

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.**

Tuesday, August 29, 1961.

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

**ARTIFICIAL BREEDING BILL.**

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

**ROAD TRAFFIC BILL.**

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

**QUESTIONS.****RAILWAY STANDARDIZATION.**

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Mr. Speaker, you will recall that on August 16 you ruled me out of order when I tried to move a motion, which I considered to be in the State's interests, concerning the standardization of railway lines, and the fact that no provision was made in the Commonwealth Budget for such work in South Australia. According to the press, the Prime Minister and the Premier of Western Australia have signed an agreement for the standardization of the Kalgoorlie to Kwinana line in Western Australia. I am not the least perturbed about Western Australia for I believe the work is essential. Members will appreciate that I have not been in Government. Can the Premier say whether Government legislation can supersede a matter before the court? I understand that there is a case before the court between the Commonwealth and South Australian Governments on the matter of standardization. Will this have a bearing on the decision that may be arrived at by the court? Will the decision be influenced? What will be the position if the court considers favourably the South Australian application? Will South Australia have a possible hope of getting standardization?

The SPEAKER: The Leader's question is hypothetical.

Mr. Frank Walsh: Some of it may be.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I did not take it as hypothetical, Mr. Speaker. I took it to relate to what bearing the present Commonwealth offer would have on the case

before the court if the offer was accepted by South Australia.

The SPEAKER: I was referring to the latter part of the Leader's question, about assuming that the court might reach a certain decision. Does the Premier wish to answer the earlier part of the question?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes. The Commonwealth offer in connection with the locomotives and the ore-carrying waggons was contained in a letter I received late on Saturday night by special messenger. It is framed with a certain amount of reservation, but one or two things are clear. In the first place, the offer is to be considered by South Australia as something entirely apart from the standardization agreement. It has nothing to do with it, so the Commonwealth Government says. It is to be regarded by South Australia as completely outside of it and the grant will be made under section 96 of the Commonwealth Constitution. One or two other matters are receiving the attention of the Government's legal advisers and I cannot indicate at this moment whether they will advise the Government to negotiate towards accepting the offer, or whether they will consider that the offer should not be accepted because of certain implications regarding a matter that is not the subject of discussion in this House at the moment. I make it clear that the offer is not made under the standardization agreement, but is completely outside of it. It is made under section 96 of the Commonwealth Constitution, and under the terms of the letter received by South Australia the offer, if accepted, would require ratification by Parliament. Certain implications must be closely examined.

I think that one or two matters mentioned by the Prime Minister at the press conference need correction. I make it clear that the South Australian Government did not prefer (as stated by the Prime Minister) to take action in connection with the standardization agreement. No Government prefers to take court action if it can get a reasonable solution to its problems without it. Secondly, the statement by the Prime Minister as to the issues involved before the court is not correct. The issues involved are whether there is an agreement between the South Australian and the Commonwealth Governments. The Commonwealth is maintaining that there is no agreement, but we believe that the document ratified by the Commonwealth Parliament and by the State Parliament amounts to an agreement.

Mr. Stott: It is a matter for the court to say.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It is, but the Prime Minister emphasized that South Australia did not consider that the time factor should bear on the matter. We have always tried to negotiate realizing that any big undertaking such as this must be considered reasonably in connection with other national objectives. An offer of a grant has been made by the Commonwealth Government under section 96 of the Constitution: 30 per cent will be repayable over 50 years, for certain rolling stock. That offer is now being closely scrutinized by the legal advisers of the Government.

