HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, December 1, 1959.

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

QUESTIONS.

RAILWAY GAUGE STANDARDIZATION.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Some time ago, following on the receipt from the Commonwealth Government of submissions connected with the standardization of the railway gauge in the Peterborough division, the Premier made a statement, although not a considered one, because, he said, he had not had time to consider the matter thoroughly. He said that the matter was being referred to the South Australian Railways Commissioner for advice and report. In view of the interest in this matter, can he now make a full statement on the position or will he make available to members a copy of the Commonwealth's submissions and the Railways Commissioner's replies thereto?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have not yet sent to the Commonwealth Government the full submission that the Railways Commissioner is preparing. It involves many calculations and much work. I have had an interim report from him, which has been made available to the Prime Minister, who has informed me that he has discussed this matter with Senator Paltridge and will submit it to Federal Cabinet. Apparently some progress is being made. I have no objection to acquainting members with the Commonwealth Railways Commissioner's submissions or to making the South Australian submission available to them. However, I point out that it is extremely technical and I could not make much out of it without reference to all the working figures that went to make up the report. However, I can summarize the attitude of our Railways Commissioner. The State Government agrees with most of his submissions. We do not believe it is possible to get the necessary turn round of trains and the carriage of goods with the rolling stock the Commonwealth Railways Commissioner proposes. We think it is totally inadequate, and it is much less than is provided for in the Standardization Agreement. Secondly, we do not agree that the tonnage suggested could be made available in standardizing the Quorn and Wilmington lines. In any case, this issue has already been agreed upon by both the Commonwealth and State and it is not at present a matter subject to review. There are one or two other matters concerning deviations that require further work before a conclusive picture can be obtained. The Commonwealth Railways Commissioner believes that no deviations should be made and that deviations would not be profitable. Our Commissioner believes that two small deviations would be extremely profitable. I am quite happy to make the document available to any member to peruse freely and I have no objection to his quoting from it if he desires.

DISTRIBUTION OF EGGS.

Mr. LAUCKE—The prevailing drought conditions in South Australia will inevitably have a heavy impact on local poultry farmers' feeding costs for the ensuing 12 months. These increased unavoidable costs underline the necessity for keen attention to be paid to the elimination of avoidable costs and charges to the producer wherever possible. A means to this end is the minimizing of transport costs on interstate egg movement, which costs, on an all-Australian basis, must be excessively high and which ultimately must be paid for by the industry as a whole. With a view to avoiding unnecessary and wasteful movement of eggs interstate, will the Minister of Agriculture endeavour to have all State egg boards confer with the object of achieving a co-ordinated and orderly policy of egg distribution on the home market on a Federal basis?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I will consider this question and let the honourable member have a more detailed reply later. At present there is little likelihood of an agreement such as he suggests. This subject has been discussed frequently and generally there is considerable opposition from some other States, although the chairman of the South Australian board is keen for some agreement that will achieve what the honourable member suggests. At the moment the various boards are attempting to reach agreement in this matter, but I do not think much progress has been made. The greatest difficulty arises in Sydney where local producers will not enter into an agreement that does not provide them a better price on the Sydney market than other producers will receive. I have already dealt with the question of interstate transport this session—during the passage of the Marketing of Eggs Act Amendment Bill and on other occasions—and it is constantly exercising the minds of the authorities. On the other hand, things are not as bad as perhaps they sound,

and because of the interstate sales of eggs the South Australian Egg Board has been much better off in the short run than it would have been had it had to export surplus eggs overseas.

MARION HIGH SCHOOL FIRE.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked on November 18 regarding the Marion high school fire, and can he indicate what compensation can be granted to teachers and students who lost books in the fire?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Two points arose in connection with this matter—

(*a*) the immediate supply of books required to enable school work to be carried on for the remainder of this term; and

(*b*) the making good of losses incurred by students and teachers in the fire.

In connection with (*a*) I am happy to say that arrangements were immediately made for such books as were needed to be supplied to the students, and the school work has continued without interruption. After receiving a report from the Director of Education I referred to Cabinet the question of reimbursement for personal possessions and school property lost in the fire. Cabinet has now approved of the following:—

(*a*) Replacement of destroyed school books which would be needed next year or later.

(*b*) Payment to teachers for loss of teaching aids and personal property.

(*c*) Replacement of school library books.

(*d*) Replacement of school equipment originally purchased on subsidy.

(*e*) Payment to children for loss of possessions (other than school books), except in the case of articles left at the school contrary to school rules.

The prinicipal of the Marion high school will be asked to prepare a detailed list of losses under each of these headings so that action as approved may be taken to make good the losses of teachers, students, and school. Payment will not be made in respect of destroyed school books no longer needed by the students, in view of the fact that these were purchased out of book allowances made available by the Government.

PARINGA CAUSEWAY.

Mr. KING—Has the Minister of Works obtained a reply from the Minister of Roads to the question I asked recently about the Paringa causeway?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—My colleague, the Minister of Roads, has received a report from the Commissioner of Highways to the effect that, owing to unforeseen foundation difficulties, it was necessary to reconsider pier design and span lengths of the bridges on the Paringa causeway. The design work has therefore been delayed. The design and drawing of the four bridges is now being done simultaneously, and it is anticipated that these will be completed by the third week in January. Quantity surveys, estimates and specifications will be ready for calling tenders about the end of February. Plans for earthworks will be completed before the end of December.

TYPHOID FEVER.

Mr. HUTCHENS—It has been reported in the press, and over the air by the Australian Broadcasting Commission, that two cases of typhoid have occurred in the western districts, one a girl of 14 and one a boy of younger age. I understand that the disease is highly contagious and more often than not is spread by a carrier. In this instance endeavours were made to find the carrier. Can the Premier say whether the carrier has been found, and, if not, will he ask the Minister of Health to have the symptoms of the disease publicized so that a victim of the complaint may receive early treatment? I do not want to create panic, but I think every care should be taken.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I know that the department has made intensive efforts in a check amongst those who have contracted the disease in the hope of getting down to the source, but I do not know whether it has been successful or not. I will inform the honourable member further tomorrow.

REINSTATEMENT OF ROADS.

Mr. DUNNAGE—Has the Minister of Works any further information regarding the reinstatement of the roadway on Glen Osmond Road and South Road, following on the laying of mains in those two roads?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I have received the following report from the Engineer-in-Chief:—

Glen Osmond Road.—The department has completed the laying of mains in this road and orders were placed on the Highways Department for the reinstatement of the roadway, as

is the usual custom. The work on this reinstatement has been commenced.

South Road.—Work on the laying of a 6in. main in this road was commenced adjacent to the Castle Inn and work proceeded in a southerly direction as far as Daws Road. Along this section of the work, the Highways Department was able to keep a gang employed on the reinstatement of the road following closely behind the laying of the main and backfilling of the trench. After reaching Daws Road, the main laying gang returned to the Castle Inn and continued to lay the water main in a northerly direction as far as the Anzac Highway. It is understood that the Highways Department was not able to make available a gang for the immediate restoration of the roadway along this section and it is not known when this reinstatement is expected to be done. Orders have been placed on the Highways Department for the reinstatement of the road surface in the normal way. The District Engineer, Metropolitan, has been asked to make an inspection of the bad place referred to at the corner of Anzac Highway and South Road and if found necessary, further temporary repairs will be carried out.

INCREASED METAL TRADES MARGINS.

Mr. HAMBOUR—My question concerns the granting of the recent increases in metal trades margins, and the statement by the Arbitration Commission that "Considering the aggregate profit of companies and bearing in mind other material before the Commission, it feels that the position of companies is that they are able to bear the increases in wages." As Prices Minister, will the Premier make all possible endeavours to see that the increases are not passed on to consumers?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Members will appreciate that although the Commission may have taken into account the position of a large number of companies it did not consider all companies. It has not been the policy of the Government or the Prices Department to hold business people down to an unprofitable level, and I do not think the honourable member would want that to be done, because it would close up industries and create unemployment and hardship. The Prices Department sees that the public are not exploited by excessive charges and that will be the policy in this matter.

CONCESSION FARES TO PENSIONERS.

Mr. McKEE—My question relates to concession fares for pensioners on private buses. My attention was drawn to an article in the *Advertiser* one day last week which stated that at the annual conference of the Old Age and Invalid Pensioners' Association it was decided to seek a reduction in fares on private buses under Government control. When the approach is made will the Premier give the matter earnest consideration, as pensioners in country towns find living much dearer than those in the metropolitan area. This is not a new request. Many pensioners in country areas are finding it hard to make ends meet and small concessions like this would be a great help to them and appreciated.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Government has carefully considered this matter, but I regret to inform the honourable member that it is not possible this year to consider any extension of the privileges already given. It is not known yet how much those privileges will cost the State. The cost to outside authorities is complete but does not in any way involve bookkeeping entries or cross credits. In other words, the Government would actually have to pay out money, whereas in one instance what it would lose in one respect it would perhaps gain in another. As members know, the Government has had to incur extremely heavy costs this year in providing water for every part of the State. Pumping costs have gone up to an alarming amount, the Government has had to stand very heavy increases under arbitration awards and it is now confronted with another very heavy increase. Additional privileges can be granted only by cutting out something that has already been provided by Parliament, either through the Loan programme or in some other way. I do not know of any activity that Parliament has passed that is not warranted. Much as Cabinet regrets it, it is not able to consider an extension of this concession this year. Perhaps in another year we shall be able to consider it, but the financial position of the State will not allow us to incur additional untoward expenditure this year.

BARLEY MARKETS.

Mr. HALL—In recent years Queensland and Western Australia have become significant barley producers and from reports we hear they are competing for the same markets as the Australian Barley Board. I believe they are cutting prices and as a result returns to our growers have suffered. Does the Minister of Agriculture know of any move to have an Australia-wide organization for the marketing of Australian barley and, if not, will he support any moves originated in that direction?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—The honourable member is correct in saying that there has been some difficulty over the marketing

of barley and that some countries appear to take a certain amount of barley from Australia and no more. It does not matter very much who sells it to them, but they will not increase the amount they buy in all. If Queensland growers and the Australian Barley Board, which includes South Australia and Victoria, wish to compete against each other the buyer benefits, but no-one sells any great amount of barley. This matter was discussed in the Agricultural Council some time ago and as a result the authorities were instructed to confer to see if some reasonable agreement could be reached to avoid any further difficulties such as I have mentioned. Western Australia was in a somewhat different position and did not affect the whole in the same way. I do not know if an overall organization could be provided; that has not been suggested to me. The Australian Barley Board has, on the whole, done extremely well, and I do not know of any approach by or to Queensland to come into that scheme. The Australian Barley Board is set up under Acts in both Victoria and South Australia and I know of no proposal to alter that legislation.

MILLICENT HOUSING.

Mr. CORCORAN—Has the Premier a reply to my recent question relating to the Housing Trust's policy concerning rental homes at Millicent?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Chairman of the Housing Trust has sent me the following report:—

The Housing Trust has 88 rental houses at Millicent, the first of which were completed in 1942. Existing contracts provide for a further 60 houses, of which about 50 will be for rental. However, for the time being, most of the rental houses being completed will be needed to enable the trust to honour its obligation under the Pulp and Paper Mills Agreement Act, 1958.

I will take up this matter with the Trust to see that the building programme is continued.

Mr. CORCORAN—The Premier quoted the number of houses built for rental purposes at Millicent, but I already knew that and am happy about what has been done. I am concerned for the people who cannot get rental homes, particularly those not employed by Cellulose and Apcel. I want to be assured that rental homes will be available for them. Will the Premier keep that in mind?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Probably the best way to deal with the problem, particularly at Millicent, would be to get an officer of the trust to visit the district to make a complete survey of requirements. After that has been done I will inform the honourable member further.

ROAD-MAKING METHODS.

Mr. BOCKELBERG—Has the Minister of Works obtained a reply from the Minister of Roads to my recent question relating to road-making methods used in Western Australia?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—When the honourable member asked this question previously I advised him as well as I was able from my own knowledge, and the report I have now obtained from the Minister of Roads bears out fairly closely the information I then gave. My colleague has received a report from the Commissioner of Highways stating that the areas of Western Australia in which this type of mechanical stabilization was used successfully are in three coastal regions between Perth and Broome. Gravels or other natural materials were not available for orthodox base construction. Sands occurring in coastal dunes and plastic silts further inland were mixed in varying proportions as determined by laboratory tests to produce satisfactory pavements. Whether this type of construction is economical depends on the availability of suitable materials. Although the department is continually testing materials, it has not found sands and silts to which this procedure could be applied in areas where natural gravels or rubbles are not available.

EYRE HIGHWAY.

Mr. LOVEDAY—Has the Minister of Works obtained a reply from the Minister of Roads concerning the proposed route of the Eyre Highway?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I have a report from my colleague, the Minister of Roads, who advises that the Eyre Highway, which is proclaimed in the Main Roads Schedule, commences at Port Augusta, passes Lincoln Gap Station, thence through Iron Knob to Kimba and beyond. Lincoln Highway commences at Lincoln Gap Station and continues southward through Whyalla, Randell Tanks and Cowell. The honourable member's question is, I understand, directed to ascertain whether the connection between Kimba and Port Augusta will be *via* Randell Tanks and Whyalla or Iron Knob and Lincoln Gap, and the Commissioner of Highways states this matter is still under investigation. Before a decision is made, the economics of the two routes will be compared and the local authorities representing communities along Eyre Highway will be consulted.

In the meantime, traffic counts indicate that the reconstruction of Eyre Highway should be first carried out between Kimba and Minnipa.

LINDEN PARK SCHOOL.

Mrs. STEELE—Several residents with properties adjoining the new Linden Park school sportsgrounds at Sturdee Street, Linden Park, have approached me regarding earth movements connected with the construction and levelling of this area. Can the Minister of Works say what steps have been taken in the matters I referred to him last week, namely, the dust nuisance and the close proximity of the built-up earth to the fence of one of the residents?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—An officer of the Architect-in-Chief's Department visited the area, conferred with the people residing adjacent to the Linden Park school oval, and ascertained that in fact there was a dust nuisance due to the necessary movement of large quantities of earth in extremely dry conditions. He promised that an effort would be made to overcome the problem by watering the earth as much as possible. However, I think the honourable member will appreciate that with the soil dry so far down it is extremely difficult to do the work without creating some problem for people nearby. Efforts are being made to minimize that problem. The other matters regarding the proximity of the earth bank to fences and so on are under investigation, and I hope to be able to inform the honourable member in more detail later on what is proposed regarding them.

TELEVISION LOUD SPEAKER NUISANCE.

Mr. LAWN—In May this year when the test television programme commenced the owners of a shop on the Marion Road commenced broadcasting television programmes and erected loud speakers outside the shop with the idea of blasting these programmes around the district. The noise was terrific. Shops opposite had to turn off their radios, and residents had to put up with this noise. A complaint was lodged with the local council, but without result. A complaint was then lodged with the Police Department, and within half an hour a police patrol arrived at the shop and ordered the taking down of at least one piece of broadcasting apparatus outside the shop. This nuisance, however, is continuing, and in recent weeks the volume of noise has increased, and residents cannot get any peace of an evening. Can the Premier, representing the Chief Secretary, say whether the police have any authority to act in the matter, or whether it is purely a matter for the local council?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Without going into the precise powers of the police, I would have thought that the police might give instructions to anyone creating a public nuisance. I could not quote the appropriate section offhand, but I know the police often intervene where a person is creating a public nuisance and tell that person to behave or they will take action. I will obtain the opinion of the Attorney-General in the matter.

RESERVE BANK PLANS.

Mr. HARDING—I think all honourable members know the proposed site of the Reserve Bank in the north-east of Victoria Square. An article in this morning's *Advertiser*, headed "Reserve Bank Plans," states:—

> Six floors of the bank building would be made available to the South Australian Government, because the Reserve Bank's requirements were mainly below ground and on the ground floor for a banking chamber. It would not have a big staff; certainly not enough for a 132ft. high building.

Is it expected that the Reserve Bank building will be built to a height of 132ft., and, if not, can the Premier say whether the original plan has been revised?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The proposal is that the building will go to the full height permitted at present under the City Council by-law. The plan has not been revised. The State Government will lease six floors on a permanent basis, and an additional floor will be available to the State Government, at least for a considerable number of years. The bank will occupy the remaining floors and the vault.

SEPARATE ENFORCEMENT OF WARRANTS.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Following on questions I addressed to the Premier concerning statements by the Police Magistrate on the way in which warrants in default were executed by the Police Force, there appears to have been a further instance in the Adelaide Police Court where the police did not execute a warrant for default in a case where the magistrate desired that warrant to be executed concurrently with a warrant for another sentence which he had imposed. I was so concerned about this matter that I made inquiries, and I have seen the order signed by Inspector Lenton to all personnel in the Police Force directing them that they

are not to execute warrants in default concurrently with warrants for any other sentence. As this would appear to deprive magistrates in many cases of their opportunity to assess the total of sentence which is to be carried out upon a person who appears before them, I ask if the Government will immediately investigate this matter to see whether full discretion can be restored to magistrates in our police courts.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I believe this matter could cut both ways: to the advantage of the person charged, or to his disadvantage. It would depend upon the circumstances. I believe that the Police Force is acting under a Crown Law instruction which is of very long standing, and that only quite recently has there been any suggestion that that instruction is not in accordance with the law or the proper procedure. I will investigate the case mentioned by the honourable member. I understand that when the magistrate saw that the warrant was not executed he accordingly adjusted his penalties to provide for the matter. The procedure has not been altered, but the actual method of imposing penalties may have been subject to some slight variation.

NORTHFIELD RESEARCH CENTRE.

Mr. NANKIVELL—Has the Minister of Agriculture an answer to the question I asked on November 12 regarding the Northfield Research Centre?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—The Director of Agriculture reports:—

Plans and estimates for the research centre building at Northfield are being prepared by the Architect-in-Chief and I am advised that the plans, together with estimates, will be available within the next two or three weeks. Reference of the project to the Public Works Standing Committee will be necessary.

PLYMPTON HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. FRED WALSH—There is some doubt regarding the preparedness of the Plympton high school for occupation by the students at the beginning of the next school year commencing in February. Can the Minister of Education say whether that school may not be ready for occupation, and, if that is so, what alternative accommodation is being provided?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Although the construction of this school is well under way I do not consider that it will be completely ready for occupation by the beginning of the next school year. Accordingly, arrangements are being made to provide temporary alternative accommodation for intending students who will be in the first year of their secondary course. It is proposed that they will be accommodated for a short time at the Fulham primary school. This is a large new school which has recently been completed and is ready for use. If this plan is put into effect it will be necessary to arrange bus transport for the high school students. The temporary use of the Fulham school by these students will not inconvenience intending primary scholars, because there will be ample accommodation for all.

CLAPHAM BRIDGE WIDENING.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Has the Minister of Works a reply to the further question I asked last week about the widening of the Clapham Railway Bridge?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—My colleague, the Minister of Roads, has forwarded a report from the Commissioner of Highways which states that the availability of funds for this type of work will not be known until next year's programme has been formulated. Until this has been done, estimates prepared and traffic studies made, he cannot recommend any definite part of the cost of this bridge as a departmental contribution, particularly as the bridge is on a district road.

