over all film advertising material.

With reference to the penultimate paragraph of your letter, the film "High School Confidential" was released in Adelaide on June 11, 1959, and has since been screened in 24 suburban and nine country theatres. During the screening period of four months no word of complaint against this particular film has previously been received by this office. The matters raised by you will continue to receive my attention.

REFUND OF MONEY BY PRISONER.

Mr. BYWATERS—During the debate on the Estimates on October 20 I asked the Treasurer whether it was true that the Children's Welfare Department was asking for a refund of the amount of money paid to a person's wife while he was in prison, and he promised to obtain a report. Has he a reply on this matter?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—A report has been prepared and I have seen it, but I have not it with me today.

LOSS OF ELECTRIC FAN.

Mr. BYWATERS—Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked regarding the loss of an electric fan from the Adelaide Local Court?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The report from the Clerk of the Adelaide Local Court on this matter is as follows:—

The absence of the electric fan in question from the office was noticed by one of the staff on Monday, 13th April, 1959, and reported to the Assistant Clerk, who made enquiry from the cleaner that evening and was informed by her that she recollected the fan being on the floor in front of the fireplace when she cleaned the floors on Friday evening, the 10th April, and noticed it was not there when she arrived on the morning of Monday, 13th April. After due enquiry of the caretaker, the possibility of the fan having been picked up in error, for repairs, by an employee in the electrical section of the Architect-in-Chief's Department was checked, but without result, and on 22nd April, 1959, it was reported as missing to the Architect-in-Chief's Department and I understand it was that department that notified the police.

SUPPLY OF SEED WHEAT.

Mr. NANKIVELL—In view of the definite shortage of seed wheat for the 1960 season, will the Minister of Agriculture ascertain the expected harvest from both the Minnipa Research Centre and the Roseworthy College, both of which are breeders of pure seed wheat, and also how much of this wheat it is expected will be available for sale for seed?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—Yes.

RAIL STANDARDIZATION.

Mr. STOTT—Some time ago I asked the Premier questions regarding the railway unification agreement between the Commonwealth Government and the South Australian Government, and in his reply the Premier referred to pending High Court action. Since those questions were asked in this Parliament, similar questions have been directed to the responsible Minister in the Senate. I happened to hear the broadcast of the reply to those questions in which the Minister stated that under section 9, I think it was, of the schedule to the agreement the proposal to go ahead was subject to mutual agreement between South Australia and the Commonwealth. The Minister went on to say that he was still awaiting a report from the Premier of South Australia on this particular question, which indicates that the Premier and not the Commonwealth Government is at fault. In order that we may get the position clear, can the Premier reply to the allegation made by the Minister in the Commonwealth Parliament?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I thank the honourable member for his persistence in this matter. I read with some interest the press report of the Senate debate, and I noticed the report that the Minister for Shipping and Transport (Senator Paltridge) had stated that he was awaiting a reply from South Australia in the matter. The reply that he was waiting for is in connection with matters I previously disclosed to the House, namely, the document submitted by Mr. Hannaberry, which, of course, is a complete departure from the standardization agreement. I shall be able to furnish the Commonwealth with a full report on this matter next Monday or Tuesday, when I intend to discuss it with the Prime Minister, and I shall be able to let members know some time next week how the proposition looks.

NORTHFIELD RESEARCH CENTRE.

Mr. NANKIVELL—Can the Minister of Agriculture ascertain for me whether the plans for the new Northfield Research Centre have been completed, the estimated cost of those

buildings, and when it is expected work could be commenced on their construction?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—Those plans are being prepared. I am not sure whether I can obtain the estimated cost, but in any case it will probably be necessary to refer the whole project to the Public Works Committee at some time, if not in its initial stages, and that is what is being worked on at present. I will obtain detailed information, as far as possible, for the honourable member.

HALLETT COVE TO PORT STANVAC RAILWAY LAND.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked regarding the acquisition of land for the Hallett Cove to Port Stanvac railway?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The Minister of Railways has advised that no land necessary for the proposed Hallett Cove to Port Stanvac railway has been acquired, but that a preliminary approach has been made to all the land-owners likely to be affected.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: HOUSING TRUST SAWMILL PURCHASE.

Mr. DUNSTAN—I seek leave to make a personal explanation.
Leave granted.

Mr. DUNSTAN—In reply to a question by the member for Mitcham the Premier said that he was somewhat surprised to see a statement in the press this morning. I must confess I experienced some slight surprise myself because the report was not entirely accurate. While I feel that this has probably arisen because of the difficulty of hearing my remarks in the press gallery, I think it appropriate that the House should know what I did say, and which is recorded by *Hansard*. The press reported me as referring to the Housing Trust's purchase of a sawmill in Victoria "recently." What I did say was:—

I should like to know in some detail something about the Housing Trust's purchase of a sawmill in Victoria some time ago, and about the burning down of that sawmill when it apparently had no insurance cover.