#### PORT STANVAC DISPUTE.

Mr. JENKINS: My question relates to the ban imposed by several unions on construction work at the oil refinery site at Port Stanvac. As this project is of great economic importance to South Australia, and to Australia as a whole, and as there is unemployment, this hold-up must be deplored. Can the Premier say whether the construction company is prepared to comply with Commonwealth and State awards for its employees on the site and, if so, can he say what the unions demand over and above these awards?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This matter was raised in a communication from an officer of the Trades and Labor Council to me, and I discussed the matter with the chief contractor supervising the work. He said there were two or three misconceptions in the letter. The first was the statement that all refineries in other States had been built under special conditions, whereas the contractor told me that this was only partly true. Some refineries in other States were built under special conditions, but others were not. He told me that he did not desire to have a special agreement because he did not think it was necessary. He desires to work under the relevant Commonwealth and State awards that apply to his industry. He told me that his company had a reputation of being a good employer and that it desired to work under the relevant awards, which I believe is a proper attitude to take. Although I have not verified the amount, I understand that the demand is that everyone employed on the work shall get a weekly increase in wages of either £5 15s. or £6 15s. merely because he is employed on this work. I believe the ban imposed is entirely unlawful, and I hope it will be removed. At a time when we are desperately anxious to encourage large enterprises to come

to this State and when we have considerable unemployment, it seems anomalous that immediately this project is commenced things are made unpleasant for the employer and restrictions are imposed.

Mr. Fred Walsh: In many instances the employer takes advantage of the circumstances.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No member knows better than does the member for West Torrens that industrial tribunals are constituted to deal with industrial matters and because of that the placing of an unlawful ban on work as has been done on this job is improper.

#### POTATO PRICES.

Mr. TAPPING: The retail price of potatoes increased sharply yesterday and the following is an extract from last Saturday's *Mail*:

Potatoes up 2½d. a pound. The retail price of potatoes would rise by 2½d. a pound on Monday, the Potato Board announced today. They would go from 9d. a pound to 11½d. a pound. A board spokesman said: "This increase is due to an increase in potato prices on eastern State markets." The grower's price will increase on Monday by £20 a ton—from £61 5s. to £81 5s.

I was perturbed at the steep increase and wired Melbourne to find out the Victorian position because that is used by the Potato Board as the measuring stick for potato prices in this State. I received the following telegram:

Wholesale market rate old potatoes was last Friday £73 to £76 10s. and today was the same rate. This is the best price for redsoils. Redsoils are regarded as the best Victorian potatoes. Because of the disparity between prices in the eastern States and those in South Australia will the Minister of Agriculture ascertain whether the action of the Potato Board in providing for such a steep increase is justified in view of the Melbourne prices, which are somewhat cheaper?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have a letter from the secretary of the Potato Board and I shall refer to the relevant portion that explains the position from the board's point of view. The letter states that there is a shortage of potatoes in South Australia, that stocks held are nearly exhausted, and that there would be less than the quantity required for the next three weeks. The letter continues:

At present, Victoria appears to be the only State with supplies available and reports indicate that their stocks will only be sufficient to meet their own distribution needs. Western Australia has a limited quantity and they have assured us that any surplus to their requirements will be made available for this State.

As our own spring crop is not expected to be ready in volume until early November, this will leave a gap of several weeks, probably four, when No. 1 grade potatoes will not be available.

The letter has much more to say about the position and the board is considering alternatives to deal with the situation. The figures quoted by the honourable member will be forwarded to the board and I will obtain its reply to his specific question as soon as possible.

#### ROAD REHABILITATION.

Mr. CUMBE: Recently the Engineering and Water Supply Department undertook a fairly large job on Irish Harp Road and Rakes Road in Prospect and Enfield. Is the Minister aware that the resulting rather large and numerous excavations have been filled in temporarily and are causing much nuisance to traffic on these busy roads? Can the Minister of Works arrange with either his department or the councils concerned to re-establish these roads as soon as possible and, at the same time, will he undertake that on such major roads, after allowing for natural subsidence of soils to take place, re-establishment work will be completed as soon as possible?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The honourable member has raised a somewhat difficult question, and I think he put his finger on the major difficulty when he referred to the lapse of time required to enable the back-filled soil to consolidate to a point where road reinstatement could be permanently effected. There is always a difficulty with a narrower type of trench, where consolidating equipment is not able to operate very satisfactorily and heavy rollers are not effective in getting the soil to consolidate to the necessary point. I am constantly on the watch, as I move around, for cases where the back fill has subsided to a point where some traffic hazard might occur. The Engineer-in-Chief and his officers also are very alive to this problem. The subsidence occurs very rapidly in the early stages, and a few vehicles passing over a trench newly filled, even over the short period of the week-end, will lower the level of the soil quite substantially and to a point where at the commencement of work on Monday morning there is possibly a problem already in existence.