ELECTRICITY CHANGE-OVER COSTS.

Mr. BYWATERS—Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on November 19 concerning the high cost to consumers of extending electricity supplies from Mannum to Nildottie?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Mr. Huddleston, Assistant Manager of the Electricity Trust, reports as follows:—

The question asked by Mr. Bywaters, M.P., refers not to charges levied by the Electricity Trust, but to costs incurred by the individual in installing his electrical wiring and apparatus and in many cases changing from existing diesel pumps to electric pumps. The trust appreciates that these costs are often substantial, but nevertheless considers that it can only justify the high cost of extending electricity mains if people are prepared to use the power once it is available.

The case mentioned of possible extension of power supply from Mannum to Nildottie is a very extensive scheme. The actual construction period would exceed 12 months and applicants would have up to two years from the time they accepted the trust's proposal until the power was available. This would present a reasonable period in which the people could arrange the installation of their equipment.

ROAD TO OIL REFINERY.

Mr. JENKINS—In recent months there has been considerable activity by surveyors on the South Road over Tapley's Hill and this morning Electricity Trust employees were moving power lines. Can the Minister of Works say whether that indicates that an early start is to be made on the road to serve the proposed oil refinery?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I will refer the question to my colleague, the Minister of Roads, for report.

PORT AUGUSTA POLICE STATION.

Mr. RICHES—I understand that because of staff difficulties at the Port Augusta courthouse arrangements have been made for the registration of births, deaths and marriages to be transferred to the police station. This has accentuated the accommodation problem at the police station, where there is no accommodation available for the general public. At present 19 officers are accommodated in four rooms and the woman police officer works in a room 11ft. x 10ft., with all the police radio equipment and records. Will the Minister of Works have this matter investigated and give instructions to have done whatever can be done to alleviate the situation? During the last three or four years this matter has been raised from time to time and plans were drawn for a new station. About three years ago provision was made on the Estimates, but for some reason or other the work has been constantly overlooked in favour of work elsewhere. The present situation should not be allowed to continue. Will the Minister endeavour to give me a reply this week?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I have seen the docket relating to the Port Augusta police station on several occasions, and once not long ago. I am rather at a loss to understand the purport of the question, because the honourable member prefaced it by suggesting that because of staff shortages the registration of births, deaths and marriages had been transferred from the courthouse to the police station.

Mr. Riches—The staff of the courthouse.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—If the police station is so overcrowded with staff it would seem logical to transfer a police officer to the courthouse to carry out the duties of registrar.

Mr. Riches—There is no room there.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—If there is a staff problem I cannot see why staff could not be transferred to that building. However, I will make inquiries.

SUBTERRANEAN WATER BASINS.

Mr. LAUCKE—Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question concerning the practicability of recharging subterranean basins with fresh water in winter time through bores or shafts located in lowlying areas that may be subject to flooding?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Following on the honourable member's question I indicated to him that I was aware that certain efforts had been made, with some success, to recharge the subterranean water basins in the Adelaide plains and the metropolitan area. I found on further investigation that in 1955 water was taken from departmental mains for experimental purposes and put down below ground through the mains of existing bores, some of which were operated by gravity and some by pressure. These tests proved that it is feasible to carry out some recharging. The degree of success, however, depends on several factors. First, it can be done profitably only when metropolitan reservoirs are overflowing, and only for the period of the overflow. Secondly, it is necessary to take water from mains as a general rule because the water from surface catchment contains too much foreign matter, which tends to clog up the bores. Generally the underground basin is charged through the geological fault line at the Adelaide foothills, which is the natural replacement source. Some 65,000,000 gallons was successfully transferred in 1955 as the result of these tests. If the honourable member desires to make further research into this matter I suggest that he get Department of Mines Bulletin No. 27, on page 250 of which he will find a comprehensive report by Mr. A. A. Mason entitled, "Artificial Recharging of Adelaide Plains Artesian Basins."

RAIL CARS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Last week when visiting the Adelaide railway station I noticed that work was in progress for the purpose of supplying water in each bay of railway platforms. It would appear that the water is to be used for the cooling down of railcars, which apparently have the habit of running hot. According to the printed timetables the time allowed at the terminus is very limited. If this time is to be used for the cooling down of the engines of the rail cars, can the Minister of Works indicate what effect there will be

on those engines? I understand that, if sufficient time is not allowed to cool down the water in the radiator of a motor car after it has boiled, damage can be expected. Can the Minister also say why the rail cars of the 300 class have not been provided with roof radiators? I understand that four are fitted to the GMH class and six to the Rolls Royce class, leaving 38 for conversion. Would it be possible to have the roof radiator system installed throughout to enable the rail services to be run in accordance with the printed timetables?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I will seek the information desired by the honourable member.

ORGANIZER OF SCHOOL LIBRARIES.

Mrs. STEELE—Some time ago I addressed a question to the Minister of Education regarding the appointment of an organizer of school libraries. Can he say whether such an appointment has been made, or whether one is contemplated to take effect in the next school year?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I am extremely disappointed at the unusually long delay in making the appointment to what I consider to be an important office. Although I have not received any official advice on the matter I have been unofficially informed that the Public Service Board proposes in the near future to recommend that a member of the Public Service fill the position temporarily.

SEED WHEAT SUPPLIES.

Mr. NANKIVELL—On November 12 I asked the Minister of Agriculture whether he had any information concerning supplies of seed wheat likely to be available this year at the Minnipa Research Centre and Roseworthy College. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—Regarding the Minnipa Research Centre, the Director of Agriculture reports that the current estimate of the 1959-60 wheat harvest is 1,900 bushels. From this it is anticipated that 1,550 bushels of graded seed will be obtained. As 250 bushels of this are needed for 1960 sowings at the centre, the amount of pure seed wheat available for sale is expected to be 1,300 bushels. In regard to Roseworthy Agricultural College, the Principal has reported that the amount of seed wheat available will be 1,500 bushels or half the crop, whichever is the lesser. In a normal year the college will sell about 6,000 bushels.

Mr. NANKIVELL—The Minister of Agriculture said that 1,500 bushels of seed wheat was likely to be available from Roseworthy College this season. Can he say whether that includes the carry-over from last year, or whether it is in addition to any carry-over, and if so, roughly how much that carry-over was?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I did say that the amount available would be 1,500 bushels or half the crop, whichever is the lesser. I recall that a certain amount of seed wheat is on hand from last year. I do not think it is a great amount, but I will find out for the honourable member what the amount is.

COOBER PEDY PROSPECTING.

Mr. LOVEDAY—Earlier this year I wrote to the Minister of Mines pointing out the activities of Coober Pedy prospectors. I said that many claims were pegged out around newly discovered finds of opal so that no-one could get near and suggested that each prospector have four pegs officially issued to him by the Mines Department to prevent that happening. Has the Premier any information on the matter?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will take up this matter with the Minister of Mines, and hope to obtain a report.

ELECTRICITY TRUST EMPLOYEES.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Will the Premier reply to the following questions? (1) Is it a fact that for some time past the Electricity Trust has built up a series of highly trained bands of linesmen for the erection of high tension lines and the installation of the single wire earth return system? (2) Is it the case that now a series of the Electricity Trust's contracts have been given to two Italian firms working in South Australia with workmen who are not observing union standards and who are acting without either the equipment or the normal safety devices upon which Australian unionists insist? (3) Is it a fact that numbers of workmen employed by the Electricity Trust have been dispersed from jobs for which they have been trained at the expense of the trust for workmen of this type and notified that they will be liable for reclassification within two years to jobs which are not skilled, although they have been trained at the trust's expense for these jobs? (4) Is it a fact that, upon inspection of certain lines near Port Augusta, installations by one of these firms had been found to be unsatisfactory? If the answer to these questions is "Yes," will the Premier make a statement on the policy of the Electricity Trust on the

employment of Australian workmen trained here as against workmen who are not being given similar standards and who are being imported temporarily from overseas?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I should like the honourable member to put that question on notice, and I shall have a reply on Thursday.

TAILEM BEND TO KEITH WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. BYWATERS—The following statement appeared in a recent issue of the *Murray Valley Standard*:—

The Premier wrote that a report from the Minister of Works (Mr. Pearson) showed that an investigation relating to a larger scheme, also involving Tailem Bend and Keith, was nearly complete and it would shortly be possible to determine the extent to which the two undertakings could be combined.

This report referred to a letter the Premier wrote to one of my constituents relating to a short extension, which has now been approved. This scheme to Tailem Bend and Keith concerns the member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) and myself and we are both interested to know whether it will shortly be referred to the Public Works Committee or whether work of a minor nature will be commenced soon.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The preparatory part, particularly the planning and the hydraulics, of the work from Tailem Bend to Keith has been held up somewhat due to the urgency of the first part of the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline duplication, which has, of necessity, occupied a much higher priority. As much as we would like to have made progress on both schemes, it has not been possible to get on with the Tailem Bend to Keith scheme as fast as we had hoped. However, the main engineering and planning work for the first part of the Morgan-Whyalla main duplication is virtually completed, and it is now hoped to be able to concentrate more on the scheme to which the honourable member referred. Until further work is done I cannot say that the scheme will be ready for presentation to the Public Works Committee but I should think that after the Christmas shut-down the department will be able to give it close attention.

FEED BARLEY PRICES.

Mr. RICHES—Is the Minister of Agriculture able to reply to a question I asked last week concerning the reason for an increase of 1s. 6d. a bushel in the price of feed barley, and can he say how the price for barley sold in Australia to Australian primary producers compares with the price of barley sold overseas?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I do not recall the honourable member's asking me how the price compared with the price on overseas markets, but I have a reply from the Australian Barley Board on the reason for the increase in price. The General Manager of the Barley Board, in a letter to my secretary, stated:—

I should be obliged if you would kindly inform the Minister that the Barley Board raised the price on feed barley from 9s. 6d. to 11s. a bushel at its last board meeting held on November 16. This was the first increase in price for a considerable time, and the price was increased to make it more consistent with the price of other feeds, noticeably oats, which have registered a considerable increase in recent weeks. In any case, a considerable quantity of barley has been sold to other than barley producers and the board felt that it was not the function of barley growers to virtually subsidize other industries at the expense of the growers. This price increase is simply a reflection of increases generally on feeding material. As the board has not made any export sales now for the last three or four months, a true comparison of local and export values cannot be determined. It should be pointed out that the increased revenue for barley growers from this increase will be reflected in the payments made back in due course to barley producers.

ASSISTANCE FOR CANNERIES.

Mr. KING—Last year arrangements were made for canneries that were in difficulties to process the 1958-59 crop. Does the Treasurer know of any plans in hand to assist canneries for the coming crop, and can he say what prospects the growers, who were not paid for the 1958-59 crop, have of receiving payments so that they will be able to make plans for the coming harvest?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—With one or two exceptions the money made available to the canning industry was made available as a normal banking procedure by various banks and not by the State Treasury. In one or two instances the Industries Development Committee recommended an overall guarantee to a bank and that, of course, has been unaltered this year; the firms that had that guarantee, supported by the Industries Development Act, will continue to have it available to them but, of course, it will not be increased. Only one firm has actually been in touch with me about this matter and that firm banked, not with the State Bank, but with a private bank, which agreed, after representations had been made to it, to finance

the cannery for this year's operations. That arrangement was between the bank and the client, and I am not in a position to know the terms.

Last week the member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) asked when the canning industry was likely to have a report from the committee and whether growers were being consulted. I have obtained a report from the chairman of the Canning Industry Committee to the effect that the committee has held 21 or 22 meetings, that it has interviewed 21 or 22 witnesses, and that it has met the case for other grower representatives to appear before it. The committee doubts that the report will be available before this year's canning harvest is commenced, but it is taking evidence from growers. The only cases that have come under my notice have been met by the bank in question and the guarantees given by the Government are, of course, still outstanding.

EROSION IN MID-NORTHERN AREAS.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—During the past fortnight I have travelled over a considerable part of the mid-northern agricultural areas and I have been alarmed at the conditions in certain parts where paddocks, completely devoid of vegetation, are already showing some indications of surface wind drift. If there is a heavy fall of rain this will be increased by sheet erosion caused by water. It seems to me that immediate steps to protect these areas would be advisable. I am not an agricultural scientist and do not know what steps can be taken, but I think fairly deep fallowing or strip ploughing of the paddocks would be a great help. Will the Minister of Agriculture take up this matter with some of his officers to see what practical steps can be taken? These officers may, in turn, be able to advise the persons who are now suffering and may suffer still more.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I will take up this matter with the Soil Conservation Branch. In general, it could be said that the farmers, particularly those in areas north of Adelaide, have had many years of experience since the Soil Conservation Branch began, and that the methods used by the farmers are undoubtedly a great improvement on those used 20 or 30 years ago. Of course, in an extremely dry year like this the soil erosion problem will be severe. Soil erosion is largely a result of the depletion of organic matter in the soil, and, of course, there will be a considerable amount this year. Whatever else happens, it will not be as bad this year as it would have been had we not had improved methods of farming such as those the farmers now follow. I cannot comment on the method of dealing with erosion, but I will get a statement from the Soil Conservator and consider the suggestion that added publicity be given to approved methods of safeguarding the soil in a season like this.

SOUTH PARA FIRE-FIGHTING UNIT.

Mr. LAUCKE—Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question concerning the provision of additional fire-fighting plant in the Mount Crawford pine forest?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—The honourable member, when asking this question, said that during the construction of the South Para reservoir two fire-fighting units were stationed there under the direction of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, and asked whether the Woods and Forests Department would consider providing fire units for the protection of reserves under the control of the Minister of Forests. The District Council of Barossa also wrote about this matter, and that council has been advised by letter from the Conservator of Forests that it would not be possible to accede to the request to replace those two units completely. For the honourable member's information, I have an inventory of what equipment is being held in this area which will show the honourable member that a fair amount of precaution is now being taken. The fire equipment on the Mount Crawford forest reserve is as follows:—

Item 1.—One 4 x 4 Commer Truck on which is mounted a 500-gallon tank with Northey pump and B.S.A. engine, plus ancillary equipment such as hoses, fire rakes, knapsack sprays, auxiliary hand pump, etc.

Item 2.—One Commer Standard Truck on which is mounted a 400-gallon tank with Kelly & Lewis pump and engine, plus ancillary equipment such as hoses, fire rakes, knapsack sprays, auxiliary hand pump, etc.

Item 3.—20 knapsack sprays.

Item 4.—24 fire rakes.

Item 5.—10 miles of telephone system connected to five external points plus intervening houses.

Item 6.—Fire tower which is manned by the department on fire days or when conditions warrant it (during 1958-59 fire season the tower was manned on 56 days).

Item 7.—The department operates the local Emergency Fire Services radio base station and two departmental vehicles are connected to this system. (One at Mount Crawford and one at Kersbrook.)

Item 8.—During the fire season two departmental officers are on duty during all weekends and, in fact, act as the local alarm centre. The local people make a practice of

ringing Mount Crawford and advise their whereabouts in case of alarm.

The honourable member will see that the Woods and Forests Department is certainly pulling its weight in the matter of fire precautions in that district.

WATER SUPPLY FOR HUNDRED OF BURDETT.

Mr. BYWATERS—The *Murray Valley Standard* contains an article dealing with the laying of an additional main to serve a few people in the Hundred of Burdett. It states:—

The Premier reported that Cabinet had approved the laying of this main at an estimated cost of £10,000. In view of this heavy drain on the State's resources in this extremely dry year it was not possible to say exactly when this work would proceed, but Mr. Pearson had stated that it would be put in hand as soon as possible.

Can the Minister of Works elaborate on that statement, and say whether work will be commenced in the ensuing few months of this financial year, or whether it will be done in the next financial year?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The statement to which the honourable member refers was made only within the last few days, and I am not able to add anything to it. As the honourable member knows, the department this year has been faced with very heavy and, I hope, non-recurring emergency expenditure in the supply of water and the rearranging of the supply of water, and that, of course, has had an effect upon the overall funds the department has available for its normal purposes. Until the position is clearer on just how far the Loan Funds will go, I am afraid I am not able to give the honourable member any certain assurance in regard to the particular extension he has mentioned.

HONEY BOARD BALANCE-SHEETS.

Mr. McKEE (on notice)—

1. Has a balance-sheet been prepared by the South Australian Honey Board for the years 1957-58 and 1958-59?

2. Is it a fact that up to 1957 it was the practice of the Honey Board to publish its balance-sheet in its annual report?

3. Has this practice been discontinued? If so, why?

4. Is the board expected to submit a copy of its balance-sheet to the Minister?

5. Is the balance-sheet subject to audit? If so, has the auditor reported on the operations of the board for the years ended 1957-58 and 1958-59?

6. Where can honey producers obtain a copy of the balance-sheet?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—The South Australian Honey Board reports as follows:—

1. Balance-sheets have been prepared by the board for the years 1957-58 and 1958-59.

2. Up till 1957 it was the practice of the board to publish its balance-sheets in its annual reports.

3. This practice was discontinued after 1956-57 when the board decided that, instead of preparing final accounts at June 30 each year (in which case it is necessary to determine the value of stocks on hand) it would prepare interim accounts only. When the stocks of each year's pool are sold, then a final statement, showing the surplus of the pool, would be prepared. The accounts for the years ended June 30, 1958, and June 30, 1959, show the position as at those dates according to the value of stocks at the then current market values. The profit shown will not necessarily be the final profit when the pools are completed.

4. The Honey Marketing Act does not require the board to submit a copy of its balance-sheet to the Minister, but it is the practice of the board to submit to the Minister a copy of each annual report and, when the Honey Marketing pools are completed, the balance-sheets will be published with the results of the financial pools.

5. In accordance with the Honey Marketing Act, the board has its accounts audited at least once a year by an auditor holding an auditor's licence under the Companies Act. The balance sheet 1957-58 has been audited and the auditor's report appended. The 1958-59 balance-sheet audit should be completed in the near future.

6. It is the intention of the board to publish for beekeepers the final statements referred to in 3 and 4 above.

MILK WHOLESALERS.

Mr. BYWATERS (on notice)—

1. Will Gawler be included in the metropolitan milk distributing area?

2. If so, will the present wholesaler, who does not hold a treatment licence, maintain his present status, or will he become a semi-wholesaler?

3. Will the Prices Commissioner continue to fix his margin or will the Metropolitan Milk Board do so?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—The Chairman, Metropolitan Milk Board, reports:—

1. At present, the board has no plans to include Gawler in the metropolitan milk distributing area.

2. See answer No. 1.

3. See answer No. 1.

HOSPITALS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 24. Page 1792.)

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—The Bill does not make extensive amendments to the Act, and the two amendments are desirable. The first gives the Director-General the power to effect differential rates for different types of accommodation provided in public hospitals. The second resolves any doubt that might exist as to whether he has the power to remit the whole or portion of the fees owing by a patient and whether, having remitted portion of the fees, he can subsequently, as a result of further disclosure of the patient's financial position, remit the whole of the amount owing. So far as it goes, I agree with the Bill. However, I think there are some points appertaining to hospital policy and this Bill on which I might be permitted to say a few words this afternoon.