I was only recently made aware of this fact, although I was, when told about it, made aware that it had happened before I became a member of this House. I checked with Housing Trust reports and found no details and therefore thought it was not a matter that could be adequately dealt with by question in this House, but it did raise a matter of policy

which could be gone into by a committee of the kind we were debating. I hold to that view and that is why I raised it in the House at that time.

VINE, FRUIT, AND VEGETABLE PROTECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

LANDLORD AND TENANT (CONTROL OF RENTS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

RENMARK IRRIGATION TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS brought up the report of the Select Committee together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received and read. Ordered that report be printed.

THE REPORT.

1. Your committee met on two occasions and examined the following witnesses, viz.:—Dr. W. A. Wynes (Parliamentary Draftsman), Mr. T. M. Price (Chairman, Renmark Irrigation Trust), Mr. R. H. Waters (Secretary, Renmark Irrigation Trust), Mr. J. J. Thompson (Mayor, Corporation of the Town of Renmark), Mr. J. S. Lewis (Town Clerk of the Corporation of the Town of Renmark), Mr. A. C. Gordon, Director of Lands.

2. Advertisements inviting interested parties to give evidence before the Select Committee were inserted in the *Advertiser*, *News*, and *Murray Pioneer*.

3. Both the Renmark Irrigation Trust and the Corporation of the Town of Renmark signified their approval of the legislation and their desire that it be passed as soon as possible.

4. Your committee is of opinion that there is no objection to the Bill, and recommends that it be passed.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS (Minister of Lands) 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 Renmark Irrigation Trust Act Amendment Bill.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 18 passed.

Clause 19—"Free passage to supply water."

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I move—

At the conclusion of the clause to add the following words, "and by inserting therein after the word 'drainage' the words 'or electricity as the case may be'."

This is a consequential amendment which will make section 172 of the principal Act provide that owners or occupiers must give free passage to water or drainage turned into the channels, etc., or electricity mains by the trust.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 20—"Private works."

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS moved—

To delete the word "subsurface" where appearing.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported with amendments. Committee's report adopted.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SUCCESSION DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution:—That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Succession Duties Act, 1929-1955.

Motion carried.

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

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is first to provide rebates of succession duty payable in respect of land which has been used for primary production for five years prior to the death of a deceased person where the land is left to the widow (or widower) or a direct ancestor or descendant of the deceased, provided that the person taking the land intends to continue to use the land for primary production.

The second object of the Bill is to provide a complete remission of duty in the case of property given by will or non-testamentary disposition to the University of Adelaide, School of Mines, Waite Agricultural Research Institute, the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, to non-profit hospitals and certain benevolent institutions. I shall deal with these two separate sets of provisions in order.

The provisions concerning land used for primary production are enacted by clause 4 of the Bill, which will insert four new sections. What the Government has in mind in introducing this legislation is in broad terms to give some measure of relief in cases where what I may describe as a farming property has been in the possession of a family for a number of years and it is intended by those left behind to continue to use the property in the same way and for the same purpose as

the deceased—in other words, to assist the family to carry on the pursuit of primary production without being faced with what may be, in some cases, high death duties. That, in brief, is the object of the Bill. To carry out the Government's object in such a way as to provide for every possible contingency is not easy, but the Government believes that the provisions of the Bill will go as far as is practicable to afford a reasonable measure of assistance in genuine cases, while not going too far in the opposite direction.

The first of the new proposed sections will define land used for primary production as land which has been used for the business of primary production for a period of five years immediately preceding the death of the deceased person. The definition will exclude land devised for a term of years, annuities charged on land or land which was held by a deceased person as a shareholder in a company, member of a partnership, joint tenant or tenant in common.

The new proposed section 55f makes provision for the rebate which, by subsection (1), will be limited to those beneficiaries who consist of a widow or widower or a descendant or ancestor of the deceased person. Subsection (2) will provide the formula for ascertaining the amount of the rebate. Before discussing the formula, I pass to the other provisions of the Bill.

In the first place, the rebate will not apply to any interest passing by way of deed of gift, or gift or settlement or under any of the circumstances described in the special cases mentioned in section 32 of the Act. The rebate will be made only where the Commissioner is satisfied that the size and condition of the land and the circumstances are such that it is capable of being used for the business of primary production. This provision is made by proposed new section 55g. The beneficiary on whose behalf an application for a rebate is made must satisfy the Commissioner that it is his or her intention to continue to use the land for primary production, and the Commissioner is empowered to obtain a declaration and any other information that he considers necessary for the purpose of satisfying himself on this point. These provisions are contained in the proposed new section 55h.