I assure the honourable member that the department is watchful about these matters. Quite apart from what a court might decide—and actually the courts have ruled in this matter—the department is anxious to avoid inconvenience or damage to any person or

vehicle. The question of reinstatement of roads is one which is usually dealt with by negotiation between the department and the council in whose area the work is being carried out. I think I can say that generally speaking the council desires to do its own reinstatement and satisfactory arrangements are made between the department and the council concerned about the cost of that reinstatement. The council prefers it that way because the work is within its own area and it has the plant and the men able to get on with the job promptly. I have not for some time been on the road mentioned by the honourable member, but I shall draw the Engineer-in-Chief's attention to his remarks and make sure that as far as possible there will be no delay in the reinstatement of that road.

#### ANDAMOOKA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Last night over the radio-telephone from Andamooka, via Broken Hill, I received an urgent message from the secretary of the Andamooka Progress Association (Mr. Schulten) to the effect that the water supply on the opal field was now very critical, there being 500 people there and the water being rationed to 12 gallons a week for each person. I am informed that among the 500 people there are 150 children. In addition, Mr. Schulten drew my attention to the fact that the sandhill some few miles this side of Andamooka was in such a bad state that a truck and six or seven cars were hopelessly bogged there last week. I believe that something has been done regarding a water supply controlled by the Andamooka Pastoral Company, and it is suggested that the solution to this problem might be found in the use of that water supply. Will the Minister of Works treat both these matters as urgent and see what can be done to relieve the situation?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The unprecedented dry spell in the north has caused great difficulties for all concerned, such as pastoralists and others, and this has applied particularly at both Coober Pedy and Andamooka. I appreciate the honourable member's drawing my attention to this matter, which has not come to my notice directly yet. I should think that the Engineer-in-Chief was aware of it. If he is not, I will make sure that the honourable member's remarks are drawn to his attention and see as a matter of urgency what steps can be taken to overcome the problem. I should not think the solution is an easy one. The Andamooka Progress

Association has been a very good body to get on with and the Engineer-in-Chief has frequently expressed to me his appreciation of the way it handles matters at that location. I am sure that everything that can be done will be done, and promptly.

#### WATER PRESSURES.

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of August 15 regarding the water supply to a householder at Beaumont?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: It so happens that last night I saw the docket containing a report on this matter and the position is that in this particular case no water was available for a short period. It is the department's practice during the winter months to clean out storage tanks and mains in readiness for peak loading in the summer. In this case the tank had been emptied and cleaned out and was in the process of being filled. I think the officer concerned actually made a slight error of judgment in that he diverted practically all the water in the main to the tank which left the people depending on main pressure a little higher up without water. That would be unusual and that explains why this particular householder and others in the neighbourhood were without water for that period.

#### RIVERTON-JAMESTOWN BUS SERVICE.

Mr. QUIRKE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of August 3 concerning the delivery of mails between Clare and Spalding and Jamestown?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have received the following report from my colleague, the Minister of Railways:

The Railways Commissioner advises that when the new time table comes into operation on August 27, the people living between Clare and Spalding will be served by one bus each way each day, seven days a week. The Postmaster-General's Department has adjusted its working to suit the new time table. Mails for post offices beyond Clare will be carried on the evening service and will be delivered to the post offices early on the following morning.

He believes that the service beyond Clare will be adequate and at least comparable with the services provided in most country areas. At present, the bus service is provided by a private operator under contract to the department, payment being on a mileage basis. If a private operator is prepared to provide a service under licence between Riverton, Clare and Jamestown, for passengers, parcels and mails—which service would co-ordinate with the train service through Riverton—he would be prepared to determine the existing contract.