As honourable members know, we on this side of the House have consistently advocated that hospitalization in public wards should be absolutely free. We still adhere to that principle, and believe that it should be given effect to. I have the utmost confidence in the Director-General of Hospitals. I believe he administers the provisions giving him the power to levy and remit fees with much understanding, but at the same time I also believe that he might soon find himself in difficulties with an impecunious Government of a non-claimant State desiring to secure revenue from all and every source that can possibly be secured, even from those who are ailing.

I believe, therefore, that some safeguard should be inserted in the Bill providing that Parliament would have a say in examining the fees that may be fixed by the Director-General, and at the appropriate time, if the Bill passes the second reading stage, I will move that the fees shall be fixed by regulation, which, of course, can be subjected to scrutiny and disallowance by Parliament if Parliament feels so disposed. Regarding the matters that are contained in the Bill, I support them and consequently do not oppose the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Cost of maintenance of patients."

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—I move after "amended" to insert:—

(i) by striking out the words "The Director-General may from time to time in respect of any public hospital fix" therein and inserting in lieu thereof this passage—"After the coming into operation of The Hospitals Act Amendment Act, 1959, the Governor may from time to time, on the recommendation of the Director-General, by regulations, which he is hereby empowered to make, fix in respect of any public hospital;" and (ii).

This clause amends section 47 of the principal Act, which was substantially amended in 1941. That section, as it now stands, provides that the Director-General may from time to time in respect of any public hospital, fix:—

(*a*) A daily rate of payment which shall be payable for the cost of maintenance of persons as patients in the hospital.

(*b*) Rates of payment which shall be payable for the treatment of persons as outpatients at the hospital.

(*c*) Rates of payment which shall be payable in respect of medical supplies provided to persons from or at the hospital.

I do not object to the principles contained in clause 3 but I believe that the fees to be imposed on patients should be subject to review by Parliament. Fees can be onerous to many people, particularly those represented by the Opposition. Under the amendment the Director-General will still have power to recommend the regulation prescribing the charges, but Parliament will be able to scrutinize it. Parliament should have that power because in the final analysis it is Parliament's duty to protect the interests of the needy sick who will be affected by the imposition of hospital fees in public wards.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I have not consulted the Parliamentary Draftsman about the precise meaning of the amendment, but I presume it proposes a new method of fixing fees—by regulation. It took the Legislative Council a long time, on one occasion, to decide whether matters should be done by proclamation or regulation, and this is often a difficult matter to determine. I point out that in this instance the hospital fees will be subject to administrative action because in needy cases there will be power to remit the fees. I think Parliament realizes that in our hospitals today there are many people, well able to pay, occupying beds on a nominal charge to the exclusion of people who cannot afford to pay.

Mr. O'Halloran—I have admitted that.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—If a person is in a position to pay he should do so. I am prepared to accept the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

EIGHT MILE CREEK SETTLEMENT (DRAINAGE MAINTENANCE) BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 25. Page 1851.)

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh)—I support the second reading of this Bill relating to the area in the vicinity of Eight Mile Creek which was developed and improved as War Service Land Settlement land. The history of this area is rather interesting, and it may be appropriate to refer to it briefly. In May, 1937, approval was given for a survey with a view to drainage as a result of representations by the Port MacDonnell District Council. In February, 1938, the initial drainage work—the clearing of Eight Mile Creek and Deep Creek—commenced under the direction of the South-Eastern Drainage Board. In July, 1938, the Land Board reported the area as favourable for development for closer settlement and in December, 1940, the South-Eastern Drainage Board reported that drainage was well in hand and the area was ready for clearing. In January, 1941, the Land Board inspected the area and recommended its division into four sections and tenders were called for the rolling of ti-tree scrub. In February, 1942, the Crown Land Development Committee was formed and work continued under its direction spasmodically during the war years because of the shortage of plant and labour. In January, 1945, that committee was reconstituted as the Land Development Executive. In 1942 there was a soil survey of the area by the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization. In 1943 there was a study of the vegetation of the area by Mr. Eardley of the Waite Agricultural Research Institute. In October, 1943, arrangements were made with the Waite Agricultural Research Institute for the establishment of experimental pasture plots.

Costs were financed from State revenue to June 30, 1946. Expenditure was then transferred to Crown Land Development Loan works in July, 1946, and finally to deposits in War Service Land Settlement in August, 1946, following acceptance by the Commonwealth of this land and other estates for War Service Land Settlement. The development of the Eight Mile Creek area made press headlines. It was a difficult job that was greatly criticized. It was originally intended that this should remain leasehold land, but at the request of the Returned Servicemen's League the land now can be made freehold. Because of effective drainage and hard work this is possibly the richest land in the Commonwealth. It is used for mixed farming, although I believe it could be used for market gardening but for its locality. Under the lease system the rating for drainage was included in the rental of the land, but because of changed circumstances other provision must be made for rating to ensure the continuation of the drainage works in the area because, without drainage, the land would be rendered useless. Under the Bill there will be a uniform rating system for freehold and leasehold land. Each settler will be rated on a proper valuation and there is machinery for appeals to be heard. The Bill is an attempt to give satisfaction to all parties concerned and I have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages without amendment.

SCHOOL OF MINES AND INDUSTRIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 26. Page 1887.)

Mr. CLARK (Gawler)—There is no need to speak at length on this Bill, with which I completely agree. I pay a tribute to the work done by the School of Mines. For many years it has conducted most satisfactorily courses for apprentices and skilled tradesmen up to the diploma standard. Under the Bill most of the work in the subprofessional field will eventually be taken over by the Education Department, and the South Australian Institute of Technology, formerly the School of Mines, will concentrate on the higher professional field. It is anticipated that the school will provide training for professional and industrial skilled courses, which lead in the main to the degree of Bachelor of Technology. I regard this as a forward step, and the institution will work in collaboration with the University. The Bill proposes not only a change in the name of the institution but an alteration in the teaching functions. The institute will continue as an

important academic asset to the State, although its functions will be different from those of the School of Mines.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens)—I support the Bill and am happy to be associated with it because for three generations my family has been associated with this school. I am now a member of the school council. The main purpose of the Bill is to amend the constitution and the title of the old Act and to allow the status and teaching at the institution to be raised. Today the School of Mines is recognized as the leading technical education institution of its kind in South Australia, and it enjoys a wide reputation throughout Australia for its work. It is probably unique in the whole of Australia because it is the only institute of its kind that operates under its own Act of Parliament and is not subject to the Department of Education. Its affairs are conducted by its own council. The Bill seeks to raise its status.

It is of interest to look at the history of technical education in this State. It was first started in 1876 by the Chamber of Manufactures. The School of Mines was established in 1888 under the Playford Government of that time. That was 70 years ago when the grandfather of our present Premier led the Government. Originally it taught subjects of mainly a trade nature. Later the school introduced associate diploma courses in many subjects, such as mining, metallurgy and allied subjects, which were in great demand in those early days. That is why the institution was called the School of Mines. Many of the leaders in our mining industry in past generations were taught at the school. I think of such men as Essington Lewis, Klug, Delprat, Bradford, and many others. Since 1903 the school has co-operated closely with the University and they have interlocking courses on many subjects, especially in the science faculty, which has proved invaluable to both the University and the School of Mines. The next major step forward by the School of Mines was in 1956 when, after a series of conferences, the Bachelor of Technology course was introduced in various branches of technology. This degree course now replaces the old associate diploma course, which was held in the city. This later course will be available in Whyalla and Port Pirie, and I hope it will be extended to other country centres.

One main reason why the Bill has been introduced is the trend in the school activities in recent years. The Education Department has set up its own trade schools, giving instruction in almost all apprenticeship subjects. In earlier days that was one of the main functions of the School of Mines. Adult education is now undertaken in trade subjects in suburban high schools and technical high schools. Because of the startling advances that have occurred in technological sciences and practices, subjects not dreamed of 20 years ago, and in some cases 10 years ago, are being taught. In some instances there are subjects not thought of three or four years ago. In the last decade or so the school population has increased in a startling way. In 1945 it was 6,500, and it is estimated that by 1960 it will be 12,600 and by 1975 it will be 30,000. At present accommodation difficulties are being experienced. The main buildings on North Terrace and the laboratories are full. The Bonython building on North Terrace is full, and the new six-storeyed Playford Building on Frome Road, which it was thought would accommodate students for many years, and which was completed a few months ago, will be full by this time next year. The school council is now planning a new multi-storeyed building to be erected on land on Frome Road, which is held in trust by the school and which is situated adjacent to Botanic Park.

Many students desire technical education for professional purposes but cannot afford to go to the University, probably through no fault of their own or of their parents. Many of them will take advantage of the courses that will be provided by the new Institute of Technology. Many men have to work during the whole of the day and can only attend part-time in the evenings. This is not always possible at the University, but it can be done at the School of Mines or the Institute of Technology. In addition, courses are conducted at many country centres, the principal places being Whyalla and Port Pirie by virtue of their industrial set-up, but many other country centres take advantage of the facilities offered.

This Bill seeks only to alter the name of the institution in accordance with advances in modern technological science and to provide greater representation on the council. There is now representation from many sides of industry—education, the trade union movement and many other organizations—and this measure will provide for greater representation. The Bill is a worthwhile move to provide greater technical education, and it has my wholehearted support.

Mr. KING (Chaffey)—I will not cover the ground covered by the members for Torrens and Gawler, and the Minister in introducing the Bill, but, as I raised the matter of the Adelaide technical high school, an offshoot of the School of Mines, I wish to pay a tribute to the school committee for the way in which it handled this matter. As a result of negotiations, the School of Mines will carry on this school for a period to enable the Education Department to take it over. Due to the new status the School of Mines will acquire as the Institute of Technology, this State will continue to flourish as it has in the past, as a number of people associated with the School of Mines have contributed in no small measure to our prosperity. I therefore have great pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from November 24. Page 1792.)

Clause 6—"Penalty for Overloading"—to which Mr. Dunstan had moved the following amendment:—

Before "Where" to insert "(*a*)"; and to add the following paragraph:—

(*b*) Where an offence committed against sections 88 or 89 of this Act consists of causing or permitting a vehicle to be driven in contravention of one of those sections—

(i) proof that the vehicle was driven in contravention of the section and that the defendant was at the time of the offence—

(*a*) the owner or hirer of the vehicle;

(*b*) not the driver thereof,

shall be prima facie evidence of the offence;

(ii) in addition to any other penalty provided by this Part the court for a first offence may impose a fine not exceeding £100 for a second or subsequent offence where all such offences occurred after the passing of the Road Traffic Act Amendment Act, 1959, may impose a fine not exceeding £500 provided that the court shall not impose fines as provided by this subsection if the court is satisfied that the defendant did not know and could not reasonably have been expected to know that the vehicle was overloaded.

Mr. DUNSTAN—I ask leave to amend my amendment as follows:—

After "offences" in placitum (ii) to insert "including the first."

The Parliamentary Draftsman has suggested this amendment because, although it makes no difference to the previous amendment, he feels it may cut out the objections of some members of my own profession who are looking for loopholes.

Leave granted; amendment so amended.

Mr. DUNSTAN—The Committee has already debated this proposal at considerable length, and the Treasurer has indicated that the Government is prepared to accept it. I think the amended clause meets all the objections raised except, perhaps, that raised by the member for Light, who asked whether it would not be more simple to increase the monetary penalties in the principal Act. The difficulty about that is that, as things stand now, we simply cannot prove those offences. We certainly cannot prove offences against interstate people as the Act stands but the amendment, without imposing any undue burden on the people involved, will nevertheless require that they make their defences where the offence is peculiarly within their own knowledge.

Mr. Dunstan's amendment as amended carried.

Mr. HAMBOUR—The penalty in the principal Act still remains and there are now four or five amendments to this clause. If it is confusing to the two legal members, how much more confusing will it be for the general public? I suggest that this clause should be dropped and a shorter clause introduced. It is too confusing, and I cannot support it.

Mr. LAUCKE—Legislation should be remedial, never vindictive or unnecessarily harsh. Within these penalties there is an element of harshness to which I object. We are prone to accept excessive penalties for overloading, and I feel that the present penalties are undesirable in their harshness. If there are to be increased monetary penalties as advocated by the member for Light, guilt can be proved on a weighbridge note. If there were a more severe penalty and a five per cent latitude allowed, the deterrent would be there and we would not be legislating in such a harsh and unfair way. I oppose the clause.

The Committee divided on the clause as amended:—

Ayes—(29).—Messrs. Brookman, Clark, Corcoran, Coumbe, Dunstan, Harding, Heaslip, Hincks, Hughes, Hutchens, Jenkins, Jennings, King, Lawn, McKee, Millhouse,

O'Halloran, Pattinson, Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke, Ralston, Riches, Ryan, Shannon, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Stott, Frank Walsh, and Fred Walsh.

Noes—(6).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Bywaters, Hall, Hambour (teller), Laucke, and Nankivell.

Majority of 23 for the Ayes.

Clause as amended thus passed.

Clause 7—"Power to stop vehicles and ask questions."

Mr. MILLHOUSE—What is the meaning of clause 7 (*b*) which adds new subclause (3)? I have tried to work it out, but I cannot see the object in adding the phrase "or any other law" at the end of subclause (3). The marginal note to section 99 of the Act is "Power to stop vehicles and ask questions." If we pass clause 7 as it is, its only meaning will be that the police will be able to stop vehicles and ask questions on any subject at all. That may not be the object of the phrase "or any other law," but if it is I am not prepared to accept it. Can the Treasurer explain the precise meaning of those words?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—Many things would make it highly desirable for the police to stop a vehicle and ask a question. I cannot see that any peaceful citizen would object to answering a question by a police officer, and I cannot believe that a police officer would abuse the power, so I cannot see that there is anything very undesirable in the subclause.

Mr. Millhouse—But what do the words mean?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—A theft of some commodity may have been reported and a vehicle may have been described, and a police officer may desire to stop the vehicle for the purpose of detecting a theft.

Mr. Dunstan—He has power under the Police Offences Act.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—He probably has, and if he has power there is no objection to its being stated. I cannot see any objection to the clause. The member for Norwood may be right in what he says, and it may not add to any powers the police have at present, but I cannot see any objection to the police having the power to stop a vehicle where the detection of crime and the apprehension of a criminal may be involved.

Clause passed.

Clauses 8 to 11 passed.

Clause 12—"Obedience to traffic signs."

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I move—

After "road" in subclause (4) (*a*) to insert "unless a sign bearing the word 'WALK' is also being so shown."

I think honourable members will see the meaning of this amendment, and that no explanation is required.

Mr. Shannon—That practice is standard in the other States now.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 13 passed.

Clause 14—"Pedestrian crossings."

Mr. COUMBE—Experiments are now being undertaken by the Highways Commissioner on traffic lights for pedestrian crossings, and I understand that from these experiments the best type of lights will be selected. I appeal to the authorities concerned with the administration of this section that when those lights are selected they will be uniform and standard throughout the metropolitan area. Too many different types of lights, such as exist at present, cause confusion, and I therefore make a plea for uniformity and standardization in order that confusion may be avoided.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will see that the honourable member's remarks are referred to the State Traffic Committee at a later stage. The Bill contains amendments deemed to be urgent, but the Act will be completely overhauled next year. I agree with the honourable member that uniformity is essential if the motoring public and the walking public are not to be confused.

Clause passed.

Clauses 15 to 18 passed.

Clause 19—"Standing near intersections or junctions."

Mr. RYAN—During the second reading debate I said I would object to this clause if a certain interpretation were placed on the proposed new section 136a, which provides that if a person causes or permits a vehicle or animal to remain at rest near the edge of the carriageway of a road within 15 feet of an intersection or junction, he shall be guilty of an offence. The Bill defines a "junction" as meaning where one road joins another. On the Port Road there are numerous crossovers, and if this clause is passed it will mean that people who park in front of shops, providing they are within the imaginary lateral lines within the 15 feet of a crossover, will be

committing a parking offence. The proposed new section may go even further, and apply to streets such as Gresham Place—opposite this building—where it joins Hindley Street, and in consequence people who park on the south side of Hindley Street will be committing a breach of the Act. I take it that where every street runs into another there are imaginary lines drawn across that road, and if any person parks within 15 feet of those imaginary lateral lines he is committing a parking offence. As I have said, a glaring example could be Gresham Place where it runs into Hindley Street. If anyone parked within 15 feet of the imaginary lines of that junction he would be committing an offence. There are hundreds of places in the metropolitan area where motorists could, quite unwittingly, commit such an offence. If my interpretation of this clause is correct I must oppose it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—According to the Police Commissioner's report most accidents occur at intersections or junctions. I do not believe that motorists should have the right to park their vehicles wherever they want to. Stationary vehicles should be kept back from junctions and intersections. Intersections are usually marked by local councils.

Mr. Ryan—But not junctions.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Until now junctions have not been included in the Act, but they will be marked now. I believe it should be an offence to park near a junction and I hope the Committee will accept this necessary clause.

Mr. RALSTON—The point Mr. Ryan made was that under the definition of "junction" the imaginary lines will extend to the opposite side of the road and, under this clause, 15 feet beyond, so that with a 66 feet road the total area involved is 96 feet within which motorists would not be permitted to park.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I did not understand Mr. Ryan's point, but it is logical and I do not think it was intended that the opposite side of a junction should be included. If members accept the clause as it stands I will recommit the Bill to enable Mr. Ryan to move an amendment.

Clause passed.

Clauses 20 and 21 passed.

Clause 22—"Vehicles on bridges and culverts."

Mr. DUNSTAN—I object to the clause as it stands. Subclause (3) places the onus of proof on the defendant. This is not one of those cases where the knowledge of an excuse is peculiarly within the knowledge of the defendant. The prescribed circumstances mentioned in subclause (2) are objective, not subjective, matters of knowledge and it would be easy for the prosecution to show that the circumstances in which a vehicle was on a bridge or culvert were not circumstances that would fall within the prescribed excuses, so I cannot see any justification for shifting the onus of proof on to the defendant. The House has set its face against shifting the onus of proof to a defendant except in those rare cases where the excuse must be only within the knowledge of the defendant and where there is no way the prosecution can prove its full case. I object to subclause (4), which may make an owner guilty of an offence about which he has no knowledge. Because a driver does not remove the vehicle without unnecessary delay the owner, who may be 100 miles away, shall be guilty of an offence.

Mr. Shannon—What if it is a "hire and drive yourself" car?

Mr. DUNSTAN—The poor unfortunate owner would be guilty of an offence. Is the Treasurer prepared to do something about these subclauses?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I do not know why Sir Edgar has included a provision that both persons should be guilty of an offence under subclause (4). If the driver is guilty why should a penalty be imposed on the owner as well? I cannot see why an owner should be held responsible for something he might not know anything about. I am prepared to accept an amendment to delete the words "and the owner" and "severally" in subclause (4). If that is done the driver shall be guilty of an offence. I do not think subclause (3) is of particular importance but I believe there could be circumstances in which the facts stated in subclause (2) (*a*) (*b*) (*c*) and (*d*) could be known only to the defendant. For instance, a vehicle may be pulled up on a culvert or bridge and when the police question the driver the driver may claim that he has had a breakdown, and it is quite conceivable that a petrol choke could have stopped the vehicle. That fact would not be discernible by the police but could be proved subsequently by the driver. However, if the honourable member, who has been helpful in this Bill, moves for the deletion of subclause (3) I, too, will be helpful.