The formula for ascertaining the rebate is set out in subsection (2) of the proposed new section 55f. It is measured by reference to the total amount of property, including any land used for primary production, taken by the beneficiary. Where such total property

does not exceed £20,000 there will be a rebate of 30 per cent. Where the total property taken is over £100,000 the rebate is a proportion equal to the ratio of £16,000 to such total amount. If the total of the property received by the beneficiary were £112,000, to take a simple example, the rate would be one-seventh of the amount of duty attributable to the portion of the property taken as which consists of land used for primary production and, as the total value of the property taken by the beneficiary increases, the amount of rebate decreases.

I have not dealt with sub-paragraphs (b) and (c) of subsection (2) which cover cases between £20,000 and £100,000. In these cases the formula is applied. Between £20,000 and £40,000, the rebate is a proportion of the duty on the land used for primary production equal to £6,000 plus one-fifth of the excess over £20,000, over the total succession. Between £40,000 and £100,000, the rebate is a proportion of the duty equal to £10,000 plus one-tenth of the excess over £40,000 over the total succession.

Perhaps two simple illustrations will explain how the formula works. Let us suppose that a widow receives under will in all £30,000 worth of property. The rebate of duty on land used for primary production will be £6,000 plus one-fifth of £10,000—namely, £8,000 over £30,000, or four-fifteenths, a rebate of approximately 27 per cent. Let us suppose again that a widow receives property in all valued at £70,000. In this case the formula is £10,000 plus one-tenth of £30,000 over £70,000, or thirteen-seventieths, a rebate of approximately 18 per cent.

It will be seen, as I said earlier, that the amount of the rebate diminishes as the total amount of property taken by the beneficiary increases. The maximum amount of rebate is 30 per cent, while on £116,000 the amount of the rebate is something like 14 per cent. Of course, as I have already said, the rebate will not apply to the whole of the property taken by the beneficiary but only to that part of it which consists of land used for primary production.

I believe that a measure of relief along the lines which I have mentioned will commend itself to all members. I think they have realized that our primary production lands today, owing to circumstances completely removed from anything that can be gained from primary production, have assumed capital values far in excess of their actual primary production value; but, when it comes to paying probate, those properties are assessed upon the

fictitious value, and the person who is left to carry on primary production is frequently in very difficult circumstances indeed. Unfortunately, on this account, a number of properties have been sold up which would have been continued in primary production in other circumstances. It is unnecessary for me to do more than mention the importance of our primary production. I would believe that this measure would do much to encourage primary producers to keep their farms in the family as going concerns, to the ultimate benefit not only of the family but also of the State as a whole.

The remission of duty set out in clause 5 of the Bill, which amends the second schedule, is based on requests that the Government has had from time to time from various charitable organizations and the Government feels that everything should be done to encourage the continuation and development of these organizations which themselves secure contributions from private subscriptions and derive, in many cases, considerable assistance from voluntary workers..

So far as the University, School of Mines, Waite Research Institute, and Medical and Veterinary Institute are concerned, these are all public educational bodies heavily supported already by State grants and the Government believes that the exemption should be extended to them.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

HALLETT COVE TO PORT STANVAC RAILWAY BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

PASTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

HIDE, SKIN, AND WOOL DEALERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

LAND AGENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2).

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

WRONGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

STOCK DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT
BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

NURSES REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT
BILL.

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

For some time the Nurses Board of South Australia has had in mind a proposal for the training and enrolment of nurse aides and information was sought from the other States of the Commonwealth regarding their attitude to such a scheme. At a Ministers' Conference in 1956 it was agreed that Victoria be authorized to call a conference with representatives from each State to consider the terms of training and practice for nurse aides and reciprocity between the States in regard to them. However, no action was taken because the subject of nursing control in that State became a matter for Government consideration during that year. New legislation was drafted and a new body, known as the Victorian Nursing Council, was created and given powers, far in excess of those given to the old Nurses Registration Board, to control all aspects of nursing, including those relating to nurse aides.

Following this, some of the other States acted independently in the matter of nurse aides, and it has now been ascertained that South Australia and Queensland are the only States without a training scheme for nurse aides. The purpose of this Bill is to give status to a large number of persons performing nursing duties in nearly all hospitals but who have had no organized training. They can be divided into two groups. There are, first, nurse attendants. These are adults who for various reasons are unable to undertake the course of training for general nurses. Some have not the necessary educational standard and others are not able to live in at the training school because of home commitments. The second group comprises nurse assistants, being girls who are too young to commence training or who have not the necessary educational standard.