#### NANGWARRY SEWERAGE.

Mr. HARDING: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of August 10 regarding the sewerage scheme and the water reticulation scheme at Nangwarry?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As the Nangwarry water supply system is operated by the Woods and Forests Department, I referred this matter to my colleague the Minister of Forests, who has now forwarded the following report by the Conservator of Forests:

The re-organization of the Nangwarry water supply to ensure adequate supplies for the mill, power station, fire protection, household and sewerage, is well in hand. The elevated tank is complete and other ancillary works are well in hand and should be completed before the fire season. A reticulated water supply has operated at Nangwarry for many years. The sewerage scheme has been commenced, but it is not anticipated that it will be operating until early 1962.

#### HAWKER WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. CASEY: Can the Minister of Works say whether a survey has been made for a site at Hawker for the construction of a 2,000,000-gallon tank to augment the town's supply of water?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As the honourable member suggests, a survey was being made. I will check with the Engineer-in-Chief to see whether a conclusion has been reached as to a site and let him know as soon as I get the information.

#### "STOP" SIGNS.

Mr. HEASLIP: Has the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Roads in this House, a reply to a question I asked last week about a newly erected "stop" sign at Gladstone, on which the background was red and the lettering white?

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

A new Road Signs Code published recently by the Standards Association of Australia provides that "stop" signs be of octagonal shape and with white letters on a red reflectorized background. It is the policy of the Road Traffic Board and the Highways Department to adopt standardized signs wherever appropriate, and accordingly all existing "stop" signs will ultimately be replaced with the new red and white type. The existing black and yellow "stop" signs cannot be readily converted to red and white signs, as the red background of the signs must be of a special reflective material. However, as existing signs are approved, the new type of sign will be adopted. "Stop" signs with a yellow background have been

erected by the Railways Department for a number of years at various level crossings. These signs were in accordance with the Standards Association Code which existed prior to 1960. In 1960, the Standards Association of Australia issued a new code, CE-1-1960, for the "design, location, erection, and use of road traffic signs and signals". The sign erected at the Gladstone level crossing, having a red background, is constructed in accordance with the new code.

#### MILK PRICES.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about milk prices?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have received the following report from the Chairman of the Metropolitan Milk Board:

The complaint is based on the provision existing under regulation 7 (i) of the Milk Prices Regulations, 1960, which requires any vendor, either wholesale or retail, who supplies shops, institutions, hospitals, guest houses, cafes or canteens, in quantities which average two gallons or less over a trading period or at the one time, to charge the price fixed for retail sales.

The two gallons referred to is two gallons a day—that is, 14 gallons a week. The report continues:

This price is shown in regulation 5 (c) (ii). A similar provision has operated since May, 1957. Any deliveries above the minimum figure mentioned above are charged at a lower rate as fixed by regulation 5 (b) (iii), of the same regulations. The prices quoted in the question are as stated in the regulations. During the week ended May 5, the vendor averaged more than two gallons per day and was charged the lower price, whilst during the week ended May 12, he averaged less than two gallons per day and was charged the full retail price. Following a request received a short time ago the board is now reviewing the above provision in order to ascertain the number of shops affected. A questionnaire has been sent to all retail vendors and treatment plants, and when the required information has been returned the board will be in a position to decide whether any alteration to the present basis is warranted. When this decision has been made I will forward the result to you.

#### COMPULSORY CHEST X-RAYS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I have received a letter concerning the compulsory chest X-rays being carried out in the Unley Corporation area. People are obliged to attend at service stations for the examination. The writer has asked me to ascertain whether the compulsory provision applies to persons 70 years of age and over and whether the service could be conducted in finer weather and could be more suitably located. I am familiar with some parts of this area and know that at Goodwood

and Clarence Park there are institutes, that the Unley Town Hall has plenty of accommodation and that accommodation is available at Park-side. It is not fair to the public to expect them, in this type of weather, to attend at service stations for compulsory examination. Will the Minister of Works, in the temporary absence of the Premier, refer this matter to the Minister of Health to see whether public halls can be used?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes, I will draw his attention to it.