Mr. DUNSTAN moved—

That subclause (3) be deleted.

Amendment carried.

Mr. DUNSTAN moved—

In subclause (4) to delete the words "and the owner" and "severally."

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Clause 19—"Standing near intersections or junctions"—reconsidered.

Mr. RYAN—I move to insert the following new subsection (3) in proposed new section 136a:—

This section shall not apply where a vehicle remains at rest on that side of a road which is opposite to the side on which another road joins that road to form a junction.

As the Bill now stands, if an imaginary line were drawn across North Terrace from Gresham Place there would be opposite Gresham Place 15 feet of roadway on either side of that line where vehicles would not be allowed to park, but vehicles parked within that area would not be a danger to traffic. There must be many similar instances in the city of Adelaide. If the Bill is passed as drafted many parking meters will have to be removed to comply with the law, because it will not be possible to park vehicles within that area. Like North Terrace, the Port Road is a wide thoroughfare and the same position would apply. I think members can see the need for the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SOUTH-WESTERN SUBURBS DRAINAGE BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 26. Page 1885.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Edwardstown)—I regard this Bill as a non-Party measure. First, I pay a tribute to the work done by Mr. D. H. Susman (City Engineer of the Corporation of Marion), Mr. L. F. Lierich (Designing Engineer, Highways Department), and Mr. J. S. Gerny (Designing Engineer, Engineering and Water Supply Department). Mr. Susman was criticized because of the time he spent in drawing plans associated with this project. Some of the criticism came from his own council, which considered that he paid too much attention to that work whilst being paid by the council to do other work. The Government realized that the floodwater problem in the south-western suburbs should be dealt with and it referred the project to the Public Works Committee for investigation and report. I think the committee did an excellent job. This is an important work. The following appears in Appendix I of the report, which is a letter sent to the Minister of Local Government by the Marion and Brighton Stormwater Drainage Committee:—

Method of drainage.—Various alternatives were considered, but it was decided that the most practical and economical method of dispersing stormwaters was to discharge all waters rising east of the River Sturt into that river and all waters rising west of the River Sturt through suitable drainage outlets to the sea.

On October 9 of this year, a few days before the Labor Day holiday on October 12, I received a letter from the Mitcham Corporation on this matter, and in my reply I told the corporation that my attitude towards the Bill would be defined when I knew the contents of the legislation. I have carefully read the report of the Public Works Committee, with maps attached, and I believe that many of the matters mentioned in the letter from the Mitcham Corporation are covered by the Bill.

Mr. Millhouse—Do you say there is nothing at all in the complaints by Mitcham?

Mr. FRANK WALSH—If the honourable member had listened carefully he would not have made such a stupid interjection. I repeat that I received this letter from the Mitcham Corporation and that the complaints in it are dealt with by the Bill. If the honourable member will be patient for a time I shall probably give him some further information. Drainage water from the area east of the Sturt River will be drained to the river, and the rest will be taken to the sea. Paragraph V of clause 6 (1) provides:—

The Minister may enter into contracts with any council, person, or persons, for the construction or carrying out of the whole or any part of the works or portion of the works or for the provision of any materials, equipment, or services required in connection with such construction or with the works or any part thereof.

I think the member for Mitcham would agree that in some of the correspondence the Mitcham Council claimed that it had no responsibility for the work.

Mr. Millhouse—The council wanted to pay for it.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—As the honourable member is a ratepayer, he is better able than I to consider these facts. There is ample provision to deal with the matters raised by the Mitcham Council. Under the Bill Marion is to contribute 58.91 per cent of the cost of the scheme, and Mitcham, 16.90 per cent.

Marion will have 92,400 feet of drains and Mitcham, Brighton, West Torrens and Unley will have 81,600 feet; this is 17½ miles in Marion and 15½ miles in the other districts.

Clause 11 provides for a review of interest rates every 10 years. As the rate will be 5⅛ per cent, the interest bill will be very great. I realize that the Government will have to borrow Loan money that will have to be repaid, but I have never been able to understand why such high interest rates must be paid on a national project such as this. The Commonwealth Government can make money available out of revenue at 3¾ per cent for home building and, although I do not object to this, I cannot see why the rate on this work should be any higher.

The area east of the Sturt Creek will be drained into the creek. It is easier to drain water from the high levels than from the low levels. Not many years ago there were open drains on the Cross Roads, Springbank Road, Daws Road, and Sweetman's Road, and for practically the whole length of the Marion Road. Certain creeks in the Mitcham area drain right through Tonsley to the Marion Road, and provision is made in this Bill for an easement to the Sturt Creek.

Mr. Millhouse—Have you any idea how much the Marion Council has spent on drains in the last 10 years?

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I have not inquired but I could have provided those figures if I had been given notice. There is some doubt whether Mitcham Council could get assistance from the Highways Department as Marion did. This money was given to the Marion Council by the Highways Department because the council was taking water from Mitcham and diverting it into the Sturt Creek; the centre of South Road is the dividing line between the two councils. A new drain will be installed from near Clapham along Springbank and Daws Roads. It will be necessary to get a new easement to take water from the open drains running through Tonsley into the Sturt Creek, as these areas are now being developed as residential areas.

The water from the Westbourne Park school yard goes along Goodwood Road. It was intended that it should go underground on the south side of the Cross Roads but, because of the volume, it has to go on the northern side. The Unley Corporation has an open drain along the railway line to Emerson, meeting the waters from Westbourne Park, but there are problems in that area. Some years ago, when I inspected the flooding in company with an officer of the Highways Department, he admitted that the department would have to consider draining that water in a new underground drain south of the existing drain.

Mr. Millhouse—Is that since the reconstruction of the Emerson crossing?

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Prior to it. What the Town Clerk of Mitcham said about the water at Emerson is not accurate, on my information. When the new drains are installed they will give added relief. They will at least provide that the water coming from the high lands on the eastern side of the Sturt Creek will be drained into the creek and that people residing in the areas most affected will have a reasonable opporunity to avoid flooding.

Clauses 12 and 13 deal with maintenance. Each council will be directly responsible for the maintenance of drains in its area, while the Minister of Works will be responsible, but at the expense of the councils, in the same proportions as those relating to capital costs, for the maintenance of works on the River Sturt. Clause 13 provides that the cost will be shared in the proportions as set out in clause 7. Clause 12 provides that on the completion of a major drain or part of a major drain the Minister shall notify the council of such completion. It is possible that the drain to be constructed from Clapham along Springbank Road could be completed before the other section along Sweetmans Road and Oaklands Road to the Sturt Creek is completed, and that Mitcham would be paying for the full cost of that drain when completed.

Part IV of the Bill, under "Miscellaneous," contains one clause of merit. It gives ample provision for the Minister to call for tenders for the work. He can accept or reject a tender, and if a contractor who has already been signed up to do the work does not proceed with it, the Minister under this Part can proceed to do the work himself. I should like some information from the Minister on what will be the approach, under this provision, to the subcontractor. In the past the Government has been a little lax with subcontractors, and probably that is why so much work has been held up. The subcontractors have not always received their fair share of the amounts paid from time to time to contractors by the Architect-in-Chief's Department. Certain work is being undertaken on a new bridge on Oaklands Road, but it appears

that the Highways Department is doing one section of it and a private contractor is doing another. I hope that any subcontractors will be looked after, and that there will be no need for foreclosures.

Clause 15 gives the Minister very wide powers indeed. He has the right to enter a property and remove trees or do whatever may be necessary for the carrying out of this work. It is probably necessary for the Minister to have that power, but I hope he will never have to use it. The provision for compensation states that no compensation shall be payable by reason of the entry of the Minister on any land unless as a result damage is occasioned, in which event the compensation shall be limited to the amount of such damage. Clauses 22 and 23 are penal clauses, and I do not comment upon them at this stage.

Clause 26 is important. It provides for power to require councils to have rivers cleared. Section 643 of the Local Government Act provides:—

(1) The council may, by notice in writing to the owner or occupier of any land within the area over or through which any river, creek, drain, or waterway runs, require any such owner or occupier—

(*a*) to remove from the river, creek, drain, or waterway any trees, logs, timber, brushwood, debris, silt, or other obstructions to the free flow of water therein:

(*b*) to fill up in a good and sufficient manner any holes or places therein where water is likely to accumulate and become stagnant.

That, to me, is a very important matter when considered with the provisions of this Bill. The Minister notifies the council and the council in turn notifies the owners of the property to clear the particular area, and if the owner does not do so it is the responsibility of the council to do the work and then to claim compensation from the owner of the property.

The pioneers in the Marion area depended upon the Sturt River for a water supply. I believe they were mindful of the necessity to prevent erosion, and therefore they planted trees. However, much of this water is not now needed for irrigation, and the trees have cluttered up the creek. If more straightening of the Sturt River has priority over other type of work, I believe there will be no need to clear out much of the creek. In those portions where it will be necessary to clear the creek, it will ultimately be the responsibility of the landowner to provide for such clearing, and it will not be a further increase upon councils' rating. Whatever the Bill provides, and whatever work may be envisaged, it has not solved all the problems for Mitcham, Marion, and probably some portions of Brighton.

Mr. Millhouse—You can say that again.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—The highlands of Marion, particularly that area near Seacombe Road represented by the Minister of Education, pose problems for the corporation beyond the scope of this Bill. Certain land in Mitcham was sold prior to the operation of the Town Planning Act. The ratepayers of Mitcham have to pay for the expenditure on roads, and I believe the drainage of some of that area must be of vital concern to the Corporation of the City of Mitcham. Many areas will still have to receive serious attention from their councils. I consider that both Mitcham and Marion councils have done a fairly good job over the last few years. Marion became a municipality in 1944 and a city as recently as 1953, and it has therefore had to tackle many large problems. However, this problem is beyond the scope of one council. Certainly Marion could drain its water down the Sturt Road into Brighton, but this would mean the flooding of people in that area.

The Public Works Committee is cognizant of these facts. It is easy to drain water from the high lands to the low lands, but this Bill is the only way of coping with the problem in such a place as Parkholme, where the creek banks could be three or four feet higher than the roadways. What type of work could be contemplated there if it were not for the long range investigation and planning that has taken place in the compilation not only of this Bill but of the drawings and maps, and the inquiries that have been made in this matter? I commend the Bill, and have pleasure in supporting it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham)—I shall not speak long on this measure, but the length of my speech will not reflect the anxiety the Bill has caused me, because I have grave reservations about it. I am prepared to accept that such a scheme may be necessary to assist those councils in the south-western suburbs which have not, for one reason or another, been able to do their drainage work for themselves in the past because that, of course, is what this measure comes down to. However, I point out that these councils are extremely lucky because the Government is prepared to pay one-half of the total cost of drainage works that are traditionally the responsibility of local government. Indeed, they are much

luckier than that, because not only are all the taxpayers of South Australia coming to the aid of several south-western suburban councils, but adjoining councils are also coming to their aid to defray even part of the other half of the total cost of this work.

Mr. Shannon—I think you should name those other councils, because I will have to reply.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—The honourable member has threatened to cut my head off in this debate and he will get his chance. We must bear in mind that the Government, in its misguided generosity, is prepared to defray one-half of the total cost of this drainage scheme. This is something that has not been done for Port Augusta, nor Mitcham, nor for most other parts of the metropolitan area. That is my first point. The second is that after reading the report of the Public Works Committee I am prepared to accept the principle it lays down that contributing areas should pay somethings towards the cost of drainage, but I am entirely at a loss to understand—and perhaps Mr. Shannon will explain—why the committee in this instance decided upon one-third from contributing areas and two-thirds from receiving areas.

Mr. Shannon—Instead of the fifty-fifty?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Why not the 15 per cent it quoted on page 5 of its report? Why one-third?

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—The only precedent available was for one-half, and I think the committee thought one-third was better.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I do not know. If we look at page 5 of the committee's report under the heading "Contributions Towards Capital Cost" we see a quotation from the 1935 report that quotes from an English report which, in turn, quotes from another English report of 50 years earlier, and that all sorts of proportions are mentioned. I accept the principle, but why has the committee fixed on one-third in this particular case? I am sorry the reason is not contained in the report, but according to the report that was Mr. Dridan's recommendation because on page 6 we read:—

Mr. Dridan appointed a group comprised of officers of his department to carry out the technical work necessary to form a basis of recommendations and he subsequently submitted his recommendations in evidence. Mr. Dridan told the committee that having regard to the extent and nature of the "contributing" and "benefiting" areas he was of the opinion that a fair apportionment would result if one-third of the cost were apportioned to the "contributing" areas and two-thirds to the "benefiting" areas.

Mr. Shannon—You have not read the report clearly if you do not understand that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I am willing to believe that the committee gave considerable thought to this, but the report does not say why it chose this apportionment as fair and reasonable. Those two matters—the question of the half contribution from the Government and the question of the proportion which contributing areas must pay—are fundamental in our consideration of this Bill.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—What would you suggest in lieu of the third and two-thirds?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I am not suggesting any proportions.

Mr. Shannon—If we had to break away from the fifty-fifty—

Mr. MILLHOUSE—This is better than the fifty-fifty, but I want to know why the Public Works Committee—those wise old birds—fixed upon one-third and two-thirds. I have not yet been told and the report is not very illuminating. I greatly regret the late introduction of this, what the Minister has described as, most intricate and difficult matter. This Bill was read a first time and the second reading was given only last Thursday. Of its nature this must be extremely controversial to some members, but apparently it is to be put through not only this House but the Legislative Council in three days. I greatly regret that the Government found it necessary to do this and I am at a loss to understand why it was left so late and why there is now a tremendous rush to get it through.

Mr. Coumbe—The people of the areas concerned want it done.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—No doubt, because they will benefit. It is no wonder the member for Edwardstown complimented the Engineer for the Marion Council: he has done a good job, and no doubt the Marion people want this done.

Mr. Frank Walsh—The Engineer and the Town Clerk of Mitcham will hear about your contribution.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—The people of Mitcham are not so keen on this.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—Are you suggesting that Mr. Susman looked at this from the point of view only of the Marion Council?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I am not suggesting that at all and I hope that was not the import of my remarks.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—I thought it may be.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—If that was the import of my remarks I unreservedly apologize because it was not meant to be, but I say that the people of Mitcham are not nearly so keen upon this scheme as are apparently the people represented by the member for Edwardstown.

Mr. Shannon—The uplanders never have been, strangely enough.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Can the Minister say why he left it so late to introduce this matter, particularly as it has been hanging fire for about three years? In 1935 there was a protracted debate on the metropolitan floodwaters scheme and I regret that the Minister is apparently anxious that there should not be an opportunity for that on this Bill. Let us also remember that in this Bill we are overriding the authority and responsibilities of local government, and, so far as the corporations I have the honour to represent are concerned, we are doing it against their will. Let us remember that drainage and drainage problems are traditionally the responsibility of local government.

Mr. Shannon—You have made sure we won't forget it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—It cannot be denied that it is the prerogative and responsibility of local government to deal with drainage problems. There are many members in this House who have had long experience in local government. Mr. Coumbe is one. Does he deny that the responsibility for these problems is traditionally with the council? A House which prides itself usually upon upholding the rights of local government is apparently over-riding the wishes of a local governmental authority in this Bill. Not only are we usurping its powers—taking away from it in its own areas the responsibility for a problem that is its own—but we are doing so against its will. The same council would prefer to do all the work in its own area and at its own expense.

Mr. Frank Walsh—And in its own time: in another 100 years.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I do not know if the honourable member, who represents a good slice of Mitcham, is saying that Mitcham has not lived up to its responsibilities in this matter in the past and has not kept abreast of the drainage needs of its area. If he is I entirely disagree with him.

Mr. Frank Walsh—Did I say it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—That seemed to be the import of the honourable member's interjection. The honourable member mentioned Mitcham and Marion, but he did not mention another local government body that he and I represent—the Garden Suburb. It is only a small area, of course, and we find that it has not a big contribution to make, but, whilst the Garden Suburb Commissioner may not have stated his case as strongly as the Corporation of Mitcham, he nevertheless objects to this scheme.

Mr. Shannon—In fact I think he made a better case than the City of Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I did not have the advantage of hearing all the evidence.

Mr. Shannon—All the evidence has been tabled and you can read it. I am not making that statement without some basis.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—The Garden Suburb Commissioner—who, of course, is the councillor, Town Clerk and Mayor rolled into one—does not like this scheme. He believes that it is necessary (and I am prepared to concede that some such scheme is necessary), but he claims that in proportion to its area and population the Garden Suburb is—and I use his own words—"really getting slugged." According to the Public Works Committee's report the Garden Surburb Commissioner's contribution is only 1.03 per cent of the total cost of the scheme, but that contribution represents 4.37 per cent of his revenue, which is a high proportion. That is his objection to this scheme. He also made the quite cogent point that 20 or 30 years ago when the areas to the west of the Garden Suburb were gardens they wanted this water, but now that it is being subdivided and built upon the reverse is the case and that is why there has been a request for this scheme.

Mr. Shannon—Does the honourable member know the percentages paid by Marion and Brighton?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—They are getting all the benefit from the scheme.

Mr. Shannon—What percentage of their rates does it represent?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Any member can ascertain that. I will read them out if the honourable member wants me to.

Mr. Shannon—Perhaps it didn't suit your argument.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—It is entirely irrelevant. Marion contributes 16.24 per cent, but gets about 90 per cent of the benefit.

Mr. Shannon—How do you work that one out?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—That's a rough stab.

Mr. Shannon—It sounded like a rough stab.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Surely the honourable member is not saying that Marion and Brighton between them are not the main recipients of this scheme?

Mr. Shannon—Even Glenelg gets some benefit.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—What does the honourable member say Mitcham is getting out of this?

Mr. Shannon—I will tell you in a minute.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—It won't take the honourable member too long.

Mr. Shannon—Yours is a very selfish argument.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—It is not; it is entirely realistic. That is the objection of the Garden Suburb Commissioner. However, we have a number of objections from the City of Mitcham. Honourable members have had much correspondence from the Mitcham Corporation setting out its case, which can be summed up shortly. Mitcham has always carried out its drainage works itself and with its own money, and is in a position to continue to do that. So far the results have been satisfactory.

The corporation asks properly why it should have to contribute one-third of the cost of work in its area, when other councils in their areas have apparently neglected to do the work for themselves. That is a pertinent question. The next point must appeal to the Minister. Mitcham claims that it could do the work much cheaper than the estimated cost set out in the committee's report. I have read the report and sought the basis of the estimated costs. The estimates are set out in detail, but nowhere is there a mention of how they have been arrived at. Perhaps Mr. Shannon (chairman of the committee) will give me the information. Mitcham believes that it could do the work much more cheaply than the estimated cost. It wants to do its own work.

Mr. Corcoran—Could it do the work as well?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—The corporation says it could, and do it to the departmental specification. Evidence submitted by the corporation shows that it believes it could do the work for one-tenth of the estimated cost.