Nurse aides can be employed in the nursing of the chronic sick and patients who are not in need of highly skilled surgical or medical care. General nurses can thus be released for the more serious cases. The standard of training proposed for nurse aides will be similar to Part I of the course of training undertaken

by a general trainee, but at a lower level. Steps will be taken to ensure that a nurse aide is not compelled to undertake duties for which she is not trained and which are the province of the trainee or trained general nurse. Following a period of 12 months' training and the passing of the required examination, a further year of nursing under the supervision of a registered nurse, in a hospital approved by the Nurses Board, will be undertaken before the trainee will be eligible for enrolment as a nurse aide.

The Bill is in substantially the same form as the amendment made in 1954 (as amended in 1956) to provide for the training and enrolment of mothercraft nurses. Clause 4 inserts into the principal Act a new Part IIIB consisting of seven new sections. Section 33h will provide for a roll of nurse aides. Section 33i will provide that persons entitled to enrol will be those who have passed the prescribed examinations and passed through the prescribed course of training. Provision is also made in this new section for the enrolment of persons who have been in practice as nurse aides or nurse attendants for five years and who are at least 30 years of age; such persons must, however, apply for enrolment within one year of the commencement of the amending Act.

Section 33j will make provision for the enrolment of persons trained outside the State along lines similar to those concerning mothercraft nurses. Section 33k will provide that a person must be of good character, 19 years of age and of sound health. The age of 19 years is provided as it is considered that the age of entry for training should not be less than 17 and it is contemplated that the complete course will involve 12 months of training and a further year of nursing under supervision.

Section 33l will make the necessary consequential additions to various sections of the principal Act concerning enrolment. Sections 33m and 33n will provide the conditions upon which enrolment may be cancelled along similar lines to those which apply to mothercraft nurses. Clause 3 makes consequential amendments to the principal Act. Clauses 5, 6, 7 and 8 are also consequential. They make applicable in respect of nurse aides the penal provisions against unqualified persons. Clause 9 extends the regulation-making power to the making of provisions regarding nurse aides. Clause 10 provides that it will not come into force until it is proclaimed. It is considered desirable that the necessary regulations should

be prepared before the amendments become law.

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

BIRTHS AND DEATHS REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is designed to effect a change in procedure relating to the registration of births and deaths so as to make it possible to relieve, as far as practicable, members of the police force of duties as assistant district registrars under the Births and Deaths Registration Act and to effect an overall saving in the administrative expenses of the registration branch of the Statistical Department. The Bill also seeks to simplify and clarify the procedure relating to the registration of births and deaths and to burials.

Clause 2, which postpones the commencement of the Act to a day to be fixed by proclamation, will enable such administrative steps to be taken as are necessary before the Act is brought into operation. Clause 3 is the formal incorporation of the provisions of the Bill with the principal Act.

The effect of clause 4 is to avoid the necessity of an informant recording the necessary particulars for the registration of a birth in the presence of a district registrar or assistant district registrar. The intention is that every information statement delivered to an informant will be accompanied by explanatory directions as to the manner of furnishing the required particulars. Clause 5 clarifies the provisions of section 19 of the principal Act which deal with the registration of the birth of a child born out of lawful marriage.

Clause 6 clarifies the provisions of section 20 by expressly authorizing the Principal Registrar himself to do what he may authorize one of his officers to do. Paragraph (a) of clause 7 similarly clarifies the provisions of section 22, while paragraphs (b) and (c) of that clause effect consequential amendments. Clause 8 has, with respect to the registration of deaths, the same effect as clause 4 has with respect to the registration of births.

Clause 9 brings section 29 into line with section 20 as amended by clause 6. Paragraph (a) of clause 10 is designed to avoid unnecessary delay in registration in cases where a coroner's inquest is held into the death of any person. It is felt that notification of the

coroner's verdict, if given to the Principal Registrar instead of a district registrar, would expedite the registration.

The Cremation Act prohibits the cremation of a body until a cremation permit is issued by the Principal Registrar or one of his officers, but provides that no such permit shall be issued unless the death of the person whose body is to be cremated has been duly registered. The new subsection (3) of section 31 added by paragraph (b) of clause 10 is designed to permit the registration of the death and the issue of the cremation permit in cases where the coroner's investigation into the cause of death is complete, but no verdict has been given. This will also permit the cremation where further examination of the body is, in the coroner's opinion, not necessary.

Clause 11 brings section 32 into line with other amended sections by imposing on the Principal Registrar the same duties as are imposed on district and assistant district registrars. The new section 32a enacted by clause 12 gives legal force to the necessary administrative practice of withholding the registration of death in the absence of the certificate of a medical practitioner who attended the last illness of the deceased person or of an authority from the coroner who held an inquest into the death. Clause 13 brings section 33 (which deals with burials) into line with the provisions of new section 32a. Members will see that this is entirely a machinery measure.

Mr. LOVEDAY secured the adjournment of the debate.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 11. Page 1559.)