#### HIGH SCHOOL TOILET REQUISITES.

Mr. FRED WALSH: For some time at least two high school councils in my electorate have been providing paper towels and dispensers in their schools because they believe it to be in the interests of hygiene. However, they believe it is an imposition on the part of the department—not intentional, because it has not been approached about it—for the councils to have to provide these articles. Will the Minister of Education consider providing paper towels and dispensers in secondary schools, or alternatively, will he consider placing them on the list of subsidized items?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: I shall be pleased to consider both suggestions and will confer with the Director of Education concerning them.

#### COROMANDEL VALLEY WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. SHANNON: Last week I warned the Minister of Works that I would question him about the Coromandel Valley water supply. This area almost abuts the new main and the residents are anxious to know whether the Engineering and Water Supply Department has concluded its investigation into the practicability of reticulating the Coromandel Valley village. Has the Minister anything to report?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I called for the docket on this question, and it came up last week. I am pleased to be able to tell the honourable member that I have approved the scheme and that it will go forward from now. The first stage of the work will be the laying of the main in the street. Some pumping equipment will be needed, but, unfortunately, the pumps necessary for this job are not readily available and it will take some months for them to be obtained and put into operation, so I doubt whether the scheme can serve the township this coming summer. Every attempt will be made for it to do so, and the main laying will proceed so that when the other equipment is available it can be installed

to perhaps give some benefit towards the end of summer, although I doubt whether that will be possible.

#### VAGRANCY CHARGES.

Mr. LOVEDAY: I understand that the Minister of Education has a reply to my recent question about vagrancy charges.

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: The Attorney-General has supplied the following report from the Crown Solicitor:

In addition to the three procedures mentioned (*i.e.*, imprisonment, fine, and release upon recognizance) as being open to a court of summary jurisdiction where a person is found guilty of having no or insufficient lawful means of support, the following procedures could be availed of in proper cases:

- (1) The person found guilty could be remanded to enable him to obtain employment or obtain social service benefits or some other assistance and upon so doing or satisfying the court that employment was available the court could, at the adjourned hearing, release him under the Offenders Probation Act upon recognizance subject to suitable conditions. The fact that he has no, or insufficient, money to meet the amount of the recognizance is not necessarily an objection to this course.
- (2) Alternatively the court could convict without penalty in a proper case.
- (3) If the court considered in an exceptional case that enquiries should be made into the person's background, he could be remanded or the complaint adjourned for a probation officer's report to be obtained. This would, of course, involve the full co-operation of the person concerned and, probably, his remand to Adelaide and subsequent return to the country for appearance before the court dealing with the matter.

The procedures outlined are matters for the court's judicial discretion which must be exercised in accordance with the provisions of the Justices Act, 1921-1960, or the Offenders Probation Act. The practical difficulties that arise in remoter country areas, particularly Woomera, are much greater than those in Adelaide and nearer country localities. The fact that the man has no funds or other assets will usually render him unable to leave a particular locality in search of work but this is an economic and social problem for which the remedy seems to lie in an application for unemployment benefits and not one which can be dealt with by any extension of the court's powers.

#### BARLEY PAYMENTS.

Mr. JENKINS: My question relates to payments for barley from the last harvest. During centenary celebrations at Angas Plains several barley growers approached me about

the second payment, which they claimed was promised in July. I understand that the first payment took place earlier, and was from 4s. 9d. to 6s. 6d. a bushel according to grading. The payment around July was in respect to the winding-up of the previous barley harvest. Can the Minister of Agriculture say when the next payment will be made and if there is to be delay what is the cause of it?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will get a report and give the honourable member what information the board can provide, but I understand that it is not able at present to make a definite statement on the subject.

#### NORWOOD HIGH SCHOOL FIRE MAIN.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Has the Minister of Education obtained a reply to the question I asked recently about fire protection at the Norwood high school?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: I have been provided by the Director of Public Buildings with the following report on this matter:

Following the receipt of your request for advice on the proposed installation of fire hoses and hydrants for the new buildings to be erected at the Norwood high school the matter was investigated and it was decided that the South Australian Fire Brigade should be asked to advise on the installation of fire hydrants for both the new buildings and the existing timber buildings. This was done and a report was received from the brigade last month. A scheme is at present being prepared to incorporate the brigade's recommendations. This scheme, when completed shortly, must be submitted for approval and for consideration as to the availability of funds.