Mr. Shannon—Do you believe that?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I do not know whether it is right or wrong.

Mr. Shannon—I think it is an exaggerated statement.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Even if it were only half correct, is it not something to be borne in mind?

Mr. Shannon—Do you think it is half correct?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I may be misunderstood. We have a figure set out in the committee's report: I do not know how it was arrived at. We have a statement from the corporation that it could do the work in its area at one-tenth of the cost to be saddled upon it. According to the report, it will cost the corporation £10,257 per annum for 53 years, a total well over £500,000.

Mr. Shannon—I think that is a crude way of putting it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—It will be over £10,000 in each of the next 53 years. The corporation estimates that it could do the work in its area for £52,000. This is a matter to be considered seriously, and it deserves more attention than it has apparently had so far. The corporation also complains that most of the work under the scheme will be of no benefit to Mitcham.

Mr. Shannon—That comment could apply to practically every council.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Other councils are not paying anywhere near as much as Mitcham. Thirteen drains are set out in the first part of the scheme, and 11 of them are outside Mitcham. Only two are in the Mitcham district, and about one of them Mitcham complains bitterly. That is my next point and perhaps Mr. Shannon will be able to give me some information about it. Drain No. 2 is to be one of the first priority drains. Honourable members have copies of the plan, which is an attractive looking document and most illuminating. Drain No. 2 goes down Cumberland Avenue. Drain No. 1 goes down Cross Roads. There is a drain there now, but according to the report of the technical subcommittee it is inadequate. Drain No. 2 will go down Cumberland Avenue not far south of, and parallel to Drain No. 1. In appendix III of the committee's report, which is the report of the technical subcommittee, there is the following:—

It was found that water flowing northwards along Goodwood Road tends to shoot past the inlets near Cross Roads and find its way, via the railway drain and the water table on the northern side of Cross Roads, to the Emerson junction. A considerable "bottleneck" results at this junction and under these conditions

the pneumatic-core drain west of the crossing does not flow to capacity for a considerable part of its length. As it was realized that it would be undesirable to reconstruct the junction entirely at present, a suitable route for an interceptor drain, parallel to, and south of, Cross Roads, was sought.

Because it is undesirable to reconstruct at the Emerson crossing, Mitcham has to put up with an entirely new drain.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—You said that the Cross Roads drain was inadequate.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—The technical subcommittee said that, not I. I think there is a simple explanation for that, which I will give later. Having decided that it would be undesirable to reconstruct at Emerson crossing, the committee inquired for a suitable alternative route, and it found one. The result is Drain No. 2, and regarding it the report of the technical subcommittee said:—

The main purpose of this drain, as mentioned in the section on Drain No. 1, is to intercept water which would normally reach Cross Roads. It has also been designed to traverse one of the areas most subject to flooding, namely, that between the northern end of Marion Road and the Morphettville racecourse.

That will be entirely to the benefit of Marion.

Mr. Shannon—Is the Mitcham plan based on good engineering knowledge?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I believe it is. I will explain the assertion of Mitcham on this matter in due course, and then the honourable member will have the opportunity to give his views. The report also said:—

The route selected is considered to be the nearest to Cross Roads consistent with ease of construction and land acquisition, and with the requirements of the area to be drained. It avoids undue bends and offers no great difficulties in connection with the junction with Drain No. 1.

Obviously, the whole purpose of Drain No. 2 in the area of Mitcham is to supplement Drain No. 1 which goes down Cross Roads. Even Mr. Shannon must agree with that. Mitcham complains strongly that it is unnecessary to construct Drain No. 2. I must apologize to members for wearying them with these details, but it is all a perfect illustration of the need to further consider this matter. Mitcham said that the Cross Roads drain was adequate to cope with the waters, and that the Emerson crossing drain was adequate, before the reconstruction of the Emerson crossing. Since then the drain has overflowed even after light rain. The reason is that the work done under the Emerson crossing by the Highways Department was not entirely satisfactory. It is ridiculous to suggest that the area served by the drain along Cross Roads has not been fully built on. The explanation that Mitcham gives is the unsatisfactory nature of the work under the Emerson crossing. Because the department is not prepared to do anything about it Drain No. 2 is to be built.

Mr. Shannon—Mitcham has done nothing south of the Cross Roads to cope with the problem.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Mitcham concedes that Drain No. 3 is a necessary drain. The corporation would prefer to see the work at the Emerson crossing fixed up, Drain No. 2 abandoned and Drain No. 3 dealt with. This shows the engineering difficulty in this matter. I am not an engineer, but I realize that this is a matter of great importance.

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

Mr. MILLHOUSE—At the adjournment I was discussing one technical detail of the engineering of this scheme concerning No. 2 Drain, which is a top priority drain running down Cumberland Avenue. Mitcham asserts that that drain is necessary only because of the imperfect works under the Emerson crossing when the crossing was remodelled some time ago, causing flooding in the drain at present running down Cross Roads. The sub-committee asserts that another drain is necessary to relieve the pressure on that drain, but Mitcham says that all that is necessary is to remodel the works under the Emerson crossing. The estimated cost of the full length of that drain is £344,000.

Mr. Shannon—Do you know where it finishes?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—It is not only in Mitcham, but runs well into Marion, where it is probably a most useful drain, but the total cost is £344,000, much of which is to be spent in Mitcham, and Mitcham says it is not necessary if more work is done under the Emerson crossing. Who is right? I do not know. I do not say that Mitcham is right or that the committee is wrong, but I believe we should look closely at this matter.

Mr. Shannon—In other words, it has not yet been looked at?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—The honourable member is no doubt looking for an insult in every comment I make.

Mr. Shannon—That is obviously what the honourable member means.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I am not for a moment reflecting upon the member for Onkaparinga in his capacity as chairman of the Public Works Committee or on members of the committee, but that is one of the points raised about which I am not satisfied.

Mr. Shannon—As an engineer, you do not like it!

Mr. MILLHOUSE—As members of Parliament, we are called upon to try to understand many things. I do not hold myself out as an engineer any more than the member for Onkaparinga probably does, but I believe I am entitled to express an opinion on such a matter. I do not intend to give any other specific instance, as these things are bewildering in detail. I mention this only because it has a high priority and is one of the first things that will be done if the Bill is passed. In all fairness, the committee said:—

From its consideration of the proposals put before it, the committee is satisfied that the proposed works described in the revised stage 1 do not call for variation at this juncture. It is realized that as the scheme progresses some amendments of the design will almost certainly be necessary . . .

Even the committee itself does not believe that we must be absolutely firm on this:—

. . . and the constructing authority will then have the opportunity of taking into consideration the suggestions submitted by the local governing bodies.

Whatever alterations are made to the scheme, as it is at present drawn and embodied in this Bill, it will not make any difference to the councils' contributions. The committee has already recommended that whatever alterations are made the councils should pay the same proportion as set out in the Bill. We have talked about the proportions that the council will bear and the proportions of their rate revenues they will have to set aside but, to make any use of the trunk mains embodied in this scheme, Mitcham estimates that it will have to spend another £500,000 in the area covered by this scheme.

Mr. Shannon—Yet Mitcham has a full hand in its own affairs.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Quite. Mitcham is prepared to handle its own problems in co-operation with Marion. Before this scheme will be any good, quite apart from any contributions under the scheme, many other drains will have to be constructed to make use of the drains to be provided. There is nothing for the City of Mitcham south of Daws Road and Springbank Road; the whole of its area from there to the Sturt River is not touched by this scheme. When and if that is developed, it will be an additional responsibility of Mitcham.

Mr. Shannon—Which do you classify as the main drain in this scheme?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I hope the honourable member will not side-track me too far.

The SPEAKER—Order! If the honourable member addresses his remarks to the Chair there will be less comments from the member for Onkaparinga.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I beg your pardon, Sir. The moneys under this Bill will not be the only moneys that will have to be spent on this scheme. An interjector, I think the Treasurer, said that Mitcham did not have a big drainage problem, but Mr. Hayes estimated in his evidence that in the last 10 years or so £300,000 had been spent on drainage work by the Mitcham Council. Mitcham's contribution is 5.34 per cent of its rate revenue. Members may say that is not much but, if they look at the map, they will see that a large proportion of Mitcham, as far as rate revenue is concerned, is outside the catchment area altogether. In the north-eastern part of the area Hawthorn, Kingswood, Netherby, Torrens Park, and Mitcham, which are now highly developed, are outside any catchment area. What justice is there in rating those areas for this scheme any more than in rating the cities of Burnside or Norwood?

Mr. Shannon—You mentioned Netherby and other parts, but they are not included.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—The honourable member has not understood what I have been saying. Only a portion of the City of Mitcham is within the catchment area shown on the plan; other parts of that city are outside the catchment area, and there is no more reason or justice why those areas should be rated to pay for the scheme than there is for the Cities of Burnside or Kensington and Norwood to be rated—and they are not.

Mr. Dunstan—They are rated for their drainage schemes, though.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—That is so, but not for this scheme. If Mitcham follows the recommendation of the Public Works Committee, the proportion of the rate revenue of the areas actually within the catchment of the River Sturt and other drains will be much more than 5.34 per cent and, in justice, these are the only areas that should have to contribute to this scheme, according to the Public Works Committee. That, I think, is something else we

should take into account. What then does the City of Mitcham want in this matter? It wants to continue as it has done in the past, namely, to do its own work in its own area and at its own expense. I point out that all waters that now pass into the City of Marion do so in properly controlled channels. The problem has been tackled in the past by the co-operation of the two councils, and Mitcham wants it to continue that way.

Mr. Fred Walsh—You are not suggesting that Marion wants it to continue that way?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I do not know what Marion wants, but presumably it wants this scheme, if what the member for Edwardstown said is correct. Mitcham does not want it at all. It will do its own work in its own area at its own expense.

Mr. Coumbe—And at the expense of other councils.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Not at all. My suggestion is not a gesture of no-confidence in the Public Works Committee. Mitcham, of course, complained that it had been treated cavalierly all along in this matter, that it had been ignored and not consulted. That may or may not be so, but the fact is that the matters of complaint and doubt which I raised are matters which are not satisfactorily answered in the report.

I put the following points: firstly the whole of the State is prepared to pay half towards the alleviation of this drainage problem, when drainage is traditionally—although there are exceptions to that—the responsibility of local government. Secondly, I am prepared to accept the principle that some payment should be made by the areas contributing water, but I want to know: why one third? Thirdly, I very much regret the lateness of the introduction of this measure, and the haste with which, apparently, it is being put through. Fourthly, I point out—and this is perhaps the most important point I make—that we are overriding local government authority against its will in this measure. Fifthly, I have raised some doubts about the financing of this scheme, and, sixthly, I have doubts about some engineering aspects of the scheme.

I emphasize again that I am not suggesting that everything the Mitcham corporation is saying is right. It may not be, for all I know, but what I say is that we should be very sure that these matters Mitcham raises are entirely wrong before we are prepared to override a local governing body in its own area in a matter which is its own responsibility. That is the point. In the light of the criticisms made since the Public Works Committee's report was presented, I suggest very strongly, and most sincerely and earnestly, that we should look again at this matter before it is put into force. Technically, this may not be a hybrid Bill. I believe it is not, but I also believe, in view of all the criticisms that have been made, that it is a Bill into which a Select Committee could appropriately inquire. Because it is a technical and difficult subject, because it would operate against the will of at least one and probably at least two of the local governing bodies—

Mr. Shannon—You are referring to the Garden Suburb?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Yes. The honourable member may smile. I know it is a small area, but it has its rights and responsibilities, and it will be saddled with its burdens under this Bill. I suggest this is a measure that we could very properly have another look at through the means of a Select Committee, and I hope that is what the House will do.

Mr. HALL (Gouger)—I do not want to enter another controversy on the subject of which council should pay what percentage. My only concern as an outsider of the area concerned and as a country member is the £1,000,000 that Parliament is voting for half of the cost of this scheme. I think most members have been sent pamphlets and figures from different sources concerning this project. One that interests me is from a suburban council that claims that the average rate on an ordinary dwelling in its area is £15 15s. That council handles its own drainage entirely, and it is a considerable item, amounting, I believe, to about £750,000. I refer to the Woodville Corporation. I think most members would have received the pamphlet sent out by that corporation. From what I can make out from the sources available, the Marion Council, which bears the biggest burden under this scheme, has an average rating on a dwelling of £11. Marion pays 16.24 per cent of its rate revenue under this scheme, which is about £1 15s. 6d. a dwelling, whereas the Woodville Council, which handles its own drainage entirely, pays about £2 8s. a dwelling.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Do you say Woodville council pays that?

Mr. HALL—Yes, £2 8s. a dwelling.

Mr. Fred Walsh—What has the Woodville council got to do with this Bill?

Mr. HALL—I am comparing two councils, one that is being subsidized under this Bill

and one that is not. I am trying to ascertain the reason for the difference.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Woodville received considerable benefit from the western districts drainage scheme.

Mr. HALL—It is paying £2 8s. a dwelling for drainage, and by providing this money for the south-western suburbs drainage scheme I take it we are subsidizing ratepayers in that area to a greater extent than we subsidized the ratepayers in Woodville. If that can be satisfactorily explained I should like it to be, but so far it has not. If during this debate it is explained I shall be very happy.

Mr. Clark—That has nothing to do with it.

Mr. HALL—I think it has. We are allocating this State's finances, and I think we should do it fairly. If we are subsidizing these people in Marion, what must any ratepayer in Woodville feel about having to pay £2 8s. and to help subsidize the ratepayers of Marion who pay only £1 15s. 6d.?

Mr. Clark—Woodville is being subsidized.

Mr. HALL—Not to the extent Marion is. Those ratepayers are paying £2 8s., and Marion ratepayers are paying only £1 15s. 6d.

Mr. Clark—I thought when you started you were going to clear up several points; now you are asking for information.

Mr. HALL—If the member for Gawler can answer these questions I shall be happy.

Mr. Clark—I haven't a clue to the answers.

Mr. HALL—If the honourable member for Gawler hasn't a clue, he will certainly support the member for Mitcham, who wants a Select Committee to go into this matter.

Mr. Clark—Woodville is subsidized through the western districts drainage scheme.

Mr. HALL—Perhaps, but obviously it is not subsidized as much as Marion will be. Woodville claims that it handles all its own drainage. The average rate per dwelling in that municipality is £15 15s., whereas in Marion it is £11. If Marion paid for the whole of this scheme and added it to its present average rate of £11, the average rate would still not reach £15 15s., and I should therefore like to know whether we are subsidizing these people in Marion unfairly, compared with other suburban councils that handle their own problems. That is my main question on this Bill, and I hope it will be satisfied during the course of the debate and in Committee. I support the proposal for a Select Committee.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie)—I desire some clarification of clause 7. The Government has apparently decided to subsidize metropolitan councils to the extent of half the cost of this drainage. Port Pirie has considerable drainage problems—as have, no doubt, other country centres—and it has sought, but has been refused, financial assistance from the Government. If the Government is now prepared to subsidize metropolitan councils, will the Treasurer be consistent and do the same for country councils engaged on drainage works?

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga)—Firstly, I commend the Engineer-in-Chief, Mr. Dridan, and Mr. Richmond, the then Highways Commissioner, and Mr. Susman, the Engineer for the Marion Council, who did the original work in examining the drainage requirements of this area. Mr. Susman was appointed by the Government because he was familiar with the problem that occurred when heavy floods entered the Marion and Brighton districts through the Sturt River. These men were responsible initially for surveying the problem and deciding upon a proper policy to pursue in trying to relieve these areas of intermittent flooding. The next step was the appointment by the Government of a designing committee of engineers. Mr. Lierich, the Designing Engineer of the Highways Department, was chairman and Mr. J. S. Gerny, Designing Engineer of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, and Mr. Susman, members. They were charged with the serious responsibility of examining *in situ* the problem to be faced and with preparing a plan for dealing with the problem.

The Public Works Standing Committee could not have had more energetic or capable assistance than it received. I wish that all people, who are not specialists, could appreciate the difficulty confronting a committee of lay people in examining technical witnesses and how reliant a committee must be on well-informed persons. Unfortunately, Mitcham has not learnt that lesson. I am not referring to the member for Mitcham, but Mr. Hayes, the Town Clerk of Mitcham. He is the nigger in the woodpile. I do not blame Mr. Millhouse, because I do not think for a moment that he believes some of the things he said, which Mr. Hayes told him he should say.

Mr. Millhouse—Fair go! I said what I believed.

Mr. SHANNON—The honourable member will agree that he did say that Mr. Hayes said he could do the work for one-tenth of the cost and that when I tackled him he said, in effect, "I do not think that is quite right, but what if he could do it for half the cost?" I

think I am justified in saying that Mr. Hayes gave the honourable member an impossible task to handle in this Chamber.

Mr. Clark—You are speaking more in sorrow than in anger.

Mr. SHANNON—I somewhat regret that my young friend should have been assigned a task beyond his capacity—analysing the engineering problems of this scheme. I admire Mr. Millhouse when he debates matters within his own field, but on this occasion it was beyond him. I think the House should know the history of this matter because Mr. Millhouse invited us—and I suggest on Mr. Hayes' behalf—to appoint a Select Committee to examine the matter. I presume such a Committee would examine the same witnesses as the Public Works Standing Committee examined or is it suggested that better witnesses could be procured than our Engineer-in-Chief and Commissioner of Highways and that better plans could be devised? Unfortunately, Mitcham has no qualified engineer on its staff. It is without the services of a qualified engineer. Apparently it has a *factotum* named Hayes who can answer all of Mitcham's problems without any troubles or worries at all. I had tea with Mr. Millhouse and I told him that I thought one thing he intended to say was below the belt, but he said it, and I think it is for members to decide whether it is a fair comment by a participant in this scheme—and I charge Hayes with this very shrewd shaft which he tried to thrust into the debate—to say to country members, "You country fellows have nothing to gain and everything to lose, because you represent taxpayers outside the area concerned and you will have to find half the capital cost." That is not debate as such. It had no bearing upon the merits of what we are discussing. It was an appeal to the cupidity of individual members and if that is Mitcham's approach, I will not have a bar of it.

Mr. Millhouse—Are you saying it is not right?

Mr. SHANNON—It is not argument for a party interested in this scheme, in an attempt to avoid its responsibilities and liabilities, to appeal to the cupidity of private members by saying that they represent areas not concerned and will pay half the cost. If that is the legal profession's approach to this case—

Mr. Dunstan—No! Leave the legal profession out of it.

Mr. SHANNON—I am glad to hear one denial.

Mr. Millhouse—It was perfectly fair comment.

Mr. SHANNON—Let me go a step further with my friend, Mr. Hayes. Mr. Hayes would kill this Bill at all costs. If he cannot kill it by a Select Committee he will kill it by cupidity. Why should he want to settle this Bill? He is an uplander! Mr. Millhouse admitted reading that part of the Public Works Standing Committee's report dealing with the apportionment of the cost of the scheme on the basis of one-third to the uplander and two-thirds to the beneficiary or lowlander who has to get rid of the water the uplander sheds upon him. Mr. Hayes is the shedder. He is the chap who says, "I can look after myself." Of course he can! He is on highland. All he has to do is build houses, construct footpaths, pave streets and send the water down into Marion. That is what he wants to do. What a friend!