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—As the Premier said in introducing this Bill yesterday, it is not as formidable as its appearance would indicate. As far as I can understand, the Premier stated the position accurately when he indicated that it was purely a machinery measure to overcome certain difficulties that had occurred as a result of the provisions in the parent Act. In effect, it defines the power of local courts, which can hear compensation claims of up to a certain amount. It increases the amount over which a local court can have jurisdiction from £450 to £1,250, and makes it easier to deal with the estates of persons who have disappeared and cannot be found. It also reduces the time limit

for completion of a transfer from six months to one month, which I understand is necessary. I support the second reading.

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

VERMIN ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 11. Page 1559.)

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—I rise to support this Bill with a good deal of pleasure because it makes two amendments to the existing law which will make for the better working of that law. The control of vermin in South Australia, which most people understand to be the control of rabbits, is very important. In days gone by, particularly in the fringe country and the outside pastoral country, the rabbits had more to do with the stock losses that periodically occurred in those areas than did droughts. Very fortunately, as a result of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization's experiments with the various means of eradicating rabbits, at last myxomatosis was found to work very effectively. I understand that as time goes on rabbits are developing a resistance, or a resistant strain of rabbit is being reared, and the disease is not nearly so effective as it was in the early stages. It therefore becomes more imperative that the orthodox methods of dealing with rabbits should be resorted to whenever and wherever possible.

Every local governing body in my electorate has approached me and asked that the law should be improved in this respect. In fact, some bodies went further and suggested that we should substantially increase the penalties for non-compliance with the law. I think the penalties at present are substantial enough, provided the local authority exercises the full power it now has to deal with the position. In addition to bringing the landowner before a court and having him fined for non-compliance with the law, the local authority, if it so desires, can also take steps to employ people to carry out any necessary eradication measures on the landowner's property and recover the cost of such rabbit destruction from that landowner. That is probably one of the best means of bringing landowners who may be somewhat lethargic or recalcitrant to recognize that this is the kind of legislation that must be obeyed.

The original Act provided for the giving of notice, but no time was stipulated wherein the notice should be given. The present Bill provides that one month's notice must be given by the local authority to the person whom it desires to comply with the Act, or it may extend the notice for such further time as it feels necessary. More specific provision is made in the escape clause, which was inserted after much consideration when this legislation was formerly before Parliament. That escape clause provided that where the physical features associated with the land were such that it was impossible to destroy rabbit warrens, that should be a sufficient defence. Apparently it has been interpreted as having a much wider application than was thought by Parliament. When we passed that section we felt that when we referred to physical features we referred to creeks, watercourses, gullies, and places like that where it was virtually impossible to take effective steps to deal with rabbit warrens, but the question of acreage has been brought into it and the size of the area concerned has been used, I understand, as a defence in some cases. This Bill provides that what is meant by physical features will be those things that we thought we were providing for when the original Act was passed, and the escape clause will now be restricted in that way. I have pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. JENKINS (Stirling)—I support the Bill, particularly the provision which provides for one month after the giving of notice for the landholder to comply with the order of a council. I am pleased that the Minister has brought down this amendment, as he promised towards the end of last session after I had taken a deputation to him from a district council in my electorate. It appeared that the council had warned landholders to rip burrows in order to eradicate rabbits, but some orders were not complied with and the council had then given those offending landholders 14 days' notice. Finally, five landholders did not comply with the order; on the expiry of the notice five were taken to court, and I believe the magistrate held that three had not had sufficient time. The district council had been very active and thorough in its eradication of vermin within this area, and was rather discouraged that 14 days' notice should be considered insufficient. A deputation from that council then came to the Minister to see what could be done about the matter.

Apparently this provision to extend the time to one month is something on which a magistrate can work. The time may be extended if necessary. I think this provision will overcome any disability, and I consider that one month should be ample time for most landholders to comply with a notice issued by the local council.

The Leader has referred to the question of physical features. I think everyone thought the same as the Leader did, namely, that physical features referred to creeks and steep land where it was impossible for a tractor to rip burrows, but apparently it was held to refer to large areas. I think it probably also applies to burrows that are in very thick scrub and large areas where it is not very easy to take eradication measures.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo)—Coming from a country district with hundreds of square miles of country that at one time was overrun with rabbits, I should not merely give a silent vote on this measure. The Bill, of course, merely clarifies certain sections that have been abused. Its object is to enable councils to have a tightening effect on those who are slow to co-operate in eradication measures. It is a curious streak in some people that they are fully aware of the advantages to be gained in carrying out the provisions of the Act, but they refrain from doing so, at cost to themselves, to their neighbours, and to the State in general. They are a source of worry from time to time to district clerks and councils. With the passing of this Bill a definite time limit will be attached.