#### SOLOMIT.

Mr. LAUCKE: At Freeling considerable quantities of straw are delivered by growers to a processing plant operated by Solomit Limited for the production of a high quality fire-resistant building material. It is supplied to builders in large slabs, which facilitates the speedy erection of houses. It is customary to cement plaster the slabs to give the appearance of solid construction houses. These houses, when built on Bay of Biscay soil, have, on observation, shown no signs of cracking. As the Housing Trust has at times to erect houses on soils of this type, which are prone to quickly cause cracks in walls, will the Premier say whether an investigation can be made into the use of solomit by the trust as a building material in areas where poor types of building soils exist, in the interests of both the trust in preventing high recurring maintenance costs and the local industry at Freeling?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes. This matter was looked at some time ago when there was some problem about getting the steel supports necessary in suitable quantities and at suitable prices. I will see that another investigation is made.

#### RATES ON TELEVISION STATION.

Mr. COUMBE: My question deals with the rates paid on some Commonwealth properties. In the electorate of Torrens are three television stations. Two of them, owned by commercial broadcasting organizations, pay council rates but one, Channel 2, owned by the Postmaster-General's Department, pays no council rates to the Prospect City Council. In the past repeated efforts have failed to get the Commonwealth to pay council rates. Will the Premier take up the matter at his level with the Postmaster-General to see whether rates can be paid and, if not, whether an *ex gratia* payment can be made to the council in lieu of rates?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes, but I should like to know the precise amounts involved so that I might include them in the request.

#### SUPERVISOR OF SCHOOL LIBRARIES.

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Minister of Education any further information on the question I asked recently about the appointment of a supervisor of school libraries, concerning which he said he would approach the Public Service Commissioner about arranging a conference between himself, the Director of Education, and the Principal Librarian of the Libraries Department?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: Following on the honourable member's question and my reply, I informed the Public Service Commissioner that in view of the general dissatisfaction expressed by teachers and parents concerning the inadequacy of supervision and organization of the system of school libraries I should be grateful if he would call a conference between himself, the Director of Education and the Principal Librarian in an endeavour to put this system on a footing worthy of its importance to the community. The Commissioner readily agreed to the suggestion and endeavoured to take steps immediately to call a conference, but the Director of Education is absent on recreation leave. As soon as he returns a conference will be held, and I hope that the Commissioner will be able to effect the desired reform in this important aspect of our educational system.

#### HILLS ROAD HAZARD.

Mr. SHANNON: Along the Princes Highway between the toll house and the summit at Crafers the Highways Department has provided appropriate points for people using this section of the highway to turn their vehicles into parking bays and enjoy some of the beautiful scenery that the road offers. These facilities, which the Highways Department provides at no small cost, are becoming sites for fruit vendors to set up stalls. This creates two problems. One is a traffic hazard because people pull up on the opposite side of the road to the fruit stall and cross the road through traffic to purchase fruit and then carry it back across the road. Just as important is the unfair competition that legitimate traders in the area are suffering because these people, who pay no rates, have no overheads, and sell an article neither better nor cheaper than can be obtained at legitimate stores at many convenient points along the highway. They are not in that section of the hills, but before entering and after leaving Crafers there are many opportunities for people to make purchases. This is creating a real problem and, if it is allowed to continue unrestricted, I suggest that we will soon have a series of such incidents as happened at the foot of Measday Hill where, at a parking bay, two roadside vendors set up in competition and, although they did not come to blows, got so near to it that it created a furore to passers-by. This matter, which was reported to me, is undesirable on a public highway.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Obviously these parking bays are not being used for the purpose for which they were created. I shall draw the attention of my colleague to this matter and obtain a report on what is involved, legally or otherwise, in the question.