Mr. Dunnage—He is in the gallery looking at you.

Mr. SHANNON—I don't care where he is. What a friend! Members have received a diatribe from Mr. Hayes setting out his case, which Mr. Millhouse has endeavoured to put before the House. This is not the first time this matter has been discussed by Mitcham. Mitcham was invited to a conference in the Marion district council chamber and Mr. Dridan was there by invitation. This matter was first referred to the Public Works Committee by Act of Parliament in 1957. There was not a word of complaint from Mitcham. A conference was held of all parties concerned, including Mitcham, and this problem was discussed. I have it on the authority of some of those who attended, and I think it was correctly reported to me, that it was a hopeless conference at which to get any unanimity among the local governing bodies. Knowing now first-hand Mr. Hayes' attitude to this legislation, I could quite understand he would not have a bar of anything that would require Mitcham to pay anything for the water shed on other people. He did think there was some obligation upon the uplanders to pay some proportion of the cost of getting rid of the floodwaters, but he never questioned the distribution of one-third and two-thirds.

How lucky is Mitcham! Firstly, they are contributors for the main part, but beneficiaries in a very small way. I should not like to guess in how small a way they would be beneficiaries. As contributors they are to pay for one-third, but even that one-third is shared

by the central Government, so they are to pay for one-sixth of the cost of getting rid of a problem which they themselves have helped create. I do not know what better terms could be offered—as to whether it should be one-third and two-thirds, fifty and fifty, sixty and forty, seventy-five and twenty-five, or ninety and ten. In reporting on this matter we were guided by another set of experts in this field, mostly from Mr. Dridan's department. We were guided by what the Royal Commission in England said on this problem—that each set of circumstances had to decide what was the right division. I admit that in the final analysis it must be somewhat of an arbitrary figure. It can be roughly assessed.

I was pleased to hear Mr. Millhouse say he had read the plan, but apparently he didn't understand it, because he said that some portions of Mitcham which were to be rated for this work would not benefit. I thought Mr. Hayes did not consider that anyone in Mitcham would get any benefit, so why should Mr. Millhouse complain regarding one section around Netherby which is not in the actual catchment area, but is in the Mitcham district? Why should he complain when Mr. Hayes, his mentor, blandly points out it should get the whole of the benefit? After all, you have some basis, and stick to it, or you divide your forces, as Mr. Millhouse did, and put some in Netherby and the rest in the big group around Mitcham proper, such as Clapham. That showed conclusively to any thinking person that there was no substance in that particular argument. If Mr. Millhouse does not agree with me, I shall have to read him some of the correspondence received.

I had promised the various councils individually when they came before the Public Works Committee that I would advise them of what their commitments would be, and thus give them an opportunity to provide for it before the necessary legislation came into force. It was a breathing space for them. I did not tell them I wanted them to come back to the committee and talk about it. That was an open question. I got varying replies, and propose to read one or two of them. The following one should be interesting to Mr. Millhouse. If he looks at the plan he will see that the contributing area in Meadows is quite a small portion of the Meadows council area. This is the letter I received from that council dated November 5:—

Re metropolitan drainage works.

In reply to your letter of July 3, 1959, I am directed to advise that at the last sitting of the council on November 2, my council resolved they would accept the conditions of the scheme. Trusting this will be satisfactory.

If those people are happy to accept their share of the responsibility for shedding water into the metropolitan area, I do not know how Mitcham can have the effrontery to say they are not in it, or how they can expect to be kept out of it. Some councils suggested that they were not absolutely 100 per cent satisfied with the financial split up, and thought that something should be done about lightening their load. That applied to Glenelg, Brighton and Marion.

Mr. Fred Walsh—It is only natural to expect that.

Mr. SHANNON—We are not surprised. Stirling has made no complaint. They are in a small way, because they have only a small area. I think that the Mitcham council would be better advised to listen to Mr. Millhouse rather than to try to fly kites of their own and they might then get nearer to a fair answer to the problem. I did not have to talk to Meadows or Stirling, but they came to talk to us and neither has offered any objection, although their nearest territory is well up into the hills. They are prepared to come in. There was never any quibble. This is the first time we have heard this quibble from this piffle. After all there is no substance in their argument.

I shall now refer to one of Mr. Millhouse's major technical objections, namely, Drain 2. Quite obviously Mitcham mentioned this drain when it appeared before the committee, and just as obviously the committee made sure that our experts gave their opinion on the criticism offered by Mitcham. Mitcham was not the only council that made suggestions regarding drains. We also had suggestions from Brighton, which came along with some bright ideas.

Mr. Millhouse—I thought you said in your report that no-one made any suggestions.

Mr. SHANNON—Nothing of the sort. I regret to say that the honourable member has not read the report.

Mr. Millhouse—I have.

Mr. SHANNON—You have missed some of the vital parts of it. We not only said we had various suggestions; we also said there might be changes in the overall planning as this was put into operation because our engineers warned us that the experience of putting in these drains might result in some change in design.

Mr. Fred Walsh—In fact, changes were made.

Mr. SHANNON—However, dealing with Drain No. 2, the one that Mr. Hayes says is redundant because the Highways Department has messed up Emerson Crossing, perhaps Mr. Hayes will be the first to admit that there has been a material amount of development south of Drain No. 2 in Mitcham itself, in the building of homes and the construction of roads and footpaths, which will probably continue. There are still some vacant blocks even in Mitcham available for purchase. This drain will pick up the water from south of Drain No. 2 and take it straight down to the Patawalonga through Glenelg. In discussing this, the engineers obviously had to be ready with some explanation why they had planned these drains in a specific way. I have one small apology to make to the House. I notice that our report says "Seven sea outlets": in fact, there are sea outfalls in eight spots. I want to correct that. It is not very material but the fact that we have a number of sea outfalls is important.

This was thoroughly investigated and the committee asked me questions on it. One witness suggested that we should cut a new channel for the Sturt River at the S-bend and tip that lot straight into the sea. He omitted to take cognizance of what would happen to the foreshore when we had a really decent sized flood down such a channel. It would give such a scouring to the beach there between Brighton and Glenelg that it would be washed away for probably a mile on either side. We had not an actual outfall as they had for the Torrens. The Sturt emptied into the Patawalonga in its normal way. The Patawalonga has been the subject of a Bill before this House, and a beautification scheme is now operating there. Obviously, we do not want these waters to come down and wash away the money we have spent on the Patawalonga basin. A big flood would be the last thing we would want. They had to find sea outlets, and the fact that we had a number of them involved foreshore erosion, which they wished to avoid. Groynes will be built on the biggest of them. Experience here will teach them. If they see any sign of beach erosion, groynes will be built to combat it. If the beach can be kept intact, it is worthwhile.

Mr. Laucke—What are groynes?

Mr. SHANNON—They are piles driven into the beach at an angle to the actual prevailing wind to carry the water in such a way that it does not scour. They have to be so sited that they act as a shield against the prevailing wind. They are used in many parts of the world. In South Africa, the whole of the foreshore at Durban is protected by groynes.

There are one or two matters the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) wanted me to answer. I need not refer to them all. First and foremost, his recommendation to the House that it should appoint a Select Committee does not hurt me. Obviously, he has no confidence in the ability of the members of the Public Works Committee to investigate the project. I do not know whether or not he expects me to have much confidence in his chairmanship of the State Traffic Committee or the Subordinate Legislation Committee, to match his lack of confidence in my chairmanship of the Public Works Committee. I do not know whether that is his approach. Obviously, he cannot hide the fact that he seeks, at Mitcham's request and instigation I have no doubt, to hold this measure up by having a Select Committee appointed, which he knows could not possibly report to this House this session as a Select Committee must do.

Mr. Jennings—That is why he is doing it.

Mr. SHANNON—It is purely a stratagem to prevent this legislation from passing this session, in the hope that enough antagonism or cupidity will be engendered between now and next session to kill this legislation. I for one have deep sympathy with the foreshore councils, Brighton, Marion and Glenelg.

Mr. Clark—What about Mitcham?

Mr. SHANNON—If Mitcham were suffering from water shed on to Mitcham from an area still higher up in the hills, I should have some sorrow for Mitcham too; but, luckily for Mitcham, that is not the case. Mitcham is a shedder, not a receiver, so my sympathies go out to the people faced with this problem. We have actually had photographs shown us of some of the inundation that took place during the last big flood that flooded this area. Morphettville Racecourse was virtually a sea. The honourable member for Glenelg (Mr. Pattinson) would not think that an overstatement.

The Hon. B. Pattinson—I saw it.

Mr. SHANNON—It could be seen round the back of the stands.

Mr. Bywaters—How long ago was that?

Mr. SHANNON—Perhaps four or five years ago.

The Hon. B. Pattinson—Not so long ago.

Mr. SHANNON—Yes; anyway, within recent years. Any selfish attempt to defeat the objective we are now seeking to attain for the

benefit of these foreshore councils is, I feel, in very bad taste, to put it as politely as I can. As a fellow local governing officer who could, but for the grace of God, have been the clerk of the Marion Council instead of the Mitcham Council, to deny his unfortunate colleague the relief that this legislation will give him appears to be in poor spirit. Surely to goodness feeling for a fellow worker in the same walk of life would have some softening effect on his heart. I thought it would.

The member for Mitcham queries—I want to deal with this because I believe he is actuated again by his illegal adviser—our percentage cut-up for the various local governing bodies who are contributors under this scheme. The Public Works Committee did not work out this sum to two places of decimals. I should be the first to admit that we sought expert advice to decide what was a fair and reasonable split-up of these costs between the various people concerned. We decided that one-third of the cost should be apportioned to the contributing areas and two-thirds to the benefiting areas. We did not decide how much Mitcham should pay, what Marion should contribute, and what area of Marion would benefit. The committee sought the advice of experts on this matter and I pay a tribute to Mr. Dridan and his officers who worked out the percentages. The committee adopted them and not one person engaged in deciding this matter had any interest in the councils concerned. Mitcham said that it was not consulted, and Mr. Millhouse charged the committee with overriding local government. Is it not time that someone has overridden it, seeing that some councils regard others as fair game? Is it not time that someone took a hand and decided matters by force? The committee was worried about the impact of the annual commitments of the various councils. Then the Local Government Department came to the committee's assistance and gave the figures set out on page 8 of the report. I agree with Mr. Millhouse that despite the fact that Marion is the largest contributor, it is also by far the greatest beneficiary. In 15 to 20 year's time Marion will show a profit because of the increase in its built-up area. I estimate that eight to 10 years will elapse in the construction of the scheme and another few years for people to note the benefit in the area. Then Marion will reap the harvest. Thinking people in Marion realize that the scheme is in the best interests of the district.

The committee gave some thought to the need of councils coming into the scheme without undue embarrassment in the first years of payment, and it recommended that they pay nothing until £1,000,000 had been spent on the scheme. On the assumption that it will take eight to 10 years to complete the construction of the scheme at the rate of £250,000 per annum, it will mean four years will elapse before the councils will pay anything. That will give them ample warning to put their house in order. The committee considered this to be the balancing point. Until that time the Government will carry the whole burden and then the councils will start to pay their normal yearly commitments as if the whole scheme had been completed. The figures will then disclose that they are paying an appropriate amount for the full period. This was all worked out by a genius. It gave the councils a breathing space and did not act unfairly towards the Government.

The Local Government Department is to be the constructing authority. Marion has a good engineer and the Government was wise in choosing Mr. Susman to assist it in this matter. Marion has good plant too, and a forward-looking plan. The Town Clerk (Mr. Bradley) told me that the council would like to borrow £100,000 to spend mostly on plant to do the work, and that it would be a tenderer for the work when the specifications were available. I thought that was an excellent idea, especially if qualified men and proper plant were available. Obviously the work would have to be carried out under the supervision of the Local Government Department. If Mitcham can perform the miracles Mr. Hayes says it can in the matter of cutting costs, here is an opportunity for it to pay for its plant in a year and have a surplus; that is, if he can do the work at the cost he mentioned, but I have my doubts about that. The figures have been checked by experts. It would be a good idea to allow councils to enter into competition with private enterprise in the performance of this work.

The scheme has been thoroughly investigated and it deals with a knotty problem. We had the best skilled brains available to us from Government departments and we accepted their advice. The committee did not superimpose a lay opinion on the views of the experts, who were not denied the right to plan the scheme. To say that some of it came from the committee, to which some credit is due, is a little unfair. I feel that I had very little to do with the inquiry. It was essentially an inquiry

by experts, as was the matter of raising the dam at Mount Bold. That was an engineering problem pure and simple. If laymen started to poke their noses into that, as they are into this matter, they would deserve all they got. The committee sought the best advice available and even obtained the views of Professor Bull of the Adelaide University, and Mr. Farrent, Lecturer in Mechanical Engineering at the University. The committee had the best advice available to it in connection with this drainage scheme and no Select Committee, however adept at handling witness, could get more information from the sources to which the committee went. If a Select Committee went to other sources and accepted by and large statements made by men like Mr. Hayes of Mitcham that the work could be done for one-tenth of the cost set out by the committee, or as Mr. Millhouse said, at half cost, then save me from such a Select Committee. I cannot see any virtue in it. However, I do not think we shall get to the Select Committee stage, and I heartily recommend the Bill to the House.

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray)—I support this Bill, which I believe provides for an ambitious scheme worthy of the Public Works Committee, which inquired exhaustively into it. During its investigations the committee consulted officers with high qualifications in this field. I commend the Public Works Committee and all those who had a part in preparing the scheme before us.

This debate has been an interesting one. It was interesting to read the report of the Public Works Standing Committee, to study the map so ably presented, and to read the letter sent to all members by the Mitcham Council. I noted the council's remarks because, after all, we should consider all points of view. I congratulate the member for Edwardstown (Mr. Frank Walsh) on his sound knowledge and the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) on putting his point of view. It was interesting to hear the member for Mitcham ask for a Select Committee, because he has frequently opposed Select Committees. Members of the Opposition have put forward three or four proposals for a Select Committee this year but on each occasion he has voted against them yet on this occasion he seeks a Select Committee although the matter has already been considered by the Public Works Standing Committee, which is a select committee in that it is composed of unbiassed members from both sides of both Houses. He suggested we should have a Select Committee to go into the matters that have already been investigated; would he want another Select Committee if the first did not agree with his view? However, I do not blame him for putting forward his views because, after all, he is representing his district and putting its attitude. The Renmark Irrigation Trust legislation set a precedent for this scheme. The member for Onkaparinga said that country people are paying for metropoiltan advantages.

Mr. Shannon—That was raised by the member for Mitcham.

Mr. BYWATERS—He may have raised it, but the member for Onkaparinga referred to it. After all, we are one people and country people should help the city if they can, and *vice versa*. Now this precedent has been created in the legislation dealing with the Renmark Irrigation Trust and in this Bill, I am sure the Government will be only too happy to consider the problems of country corporations and district councils. I am sure that it will be prepared to assist Port Pirie in its drainage problems, which were mentioned by the member for Port Pirie.

Drainage problems have been accentuated over the last few years because of the increased number of sealed roads and the watershed created by additional houses built in catchment areas, as well as the runoff from other parts of the metropolitan area. This problem will become greater as time passes, and it has caused me a great deal of concern. In the metropolitan area there are about 500,000 people, and we have been told that in 10 years the population will be about 1,000,000. This increase will create more problems. The drainage problem will arise not only in the districts covered by this Bill but in other parts of the metropolitan area, too, and they will be seeking similar assistance before long. At one time Marion and adjacent areas along the Sturt Creek had lovely vegetable gardens and orchards. Those areas are now fully built up, and I think it is a shame that the metropolitan area is now expanding to the detriment of gardeners, who are being pushed out because of the rating. This has been brought about by the need for extra housing caused by the centralization policy that has been adopted. We should now take stock of that position and look to areas that are better drained, such as the limestone country adjacent to the River Murray which provides better drainage than the heavier types of soil around the metropolitan area.

As I think it is necessary to do something about the problem confronting us, I accept the Bill. However, I warn members that as time goes on we shall have more and more schemes needing similar assistance from Parliament because of the continual expansion of the metropolitan area that will greatly increase the water shed. I support the Bill, realizing its urgent need, and I commend the Public Works Committee for its excellent report. I have no doubt that the Bill will be passed.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River)—Honourable members may wonder why a country member is voicing an opinion or having anything to say on a Bill which in effect grants a subsidy to metropolitan councils. It seems that the debate has developed into an argument between the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) and the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse).

Mr. King—Degenerated.

Mr. HEASLIP—Yes. We as country members seem to be getting quite used to subsidizing metropolitan undertakings. We are subsidizing the Municipal Tramways Trust year after year, and now we have the boat-haven at Glenelg.

Mr. Coumbe—What about the South-East drainage?

Mr. HEASLIP—We are not subsidizing that, because it is resulting in increased production. The Renmark Irrigation Trust is also repaying the money advanced to it. We are paying pound for pound in this south-western suburbs drainage scheme, and we shall never get it back. We are therefore subsidizing the scheme. We shall never get money back from the Municipal Tramways Trust, and we as country members never use the trust's services. We are about to make a gift, and my experience is that one should never look a gift horse in the mouth, because one could lose it. If the councils concerned are not happy to accept what we are willing to give I do not mind if the Bill goes out, and I do not think any country member would mind if that happened.

That does not only apply to country members, because many metropolitan districts will receive no benefit from this Bill, although they will be contributing. The member for Mitcham implied that his district would not get any benefit out of it, but Mitcham has contributed largely to the difficulty of those in the lower areas. He said that we were usurping the powers of local government. We are doing so to the extent that we are giving certain councils a subsidy, and if they do not want that subsidy Parliament will not worry one bit if it does not give it. We are asked to provide the money, and if the councils do not want it under those conditions we can vote the Bill out and will not have to contribute.

I am totally opposed to the idea of a Select Committee inquiring into this matter. Parliament appointed the Public Works Committee to inquire into the matter; it has accepted the committee's findings on every other occasion, and a Select Committee would only be duplicating what has already been done. I only wish we had a drainage problem in Rocky River, but unfortunately we have not. I am sure the Leader of the Opposition would like a few drainage problems in his electorate. I am willing to support the Bill, but if the councils who are to receive the benefit from it are going to wrangle and argue the Bill can be thrown out and I shall be quite happy about that.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart)—Very briefly, I want to undermine what some members have said and underline what has been said by the members for Port Pirie and Murray, and to some extent by the member for Rocky River. I view this matter with some concern. I am associated with a municipal council which has made representations to the Government on several occasions for some assistance in draining areas that are becoming housing settlements. The experience of my council has been precisely the experience of the local governing bodies in the metropolitan area, namely, that this work cannot be financed out of rates. It is just another indication of what I have been trying to say in this House over the last two or three years, which is that insufficient finance is available to local government authorities to carry out properly the functions of local government.