In years gone by I have seen hundreds of acres of good sheep feed cleaned up by rabbits overnight along the coastal districts in my electorate, and acres and acres of crop have disappeared overnight simply because some landholders have refrained from carrying out the provisions of the Act. I have seen some landowners use the poison cart fumigation methods and plough in warrens, and then their neighbours have not co-operated or done anything about the position, and this is a very unsatisfactory state of affairs.

I think the mere fact of a definite time limit being attached to this amendment will bring about closer co-operation between councils and landowners. I well remember that during the depression days the old bunny was a salvation to many people who were less fortunate than we are today. While I was attached to the Methodist church at Minlaton I was deputed one day to go to Brentwood to visit some people there. I called at a home

occupied by a lady and five little children; they were all sitting around the table and each had a plate full of bunny. That was the only food the lady was able to give her family that night. Of course, the old bunny served a useful purpose in days gone by, but those days have gone and I hope they never return.

After section 23 is amended no longer will owners of large holdings be able to defend themselves on account of the size of their properties. I do not want the House to feel that I am being unjust to those people, but I feel that if they are in a position to acquire those holdings they must be willing to accept the responsibilities attached to them. Clause 3 amends section 22a (1) by providing a definite time limit as follows:—

One month from the date of giving of the said notice, or any further period as is specified in the notice.

No longer will the occupiers of large holdings be able to defend themselves under the Act. The size of their property has given them the excuse that the expression "physical features" excluded them from complying with the Act. The areas under the expression "physical features" are clearly defined in clause 4, and district councils will welcome this amendment.

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

MENTAL HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 17. Page 783.)

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—I take the opportunity of attempting, in supporting the second reading of this Bill, to pay a tribute to those who care for the unfortunate people who are mentally ill in South Australia. I refer to Dr. Birch and the other doctors who assist him. Mental illness is one of the saddest afflictions that people can suffer. If we compare what is being done in South Australia with what is being done in other States, we must realize that we are not only not behind the times in caring for those who are mentally ill, but in many respects somewhat ahead of other places. I know we have some accommodation difficulty, but that has been overcome to some extent. It is not nearly so serious as it was a few years ago and will no doubt be overcome completely soon. That is due in some measure to the fact that there are now more recoveries. The percentage of recoveries is much greater now than it was

a few years ago amongst the patients unfortunately committed to our mental institutions. That is due to two reasons. It is mainly due to the excellent work of Dr. Birch and the others I have mentioned, but it is also due to the fact—and we on this side of the House can take some credit for this—that we have at least been able to get the Government to recognize that mental illness should be treated for what it is, an illness, and that there is the possibility of recovery given favourable conditions. So, the accommodation difficulty has been overcome considerably and the general outlook of the public towards those suffering from mental illness has improved much in recent years.

This Bill deals, so far as I can remember, with three things only. First, it provides that the present rules relating to the Public Trustee's administering the property of all persons who are inmates of mental hospitals shall now be amended to provide that in proper cases a person who is sufficiently capable of handling his own affairs may be permitted to handle his affairs while he is in hospital. That is all to the good.

Secondly, in the case of those lucky people—it is rather paradoxical to say that a person in a mental hospital is a lucky person, but I mean those lucky enough to have means and share-holdings—if further share issues happen to be made while they are in an institution, the Bill removes any difficulty there may be in their taking up the shares or having the shares taken up on their behalf. Thirdly, it provides that the property the residue of those who have died may be dealt with in an easier manner than at present.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside)—I rise in support of this Bill because it shows a realistic appreciation of present-day thinking with regard to mental health. Any official recognition of the fact that mental disease is an illness which like many others responds to treatment is a step in the right direction, and the amendment to subsection (1) of section 98 proposed in this Bill does this by retaining to the patient certain rights in respect of the administration of his estate unless the superintendent certifies that this section shall apply. I feel it could well be applied too to the Parkside Mental Hospital, where many patients are by virtue of old age only who still retain a lively interest in their own affairs and who are far from being incapable of having some say in how those affairs should be disposed. Fortunately, the emphasis these days is moving

towards stressing the positive rather than the negative qualities in cases of physical handicap, and this is so too in people who are mentally afflicted.

There is no longer the old stigma that used to be attached to persons suffering from mental ills, one reason for this being that members of the public are better informed about the methods used to treat mental disabilities through the improved facilities provided in many of our hospitals. Another factor is the emphasis placed on the early education of children afflicted in this way in special schools and centres set up by either voluntary agencies or the Government. All these things have served to move people to demand more and even better conditions for these people, be they children, adolescents or adults, with the result that the ratio of patients in our mental hospitals per 1,000 of the population has decreased from 3.29 in 1949 to 2.81 this year. That is an improvement certainly, but we must continually strive to do even better.

I have for a long time been deeply concerned about the welfare of physically handicapped people and, as is so often the case, when one is interested in a particular sphere of social work one becomes involved in allied interests. Hence my concern about the mentally sick, of whom there are 2,667 in our mental hospitals including a considerable number of children and old people. These figures exclude the Enfield Receiving Home and Minda, which accepts only children and where 397 are in residence. And what a magnificent work that home does! In addition, 100 children are attending retarded children's occupation centres at Kent Town and Woodville, and approximately 20 at Suneden. Wonderful work is being done by these voluntary organizations and the Government, through its occupation centres, in providing the kind of limited schooling suited to children with mental afflictions of varying degrees.

Some of these children are educable to a limited degree, according to their mentality, but many are incapable of deriving any benefit but the smallest. What is provided then really amounts to occupational therapy. I know so well the heartache of parents of an afflicted child, and how even the slightest little advance fills one with hope that something tangible can be achieved with patience and perseverance. The really tragic problem arises when the child reaches 16 and school-days are at an end. Some of these children can be

trained to perform some simple, useful and partially remunerative task, and a most interesting experiment is taking place at North Adelaide where the Retarded Children's Society of South Australia has started a kind of sheltered workshop. Here these 16-year olds and older are packaging goods for an Adelaide firm. In setting the target for the first week, the promoters were doubtful whether the children could reach the goal set, but so enthusiastic were they that the week's quota was filled in the first half-day. I should like to see the Government interest itself in such a heart-warming project because this is just a beginning in showing what such children can do and could to a limited extent relieve the pressure on our mental hospitals.

In contrast is the fact that Northfield has wards for approximately 100 mental deficient, many of whom are children, and for them no schooling whatever, even of an occupational nature, is provided. Even allowing that the majority of them are assessed at well below normal school level, some are mildly trainable and some effort should be made to try to give these children some healthy and time-filling therapy. I understand that some of the nursing staff at Northfield have been attending and observing at the occupation centres with a view to doing something to improve the lot of their young charges. However, there is no definite plan in view and the matter is only at the discussion stage. I do suggest most sincerely that consideration be given to the provision of a skilled teacher in education of this kind at Northfield.

It is wrong, too, that there should be children at Parkside even though they are segregated from the older patients. I know that the hospital authorities are not happy at this arrangement but, however temporary, it is at least a sanctuary until proper and adequate provision is made for them in a separate home. If my calculations are correct, the estimated expenditure on mental institutions this financial year is about £1½ million, including the provision of £5,120 for the Child Guidance Centre, £5,000 to Minda Home, £1,600 to Suneden and the maintenance of the occupation centres. Under the States Grants (Mental Institutions) Act of 1955 provision is made for financial assistance to the States in relation to mental institutions. The total paid to this State is limited under this Act to £895,000 and reimburses the State for one-third of the expenditure involved in the erection or alteration of buildings, or to enable the State to acquire

equipment for such institutions. Serious consideration should be given by the Government, under this arrangement, to setting up such an establishment and thus relieving the pressure on Minda Home, Northfield and Parkside.

One of the greatest drawbacks in our approach to social problems in this State has been our lack of a Chair of Mental Health which would provide the facilities for training social workers, psychologists and psychiatrists who are the backbone of any preventive measures—so essential in problems affecting the mental health of the community. Nothing has given me—and many other people—greater pleasure for a long time than to read in the press last week that the University of Adelaide had accepted the offer of the Mental Health Association of South Australia to finance the establishment of a Chair of Mental Health next year—World Mental Health Year. The association must surely merit the thanks of the entire community in giving this lead towards meeting mental health needs in this way and they deserve the whole-hearted support of the public.

There is provision on the Estimates this year for £5,120 for the staffing of the Child Guidance Centre for which a suitable property has been obtained. To procure the services of a psychiatrist, psychologist and social worker is the stumbling block and such a centre simply cannot function and be an effective unit in any preventive mental health service until such appointments are made. This sadly overdue centre highlights the need for a Chair of Mental Health.

I suggest that we should completely re-orientate our thinking on this subject towards one of prevention and though I have—with the indulgence of the House, and I thank members for it—digressed to cover the case of the mentally afflicted child I feel that the amendment before the House contributes to this theory in the case of the adult. Conceding to a patient the right to have some say in his affairs is to build up his faith in himself thus arresting or preventing further deterioration in his mental condition. It also helps him to feel that there is a good chance that he will respond to treatment and this belief contributes to his ultimate recovery and discharge. I support the Bill.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga)—I join with the Leader in paying a tribute to Dr. Birch and his staff, both professional and lay; he has an excellent staff under his guidance at Enfield. I had the honour to be a member of

the committee that inquired into public health services, and which travelled to all the eastern States taking evidence from the best authorities it could obtain. Mental health was one aspect the committee examined, and I think without exception we were told in each State that Dr. Birch knew as much about this matter, if not more, as anyone they could recommend. This was a high compliment because, after all, Dr. Birch's institutions are not numerically as large as those in the eastern States. Despite that, his work was so well-known that we were recommended to accept his advice, which we did. One of the things that Dr. Birch advised was that we should have a mental hospital as such, not a mental institution as we have at the moment, where patients who have a very good chance of recovery are housed with patients who have absolutely no chance. I agree with him entirely. We clutter up Parkside, which is really an institution for the treatment of the mentally sick, not only with aments, but with the senile.