Where towns have been established in the last 10 or 20 years it has not been possible to finance the necessary works under the Local Government Act, and the councils have had to receive some financial assistance from the State Government. We would not have had a Radium Hill, an Elizabeth, or a Leigh Creek if those places had had to be financed out of rates. When an older established town, such as Port Augusta, wants drainage the Government's answer is, "We will try when time permits to give you some technical advice, but we accept no responsibility for financing drainage." That reply has been given to

Port Pirie. It is of some significance that in this Bill the Government has departed from that stand, and I want the House to take full notice of that because when the appropriate clause comes before the Committee I will try to extract a promise from the Treasurer that he is prepared to treat other parts of the State similarly to the way he is prepared to mete out assistance to the metropolitan area, to Chaffey, and to Patawalonga.

The Government must accept the responsibility for this departure from policy, because its reference to the Public Works Committee included the instruction that it was to assume that the capital cost of such works would be paid for on the basis of 50 per cent by the Government and 50 per cent by the local governing bodies. There was no inquiry by the Public Works Committee or any all-Party Committee into the justification for that; it was a term of reference to the committee that it had to assume that basis of apportionment in all its investigations. I have no quarrel with that. I intend to support the policy of Government assistance in drainage, provided that policy is applied throughout the State and not reserved to special areas.

Mr. Shannon—Of course, the landowners in the South-East have to pay a fair share towards the drainage there.

Mr. RICHES—I think the landowners are required to contribute to some of the cost in Chaffey. The principle now established is that the Government is prepared to bear portion of the cost of drainage—50 per cent in this instance and, I think, also for drainage in the irrigation settlement. Apparently if a scheme is big enough and people ask for a big enough bite the Government will provide assitance, but those seeking assistance from smaller schemes cannot get the ear of the Government and I want to know why. Surely the Government cannot say that it did not have the financial resources available when Port Pirie and Port Augusta applied for assistance because it has found £500,000 for the River Murray and £1,000,000 for the metropolitan area since then. This is a departure from the Government's enunciated policy and in supporting this principle I hope the Government will make it apply generally.

Bill read a second time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I move—

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice.

The SPEAKER—Is the motion seconded?

Mr. HALL—I second the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—The contingent notice of motion I gave today is no good until tomorrow, so I have moved thus.

The SPEAKER—There being present an absolute majority of the whole members of the House I accept the motion. The question is that the motion be agreed to.

The Speaker having put the question:

The SPEAKER—There being dissentient voices I will call for a division. Turn the glass and ring the bells.

The time for the ringing of the bells having expired:

The SPEAKER—The question before the House is the motion of the member for Mitcham: "That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable him to move a motion without notice." The Ayes will pass to the right of the Chair and the Noes to the left. I appoint the honourable member for Mitcham teller for the Ayes and the honourable member for Onkaparinga teller for the Noes.

As the member for Onkaparinga is not now present, will the member for Stuart act as teller for the Noes?

Mr. RICHES—No. I vote for free speech every time.

The SPEAKER—I will ask the House to divide to see whether there are any voters for the Noes.

The House divided and all members crossed to the right of the Chamber.

The SPEAKER—It is obvious, in view of the fact that there are no Noes, that a teller for the Noes is not necessary. It is to be regretted that several members called out "No" but apparently did not vote according to their earlier call. I trust that that practice will not continue. The question is resolved in the affirmative.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I thank the House for the indulgence granted to me and now move:—

That this Bill be referred to a Select Committee.

Motion negatived.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 6 passed.

Clause 7—"Councils liable for half cost of works."

Mr. RICHES—During the debate on the second reading I indicated that I intended to ask in Committee whether the Government was prepared to give an assurance that other councils would be treated the same as certain councils are to be treated under this Bill. Will the Minister of Works give favourable consideration to other councils being treated on this basis?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Works)—I do not think it is possible, nor do I believe the honourable member would expect the Government to give an assurance on the lines he suggests. It is well known that the Government receives requests from councils on various grounds, and only this session Parliament agreed to certain measures that will give material assistance to councils in particular areas. The honourable member will agree it has been the Government's policy to consider every application on its merits and I do not think he would suggest that the Government over the years has been unsympathetic to genuine requests. I believe that by assistance from the public purse many substantial improvements have been effected that would have been beyond the resources of councils. I could not on behalf of the Government give an open assurance as the honourable member suggests, and the only course is for these matters to be presented from time to time on their merits. The honourable member may be doing a disservice to a council by seeking such an assurance on a fifty-fifty basis, because it could be that participation by the Government in certain cases might be more than fifty per cent. Therefore, I think the prudent thing is to accept the clause as printed.

Mr. RICHES—The point is that the Government has refused point blank to accept any responsibility for drainage in certain districts in the past. The reply given to requests for an overall drainage scheme for Port Augusta was that the Government would provide technical equipment only, and that it was not the policy of the Government to accept any responsibility for drainage. I know that other councils have made similar requests. The Minister cannot expect us to accept the past as a guide for the future. It is just as important in other parts of the State as within the areas covered by this Bill that consideration should be given to such requests. I think that Parliament must seriously consider this question of being prepared to spend public money, but not to apply the policy generally. There is a limit to how far the Government can honourably go in that direction. I assure the Minister that the Government's policy in regard to drainage in country areas is not acceptable and it is expected that the Government in future will view country applications in the same light as is being done in this instance.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (8 to 26) passed and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

DENTISTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

BIRTHS AND DEATHS REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from November 17. Page 1661.)

Clauses 2 to 5 passed.

Clause 6—"Late registration of births."

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—The member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) wanted to know what would be the effect of this clause. Section 20 of the principal Act deals with the manner in which a birth which has not been registered within 42 days of the date of birth may be registered thereafter. Subdivision I of subsection (1) of that section, as at present enacted, provides that a birth may be registered within six months of the date of the birth "upon the direction of the principal registrar" and these words suggest that the principal registrar can only direct the late registration but not himself register the birth. In all cases of late registration an officer below a district registrar is never directed to register a birth and the object of clause 6 is to authorize the principal registrar himself to do what he may direct a district registrar to do, and thus save time in effecting registration. A similar amendment is not required in subdivision II of that subsection as that subdivision provides that a birth may be registered after six months from the date of the birth "upon the direction of the Minister." The Minister is not himself a registering authority and he will only "direct" the appropriate registrar to make the late registration.

The same reasons apply regarding clause 9. Section 29 of the principal Act deals with the manner in which a death which has not been registered within 10 days may be registered thereafter. Subdivision II of subsection (1) of that section, as at present enacted, provides that a death may be registered within six months of the date of the death "upon the direction of the principal registrar" and these words suggest that the principal registrar can only direct the late registration, but not himself register the death. In all cases of late registration of deaths an officer below a

district registrar is never directed to make the registration and the object of clause 9 is to authorize the principal registrar himself to do what he may direct a district registrar to do, and thus save time in effecting the registration. A similar amendment is not required in subdivision III of that subsection as that subdivision provides that a death may be registered after six months after the date of the death "upon the direction of the Minister." The Minister not being himself a registering authority he will direct the appropriate registrar to make the late registration.

Clause passed.

Clauses 7 to 12 passed.

Clause 13—"Burials."

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I move—

After "amended" to insert "by striking out the words 'last preceding section' in subsection (1) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the passage 'section 32 of this Act' and."

This amendment is consequential.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

New clause 14—"Non-application to cremations."

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I move to insert the following new clause:—

14. Section 34 of the principal Act is amended by striking out the words "the two preceding sections" in line one thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "sections 32, 32a and 33 of this Act."

This is purely a drafting amendment.

New clause inserted.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

WRONGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from November 24. Page 1802.)

Clause 3—"Claim and recovery of contributions between tort-feasors."

Mr. DUNSTAN—As the matter I raised earlier in connection with this clause has been covered by an amendment to another Bill, I now have no objection to the clause.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (4 and 5) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LOCAL COURTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 18. Page 1705.)

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood)—I support the second reading. The main parts of the Bill refer to defining the jurisdiction areas of the courts. I see no objection to them and I hope they work better than the existing practice. In his second reading explanation of clause 3 the Minister said:—

At the present time, where a warrant of commitment has been issued, a bailiff is required to execute it within five days. This gives rise in many cases to considerable hardship, for a defendant might be in a position within a relatively short time to pay the whole of the debt and costs, and the bailiff might feel satisfied on this point; yet he has no discretion in the matter. Clause 3 of the Bill is designed to enable a little more flexibility in this respect. It provides that the bailiff shall execute warrants of commitment with all dispatch, but in any event within one month.

My personal experience has been that a bailiff exercises considerable discretion in the execution of a warrant. It is difficult to get him to execute a warrant within five days. It may happen that an unfortunate workman has had a judgment issued against his wages, a bailiff has gone along to the employer with the warrant, and he has said, "This man ought to have more time," and he has not executed the warrant within five days. Many people have complained to me bitterly that it is impossible to enforce debts because of the slowness of execution of warrants. I hope this new provision will not mean that the month will be as flexible as the five days in the past. I do not think that it will go beyond the time that the bailiff tends to take at present in executing a warrant, but if the month is exceeded we shall get into a parlous situation.

Mr. O'Halloran—A month is more reasonable than five days.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Yes. If this provision only confirms the present situation I can see no objection to it, and what we gain on the swings we will lose on the roundabouts. I hope the month will be enforced because it gives ample time for someone to comply with a warrant issued against him. In these circumstances, and with some hesitation, I support the clause, and commend the Bill generally to members.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

LOTTERY AND GAMING (CHARITABLE PURPOSES) BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 19. Page 1738).

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Edwardstown)—I support this Bill, and I see no reason why it

should not be passed. However, I should like to know on what Saturday this particular race meeting will be held. Some important racing fixtures are already fixed for the year and I hope this meeting will not clash with any race meeting already fixed for December. I remind members that the many sporting bodies in this State do a tremendous amount for charitable institutions in conducting racing and trotting meetings. Although the Bill mentions a racing day, it does not mention an extra trotting day. Does that mean that the trotting clubs will have to make a separate application for the use of the totalizator? I support the second reading, and wish any club that is given the opportunity to conduct this meeting every success.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (NO. 2).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 26. Page 1901.)

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla)—This Bill can be strictly termed a Committee Bill, as it is composed of a number of disconnected matters. Some clauses are really formal drafting matters. Ratepayers are given a clear right to demand a poll before money can be borrowed for works and undertakings. These amendments have been rendered necessary as a result of two amendments made in 1957, and they appear desirable to remove any doubts on whether a poll is necessary and whether ratepayers have the right to demand a poll in these circumstances. Clause 3, which gives councils power to remit payment of rates in cases of hardship, such rates remaining a charge on the property, is acceptable. Many local governing bodies have requested this power during the last few years, and I am certain that all members will be only too happy to support that provision, although, of course, it places another rather difficult responsibility at times upon councils in deciding matters of that kind.

Clauses 6 (*b*) and 14 provide for a limited type of "owner-onus" in relation to parking in prohibited areas and exceeding the time limit in parking areas. These clauses might be objected to on the grounds that they place the onus of proving innocence upon the owner, but nevertheless there seems to be no other way in which the onus of proof can be placed in some offences referred to in the Bill. I understand that in many cases where lorries, for example, are owned by carrying companies, the owners have refused to divulge who the drivers are when vehicles have been involved in these offences, and there seems to be no way of sheeting home the offence except by means of a clause such as this. I understand that municipal bodies in the city, in particular, have had considerable difficulty in sheeting home such offences. Clause 6 (*a*) aims at standardizing prohibited area signs. I think we all agree that a measure of uniformity in traffic signs is desirable to avoid any doubt on the part of motorists and others regarding what should be done on approaching certain signs.

Clause 13 is a very acceptable provision that will give councils the power to regulate and control the use of motorboats and water skis, there being a number of dangers associated with these on foreshores in view of the speed they attain. This clause also gives councils power to make by-laws to control child-minding centres run for profit. I have noted that there has been some debate on the use of the word "minding," but there does not seem to be any other word that really fits the particular situation, because it is a term which, I understand, is used by the Kindergarten Union and is generally understood, and after all, that is the most important thing regarding a term that is used in that connection. There is no doubt whatever that, where this type of centre is being run for profit, control should be exercised by the local governing body to prevent abuse and also to see that those centres are run in accordance with the best health conditions.

Clause 18 concerns the powers of the Adelaide City Council in relation to portion of the west parklands. This is probably the most controversial clause in the Bill, and I foreshadow an amendment regarding it. I am concerned that there shall be no further alienation of the park lands in the metropolitan area, and there is no doubt that the powers that may be conferred on sporting bodies under this clause are very extensive indeed. The clause provides that the city council shall have power to lease to any club, organization or association for any term not exceeding 25 years, to take effect in possession or within six months from the making of the lease, the whole or any part or parts of that portion of the west park lands not exceeding in the whole 65 acres in area. The tendency has been noticed in local government practice where land is leased to sporting bodies for very considerable periods for these sporting bodies to assume a measure of control

which must conflict with the public interest to some extent, particularly when it extends over a period such as is suggested in this Bill. When facilities are allowed to be erected, as they are under this proposal, a measure of proprietorship is assumed by those bodies which I am certain, with usage, causes those bodies to feel that they have certain prior rights to the detriment of the public rights in an area of this character.

I feel that this provision goes too far in this direction. I realize that these areas should be developed to encourage sport and to make the necessary provision for sporting activities, provisions which are lacking today and which should be provided, but nevertheless I feel that these provisions could be provided without going so far as the Bill intends. The Adelaide City Council, if it retained these powers in its own hands, would be able to protect the public rights and prevent the growth of that feeling on the part of sporting organizations that they had an undue proprietorship in these areas to the public detriment. With those reservations I support the Bill.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens)—I support the second reading of this Bill, which I feel is a Committee type of Bill, and I, like the member for Whyalla, will comment when the Bill is in Committee. The question of "owner-onus" has often exercised the minds of this Parliament, and I believe it has not met with great favour in the past. It has been found by experience that it is absolutely impossible in most cases to get a conviction against a person who is parking in a prohibited area except by simply waiting on the spot, seeing the person who drives the vehicle to the spot, and also staying there and seeing that person drive the vehicle away. That is the only way councils have been able to get convictions in the past when persons have parked cars or vehicles in prohibited areas.

It is now suggested that this method of "owner-onus" be adopted in order to get *prima facie* evidence so that a conviction can be obtained. As the member for Whyalla pointed out, councils generally have asked for this type of legislation, which, incidentally, is not nearly so severe as similar legislation enacted in Victoria. This is a step in the right direction, and the moderate way it is to be applied will, I feel, meet with general approval.

The second matter I wish to mention is the provision whereby the City Council seeks control over certain sections of the park lands. The Bill specifically sets out the area of the park lands which it is desired the Adelaide City Council shall fence in, put certain improvements on, charge for admission and have the right to lease. This is somewhat similar to the conditions already existing with the Adelaide Oval, where the South Australian Cricket Association has a long-term lease, and the Memorial Drive, where the South Australian Lawn Tennis Association also has a long-term lease. Other sections of the park lands are fenced, but no charge for admission is made, for instance, to the University Oval and the Victoria Park Racecourse.

In this clause it is proposed to fence a specific section of the park lands and for the council to enter into an agreement concerning its use. I suggest to those who assert that our park lands are being alienated from the people that that is not so. Those who have played sport in some parts of the park lands remember the obsolete and inadequate changing sheds that are provided. They are poor and disreputable galvanized iron sheds painted a peculiar shade of green. One can rarely get a shower in them and many are practically falling down. When playing sport one has to be careful where one runs. It is proposed to spend about £20,000 on improvements in the area to be fenced and to establish two small ovals, not big enough for Australian Rules football, but suitable for soccer and lacrosse, and to provide adequate changing rooms. Recently, an international soccer match had to be played on a suburban oval because there was no suitable oval in the city. A city the size of Adelaide should be able to provide an oval on which a soccer match of international standard could be played and this proposal would meet such a need.

In the principal Act, the Adelaide City Council has power under sections 454 and 458 to establish sporting facilities and to charge for their use, but that charge only applies to the clubs and the members thereof who use the facilities. It is certain that the clubs which will use the proposed area of about 9½ acres, on which £20,000 will be spent, would not be financially able to provide for the improvements, nor could they get any mortgage on the land to use as security because the land is vested in the Adelaide City Council and is public property. The council will spend the money and charge for admission to the ground. This will give the clubs a good start. The lease will be for 25 years and obviously the council will be heavily in debt for many years, but when it recoups its capital

outlay I understand it proposes to devote it to further improvements in the park lands. Since the return of the Town Clerk, Mr. Veale, from overseas, the council has introduced a new policy of beautifying the park lands and yesterday we read of a proposal to spend a considerable sum in the south park lands. In the north park lands, in my electorate, it proposes to erect an attractive cafeteria and to establish a small golf course. I have been informed that the council's long-range view is eventually to provide an Olympic-sized running track.

Mr. O'Halloran—And ultimately to alienate the whole of the park lands from the people.

Mr. COUMBE—No. My contention is that having established these facilities far more people will use the park lands in those sections than use them at present. If the Adelaide Oval were not established very few people would use those park lands, but 40,000 to 45,000 people attend the football grand final each year. The specific area mentioned in this clause is adjacent to the Adelaide Boys' High School and is used by few people. A few clubs use it on Saturday afternoons but for the rest of the week—

Mr. Fred Walsh—What area are you speaking of?

Mr. COUMBE—The one mentioned in the Bill.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Don't be silly!

Mr. COUMBE—I know the area well.

Mr. Fred Walsh—I wouldn't!

Mr. COUMBE—Few people use it, but when these facilities are introduced the opportunity will be available for thousands to use it. The Bill contains the safeguard that the area is specifically mentioned and that any lease of it must be approved by the Governor or Parliament. We frequently hear that Adelaide should provide greater facilities for attracting tourists and sportsmen to our midst. This is a means whereby we can attract more people to Adelaide and make greater use of our park lands. I pay a tribute to Colonel Light for his wisdom in laying out these park lands.

Mr. Shannon—He didn't mean them to be cow paddocks.

Mr. COUMBE—That is so. If use is not made of these park lands the council is falling down on its duty. We should support the Bill. I well remember an occasion when the Adelaide Harriers' Club, which was established in the park lands, collapsed through lack of finance. The council proposes ultimately to lay a sports track. We all remember the outcry a year or two ago, when it was suggested that the Empire Games should be held in Adelaide, because we had no facilities of Olympic standard. I will have something to say when the Bill reaches Committee. I support the second reading.

Mr. FRED WALSH (West Torrens)—I also support the second reading, but with certain reservations. I question whether any member has more knowledge of the park lands concerned, because I was born and reared in the south-western portion of the city and so were my parents. I played sport on these parklands as a youth. This is the first attempt to develop for recreation purposes, other than as children's playgrounds, any part of the park lands away from the northern part of the city. It reflects the greatest discredit on the Adelaide City Council that it has not seen fit to develop other areas. It is obvious that influential business and residential interests have been responsible for developing only the northern part of the city. It is only in recent years that the council has gone a little westward, even in the northern parklands. Nothing has been attempted until recently to provide facilities for field games and athletics, and this is since the return of the town clerk from overseas. Obviously, he has profited by his experience and we see the result in the park land beautification proposed between Peacock Avenue and Sir Lewis Cohen Avenue.