The senile, unfortunately, can blame society for the fact that we have to house them in an institution at all. I think it is a slur on our community that the children of these elderly people do not accept responsibility for looking after them when they reach an age at which they cannot look after themselves. This would not happen in some of the countries we are inclined to look down on in matters of civilization. There, these people would not leave their old folk out in the cold or even in the care of some institution, but would look after them. Asiatics are noted for their ancestor worship and reverence for the aged. It is a pity we do not follow their example, as it would save unnecessary suffering. After all, when these people reach an age when they do not know everything that is going on, they should be cared for by their own.

The State should consider whether or not some other form of institutional accommodation should not be provided for the irrecoverables—the aments—and another institution entirely for these people who, by virtue of the passage of years and the failure of their own people to take care of them, must have a home somewhere. I compliment the member for Burnside on her contribution to this debate. I shall not take her to task for discussing matters not relevant to the subject, as they are more or less associated problems in another field; I refer to her remarks on handicapped children. I compliment her for drawing attention to the excellent work done

by the Mental Health Association. I am a member of that association and I think it is doing excellent work.

I join with the honourable member in expressing the pleasure of the association that the Government is listening to its plea for the establishment of a Chair of Mental Health at the University. Personnel is needed in this field more than buildings; we can build the finest buildings in the world, but they will not do much good if we have not sufficient staff. Skilled personnel in this field is our major problem. The Public Works Committee called Dr. Dibden, who is probably one of our leading private psychiatrists, to give evidence on what should be done at Magill Reformatory. Dr. Dibden emphasised that there was a shortage of skilled psychiatrists and social workers. The psychiatrist does not deal with the attention, of course, so it is necessary to have a trained staff to carry out his directions. It is important that his treatment should be followed, so some other trained personnel is necessary to carry out his directions. These are the shortages from which we are suffering. Dr. Birch has to have at Parkside people with a calling, which after all it is, as nobody would choose to work amongst these people, some of whom are hopelessly sick. Fortunately, there is a missionary type that feels it has a calling and a duty, and it is that type that makes a success of this work.

Mr. O'Halloran—Is it a calling or a vocation?

Mr. SHANNON—I think it is a calling.

Mr. O'Halloran—I think it is a vocation.

Mr. SHANNON—No doubt it is a vocation, and it should be a highly trained one. I used the other word only to explain the moral aspect relating to the person who takes up this fine vocation. Dr. Birch has pointed out the need for trained personnel. I think that, given the necessary monetary incentive, we have the right upper crust to direct the proper expenditure in this field. Any money devoted to this purpose would be wisely spent; I say this on my knowledge of this matter since 1940. I know some problems Dr. Birch has to handle. If this were purely a hospital for the treatment of people who had a chance of recovery I think still better work could be done. This would relieve the administrative staff, because it must be difficult to have people who cannot recover in the same institution with people who can.

I have only one comment to make on the rather simple changes suggested in this Bill.

It is a safeguard for the mentally sick, some of whom will recover, if during their illness opportunities are taken for their estates to benefit by taking out shares. If this opportunity is not taken before they come back into society, the opportunity may pass. We should not allow their estates to suffer, so I think this is a wise provision. The other provision dealing with unclaimed assets, I think, could be improved. Six years after a patient leaves the institution, his assets may revert to the Treasury. However, in the event of his ultimately turning up and being identified as the person involved, the Treasurer, upon receiving a proper certificate from the department, can then return to him the moneys to which he is entitled.

It seems to me that the provision for looking after these folk is a good one. Where a person dies and has no beneficiary to whom money can be left, that amount would obviously be very small. I support the Bill, and I ask the Government to look at this

problem, which is one in respect of which we should be getting the best value for the money we are spending. I personally feel that in some respects we are not getting the best value, and I think the Government should be pursuing a policy of getting the best we possibly can in the recovery rate in our mental hospitals, which I think should be our goal. Although I understand that Dr. Birch has the highest recovery figure a thousand of any similar institution in Australia, I do not think we should rest on our laurels and say we are doing all that can be done. Dr. Birch might be able to improve on those figures if he were given further relief, which I suggest should be given him.

Mr. MILLHOUSE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.02 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, November 17, at 2 p.m.