The park lands are not played upon so much now as when I was a young man. Then more football and cricket were played. It is unfortunate that so many attend football matches rather than take part in field games and athletics. Most people prefer to watch. Mr. Coumbe said that the park lands were not used much by sporting clubs, but I remind him that the Western Districts Amateur Athletic Club has been using its area for many years, and I happen to be a patron. It has been struggling for years trying to develop the area to encourage young people to take part in foot running and field games. When Sir Arthur Rymill was Lord Mayor I took a deputation to him from the club asking for the council's support to install an underground drain to take the place of an open drain so that a circular running track could be provided. He did assist and as a result a concrete drain was laid, but it was left to club members to fill in the earth. The club also built a concrete block clubroom and its members will be interested to know what will

become of it under the proposal in the Bill and whether they will still be allowed to use the facilities. The area has been ploughed and levelled and planted to lawn.

A few days ago a subleader in the *Advertiser* said that the area was now a green sward, but it is bare of grass, though that will not last long. Apparently the writer did not know much about the position. Whatever scheme is finally developed, it will be interesting to know what will happen to the interests of the Western Districts Amateur Athletic Club which, unlike the Adelaide Harriers' Club, did not get assistance from the Government. The Adelaide City Council also assisted the club to lay down an Olympic track, but it has been neglected, and to some extent I believe the club members are responsible, because they have to keep it in proper condition.

I am concerned about the provision made for the leasing of this area of the park lands, and not necessarily only this area. It can apply to any other area of the park lands once this Bill is passed. We may be kidding ourselves to think that what we are doing here in the development of park lands applies only to the areas at present being considered: it will apply to all areas. Therefore, we on this side of the House and some members opposite are concerned particularly with the preservation of the rights of the people on the park lands.

Mr. Coumbe—This clause does not refer to one specific area.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Some aspects of it do relate to that area; certainly clause 18 does. It provides:—

> The said council may from time to time lease to any club, organization or association for any term of years not exceeding 25 years to take effect in possession or within six months from the making of the lease . . .

We can ultimately be in a similar position to that obtaining with the Adelaide Oval and the tennis courts at Memorial Drive leased to the South Australian Lawn Tennis Association. The City Council has few rights over the Adelaide Oval and the tennis courts other than perhaps the privileges accorded to the council members and their wives attending all functions held on those grounds.

On one occasion some people wanting to hire the Adelaide Oval for a certain purpose were refused because, as it was for charity, it was felt that the members of the South Australian Cricket Association and the Adelaide City Council would not get their privileges. I could be wrong regarding the City Council, but that was suggested to me. A Bill has recently passed dealing with a charity race meeting next year. It does not matter on what racecourse a charity race meeting is held, the club membership has to pay full admission fees and pay for its cars. It has no privileges at a charity meeting. The same should apply at other grounds.

While it may be laid down that Parliament shall be the final arbiter whether these leases are granted or not, I am a little apprehensive about what may happen once that provision is inserted in the Bill. I have not lost sight of the fact that the Adelaide City Council has still in mind the separation of part of the Victoria Park Racecourse, a portion of the flat, to be leased to the Adelaide Racing Club to charge admission fees. It contemplates beautifying it but the smallness of the area makes that impossible. In view of the totalizator buildings and bookmakers' stands as well as the liquor booth in that area it will not be possible to beautify it. Also at the moment the council receives certain payment for refreshments and cool drink stands. While it is impossible to go on policing certain establishments in the City of Adelaide, it would not be a bad thing for the inspectors to police these stalls that serve drinks and refreshments to the public on the flat at Victoria Park. Some of them should be condemned for the unhygienic handling of the food, and the flies on the foodstuffs in the summer. Another fear in our minds is that the council will still insist on its plan for the racecourse. There should be some provision in this Bill that Parliament shall be the determining factor.

Mr. Coumbe—That such a thing would have to be referred to Parliament.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Yes, because it comes under the legislation governing the park lands. I questioned the Premier a few weeks ago about any approach that may have been made to him by the Adelaide City Council in this matter when it was virtually cut and dried so far as it was concerned. I commend the Premier on his attitude. He made it plain that he would not agree to it. That is my impression of what he said. Obviously the City Council must have been told in some way or other that that was the attitude of the Government, because it did not pursue the proposal. We have to consider all these things when dealing with legislation of this character.

In his second reading speech in another place the Minister of Local Government is reported in the press as saying:—

The City Council, in pursuance of its policy to develop the park lands for public recreation, amusement, health and enjoyment, had resolved to establish a sports ground in the West park lands . . . The council was already empowered to enclose the park lands and charge for their use by players, but it could not charge admission to spectators.

The council had no desire to depart from the general policy that the park lands should remain set aside for free public recreation, and the Government shared that view.

I do not understand how one can reconcile that statement of the Minister on the policy of the City Council with its intentions in the paragraph I have just read. When one watches a game being played he does not do it to improve his health, although he may be getting some relaxation. The fact is that the ground is not set aside for free recreation. If the Government proposed the use of the park lands for free recreation I would support the Bill wholeheartedly. The game of soccer will become more popular in this State and some people envisage a large soccer ground in the west park lands. They hope that one day there will be a ground there much like the Adelaide Oval. There will always be people concerned about the best use of the park lands, and there were as many people concerned about it before I was born as there will be after I am gone. There is a Park Lands Preservation League, consisting of people who are concerned about the preservation of our park lands, but unfortunately nobody seems to take much notice of it. I do not believe that the park lands belong to the City of Adelaide or to the metropolitan area. The City of Adelaide and its environs belong to the people of South Australia. In some indirect way we all subscribe to its development. Although many people do not live in the city there are times when they come to the city and they should be entitled to share in any benefits accruing from the development of the park lands.

My mind goes back many years in connection with the park lands and I have always been concerned about their development. The steps now being taken by the City Council are in keeping with what I have always had in mind. I welcome the proposal to beautify a portion of the park lands. I might question the efficacy of starting the beautification as proposed, but I have previously thought of grading the park lands, which would not be costly, ploughing and harrowing the graded area, and sowing it with lawn seed, leaving the rest to Nature. If water were available during the summer months we would have a green sward around the city. Then we could develop it as is now proposed by the City Council. I do not think that council will be embarrassed by lack of finance, judging by the revenue obtained from the parking meters. The council is spending much money in reconstructing streets and roads within the city and it will be many years before more money will need to be spent on them once they are reconstructed. Then the money in hand from rates, etc., would provide sufficient funds to develop the parklands without indulging in the leasing of parts of them. If there is to be any charge the City Council should make the charge and do the collecting. I do not want to see any portion of the park lands turned into a car park.

Mr. Hambour—It is done for the trots.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Yes, on Saturday nights, and it is done on the days the Royal Show is held.

Mr. Jennings—No fixtures are put there.

Mr. FRED WALSH—That is so. It is necessary to have these parking places in the park lands because the Unley City Council bans the parking of motor vehicles in the vicinity of the Showgrounds. I cannot see why the vehicles cannot be parked in the streets for several hours, so long as there is no obstruction to the entrances to houses. I am opposed to using the park lands for permanent car parking and the leasing of them in the manner proposed in the Bill, but at the same time I support the second reading because of the benefits that will accrue from the legislation.

Mr. HAMBOUR (Light)—I am surprised that the Opposition objects to one clause in the Bill. I thought the Opposition would support it because it provides facilities for people to play organized sport.

Mr. Ryan—At a price.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Does the honourable member think that country people get their sporting facilities free? They have to provide them and meet the capital costs incurred. Under the Bill the City Council will provide the facilities and recoup itself over the years. The member for West Torrens said that the City Council should beautify the park lands, and I think he will admit that that will be more for the benefit of people in the metropolitan area. In one breath he said that the City Council should accept the responsibility, and in another he said the park lands did not belong to the City Council.

Mr. Fred Walsh—I did not say anything of the kind. I said the City of Adelaide.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Call it what you will, the honourable member's implication was that the Corporation of Adelaide should not have the right to lease these lands. On the one hand it is expected to beautify them—and it has been applauded for what it has done—yet on the other hand it is said that it should not interfere with the land if it is to get some return for its expenditure. For four years I rode a bicycle through the park lands to work, and those park lands are now in the same condition as they were 35 years ago.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Sixty years ago.

Mr. HAMBOUR—I cannot remember that far back; perhaps the honourable member can. This would be a step in the right direction, as it would provide sporting facilities. These lands will not be used for commercial purposes and surely members opposite must realize that these facilities will be appreciated by those who will have the opportunity to use them and that the people will not begrudge the small contribution they will have to make. This will beautify the areas around Adelaide. The member for West Torrens spoke about a green sward: sporting grounds are a green sward. This is rather expensive land for grazing cows, and I think the south park lands are, in the main, used for that purpose still. I hope this will succeed in further beautifying the park lands and in utilizing effectively land that is of little use now. If the Adelaide City Council has the responsibility I feel it should get some monetary reward for the money spent on the park lands until the work is completed. I commend the council for what it has done and I hope in the future it will beautify all the park lands around the city.

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray)—I support the second reading, with certain reservations. I am pleased to see in clause 13 a provision for the control of motor boats and water skiers. Water ski-ing has become an active sport in the last few years and I, as a resident of a town adjacent to the River Murray, see much of it. It is a worthy sport and the people who participate in it say it is an exhilarating experience and is very good in building up a healthful life. Under this Bill provision is made for control by local government bodies, which is necessary.

Mr. Riches—How much has the corporation control over?

Mr. BYWATERS—It has control over the area adjacent to the river, as seaside councils have over the beaches. I think the corporation and council of the areas adjacent to Murray Bridge would have a similar amount of control, and they would have the use of the police to administer the control.

Mr. Riches—They would have to make identical by-laws.

Mr. BYWATERS—That is so, but this Bill allows them to make by-laws, which are necessary because of irresponsible people who occasionally take advantage of a provision that affects genuine people. Only a minority abuse certain privileges but, because of that, it is necessary to have some control which in turn benefits the clubs concerned. Whereas water ski-ing clubs lay down certain provisions and penalties for non-compliance, people outside the clubs abuse the privileges granted to others, so it is necessary to have some form of control.

Control of small boats has exercised my mind for a considerable time from a safety point of view. I have been in contact with the committee that has investigated this matter. I feel that this body has approached the matter in a sensible way and that some good will come out of its work. I understand that it will recommend to the Local Government Association certain amendments to the Act to provide for control over small craft; these may be before us in a future session.

Much has been said about clause 18 and the reason why members on this side oppose the alienation of park lands. The member for Light (Mr. Hambour) said that he was surprised that we objected to this clause. We object to a long term lease over the park lands. In this instance, 25 years is possible and there could be a similar set-up as now exists with the South Australian Cricket Association. The park lands must be preserved for amateur sport. Recently there has been a demand for additional recreation areas. I am pleased to have been associated with the member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke) on this matter. He has drawn the Government's attention to the need for additional recreation areas, and I commend him for that, as I know that with the increasing population in the metropolitan area it is necessary to acquire more land for these purposes. Because of this, I hate to see areas already in existence being taken over by one section of the community from people now using them on an amateur basis. We have been told that sections of the park lands have remained the same for the last 60 years, and that is so, but it is not necessary. Anyone who has noticed the work done on the women's playing

fields adjacent to Adelaide will realize what can be done by voluntary effort.

Mr. Millhouse—That was due mainly to Miss May Mills.

Mr. BYWATERS—And others, too.. I commend Miss May Mills for the fine work she has done. That lady has certainly been a leader in this field, but others have been associated with it. I could refer to women connected with the National Fitness Council of South Australia and the work that they have done. For instance, Miss Black has done a great deal towards the promotion of the women's playing fields. Most of this work has been done by voluntary effort, and it is a credit to those people and shows what can be done if sporting bodies are prepared to throw a little weight into their activities and do some hard work.

This has been done in country areas, where small communities have not received assistance from the local government authorities because those authorities have been unable to give it. Those communities have created facilities by voluntary effort, and the work they have done is a credit to them. I always find it pleasing when I come to Adelaide on a Saturday afternoon to look around the park lands and see the various sporting activities carried on. In the winter time there is nothing more pleasing than the sight of people playing football, basketball and other sport in the park lands. The colourful display of the youthful participants is one that gladdens the eye. It should be encouraged, not discouraged by taking away land which those people are at present using.

The member for West Torrens (Mr. Fred Walsh) has had considerable experience of the park lands in question, and I do not think his arguments can be refuted in any way. Rapid expansion is taking place. It is estimated that there are about 51,000 youths in the metropolitan area and surroundings who should be taking part in active sport and should be encouraged to do so, and it is further estimated that by 1965 there will be 90,000 youths looking for recreation areas for active sport. It was said earlier that 45,000 people go down and watch football at the Adelaide oval at certain times of the year, and that is good. It is a recreation to go down and have an afternoon's entertainment, but it is not furthering the development of healthy activity which is so necessary. There is nothing finer than for a youth to be busily occupied either in work or in sport, for it keeps him out of mischief. Those who are actively associated with sport very seldom get into trouble. I feel there is a growing need for more recreation areas instead of taking away some of those that we have at present.

I support the second reading, but trust that the amendment foreshadowed by the member for Whyalla will be accepted and that these areas will not be alienated and go into the control of one section of the people to the detriment of many others.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside)—The portion of this Bill on which I wish to speak is the provision for the licensing, regulation, supervision and control of child-minding centres. Honourable members will recall that I have on several occasions during the session brought this matter forward, and although I favour the principle of this amendment I consider it would have been a more satisfactory method to introduce this matter in the form of a special Bill. In his second reading explanation, the Minister of Works said:—

The Government has considered representations from various bodies interested in children's welfare and recognizes the need and desirability for ensuring that such centres are conducted on suitable lines and in suitable premises. The Government considers that the most efficient and appropriate method of securing the adequate supervision and control of such centres is to confer the necessary power on local authorities to supervise the centres within their own districts.

I have discussed this subject with many women's organizations, and with due deference to my male colleagues in this House I point out that this is a subject on which women are particularly well able to speak and which they have probably considered more than would a man. This matter has been the subject of much investigation and discussion over a considerable period in South Australia, but this problem is not peculiar to South Australia. It has been vexing the minds of people everywhere interested in this activity carried on by people who are making quite profitable concerns out of these child minding centres.

The Australian Pre-School Association at its last conference in Canberra devoted much time to this subject, and recently in Brisbane, when the Lord Mayors and Town Clerks of the various capital cities conferred, this matter also came up for discussion. I feel, therefore, that it is a matter that has concerned organizations and people in authority. The position is slightly different in Victoria, because I understand that some local governing authorities there administer their own

pre-school set-ups, and therefore they have the people on the spot who can inspect, control and recommend the necessary improvements to these centres.

I have much information that I should like to bring before the House but which I prefer to do when the Bill is in Committee. At this juncture I reiterate that I feel that, had this matter been introduced as a separate Bill and the Control of these centres placed with a central authority, there would have been no opportunity for a variation in the standards of these creches that we may get when it is introduced as a by-law giving local authorities the power to control creches within their areas. When discussing this Bill with the various people interested in the question, I found that the Acts that were particularly relevant to this subject were the Health Act and the Maintenance Act, but that the most desirable course would have been to introduce a special Act to deal with this subject. Although I support the Bill, I will say more on this matter in Committee.

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa)—I am in complete accord with the reasons for this Bill. Clause 5 makes provision to enable local governing authorities to postpone payment of rates where hardship can be occasioned the owner-occupier. Those rates can be subsequently retrieved if the owner-occupier becomes able to pay later, and after decease they can become a charge against the deceased's estate. I welcome this provision because it can relieve the position of an individual in straitened circumstances. I am delighted to note the provisions of clause 18 concerning the City Council's powers over portion of the west park lands. I am impressed with the council's positive approach in beautifying our park lands and enabling them to be fully utilized by the maximum number of people in active sport in pleasing and satisfying surroundings. I have no doubt that the policy and endeavours of the council in beautifying our park lands and in providing for recreation are fulfilling the high purpose for which Colonel Light originally set this land out. I congratulate the council on giving our park lands a new deal and a new look in keeping with a progressive city such as Adelaide.

Clause 18 contains three major provisions. The first empowers the council to grant leases to any club, organization or association for a term of up to 25 years on certain conditions. I can see no harm in this but rather a great benefit to many in enabling certain bodies to provide facilities for active participation in sport, which would otherwise be impossible. The second provision is the freedom to build dressing sheds, pavilions and so on—all necessary for complete participation in sport. The third provision empowers the council to grant permits or licences for periods up to six months with power to prohibit admission at any time when organized sports are in progress and to charge fees. In country areas the park lands are the property of the people in most instances. There are certainly many country park lands under the trusteeship of the local council, but there are many too, that have no connection with local governing authorities. They are the people's park lands and an admission is charged to football matches and gala events. I can see no harm, for a given few hours on certain occasions, in enabling charges to be made for admission.

Mr. O'Halloran—You do not grant a lease to individual organizations.

Mr. LAUCKE—We grant leases to tennis clubs because the park courts are leased to the clubs for a given fee annually.

Mr. Loveday—Leased for up to 25 years?

Mr. LAUCKE—In perpetuity, it seems, at a given annual fee.

Mr. O'Halloran—To a football club or a cricket club for the whole area?

Mr. LAUCKE—Only for certain parts of the park.

Mr. Jennings—What about after dark?

Mr. LAUCKE—We have lighting which enables sporting events to be conducted under lights in the cool of summer evenings. What appeals to me most in clause 18 is that we are providing facilities to permit many people to be active participants in sport. The 65 acres affected by the Bill will enable the provision of grounds for soccer, baseball and other sports that have not yet achieved great popularity and which do not have adequate grounds at present. This provision opens a new vista for sporting participation and I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 12 passed.

Clause 13 "By-laws."

Mrs. STEELE—There is some concern that the provision to enable by-laws for the registration and supervision of child-minding centres may result in a great variation in the standards of child-minding centres. This

question has been discussed throughout Australia. There are four main standards which most bodies connected with child welfare are anxious to see stipulated, but I do not know whether they can be stipulated when the control is in the hands of a number of councils. The standards concern buildings, grounds and personnel and they apply to any place where children attend on an occasional basis and are not enrolled regularly, which, of course, is the function of child-minding centres. If there were a central authority there would be an opportunity to appoint people well versed in what is required under these standards. I know that the Kindergarten Union is most perturbed that under this method we may have a variety in the standards I have mentioned.

There are in Adelaide and surrounding suburbs a number of these centres and the majority charge about £2 10s. a week. Some are open to criticism. There is one not far from Parliament House situated in a basement and it caters for 15 children from one to five years of age and it is open from 7.45 a.m. to 6 p.m. There is no way of establishing whether or not it is properly conducted. There is another in Adelaide in an old shop and it is easy for anyone passing to look in and see the children with their faces pressed against the glass, and they have little equipment to keep them occupied. There is one in my electorate about which our council is concerned, so the general standard of these child-minding centres leaves much to be desired. I do not know whether any standards can be supplied to councils to serve as a basis for their approval of these centres, but I know that women's organizations which are particularly interested in this clause would be glad if a standard could be set.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 11.03 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, December 2, at 2 p.m.