#### TOURIST BUREAU OFFICES.

Mr. DUNNAGE: I noticed in a recent press report that the Government contemplated purchasing a property in Sydney for use by the Tourist Bureau. I think everyone who has visited the bureau in Sydney will agree with the wisdom of this move, but will the Premier say whether it is to be the general policy of the Tourist Bureau to have separate offices not associated with other Tourist Bureaux in each State?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Although we have had offices in both Melbourne and Sydney for a considerable time, they have been located in the offices of the bureaux of

other States. In Melbourne and Sydney our office was in the office of the Victorian bureau. We had limited accommodation and rights of display, officers were working under difficult conditions, and we were not getting the results we would have got had a different type of building been available. Unfortunately, it was not possible to lease premises in either Melbourne or Sydney, so it was decided as an experiment to purchase a building in Melbourne last year. Although conditions are not nearly as favourable now as they were when the property was bought, the Government was delighted that the volume of business passing through the office was 40 per cent more than last year. Recently, we ran up against a similar problem in Sydney and purchased a five-storey building there. The purchase has been completed and the necessary alterations are about to be undertaken. We will occupy the ground floor, and arrangements have been made to lease other parts of the building.

Mr. DUNNAGE: Will this be the policy of the Government in other capital cities?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The cost of running an office in another State is substantial and it may not always be practicable, because of the volume of business available, to have separate premises, but in general the Government desires to have its own offices wherever practicable.

#### VICTOR HARBOUR JETTY.

Mr. JENKINS: Has the Minister of Marine a reply to a question I asked recently about fencing around the screwpile jetty at Victor Harbour? I understand that the Minister, after refusing the first quote of a certain firm, has a further suggestion.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: In view of the special circumstances of this case, the Harbors Board has agreed that a protective fence should be provided. That has been approved, and the honourable member can expect some protection soon.

#### STANDING ORDERS.

Mr. LAWN: I wish to direct two questions to you, Mr. Speaker, on rulings. One question concerns something that took place here last session, and I am raising it now when the matter is not before the House and there is no heat or direct interest in the matter. I have been advised ever since I have been a member that the subject matter of an Act can be amended only once during a session or (shall I put it this way) that the subject matter of an Act can be the subject matter of a Bill only once

during the session and, once it has been disposed of by being either passed or rejected, a Bill on the same matter cannot be introduced again. However, after the Prices Bill was passed in its entirety last session, another Bill was introduced later to amend the legislation.

The second point on which I should like a ruling relates to second readings, and on this occasion I may have the support of the Premier. Under the procedure laid down for a second reading, I understand you put the motion: "That this Bill be now read a second time". My understanding, and that of other members, is that if the motion is defeated it means the defeat of the Bill; it is finished. I should like to have your clarification of this, particularly in view of what happened in the Senate last year after this House rose. A Bill was before the Senate and the motion was put "That the Bill be now read a second time", and it was rejected. The President of the Senate held that the emphasis was on the word "now" and that a Bill could be put up 20 times and rejected 20 times. The Premier made a statement that ridiculed the ruling of the President of the Senate. I am not asking for a ruling to be given immediately, unless you desire to do so; I want a considered ruling so that we shall know the position relating to both these matters.

The SPEAKER: I think the honourable member will appreciate that rulings are given on matters as they arise, but I shall look at the matters raised by him.

#### DISUSED REFRIGERATORS.

Mr. HUGHES (on notice): Is it the intention of the Government to introduce legislation this session similar to the New South Wales Factories and Shops Act, which prohibits the indiscriminate discarding of refrigerators before removal of locks and hinges therefrom?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Minister of Labour and Industry reports:

The New South Wales Factories and Shops Act provides that it is an offence for a person to sell any refrigerator, ice chest or ice box which has in it a compartment with a capacity of  $1\frac{1}{2}$  cubic feet or more unless that compartment is so constructed or equipped that every door or lid can be opened easily from the inside when any lock or catch that can be operated from the outside of the compartment is fastened. There are no records of any accidents having occurred in this State which would justify introducing similar legislation.

#### WINDY POINT.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What plans has the Government for the improvement of Windy Point?

2. When will improvements be effected there?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It was intended to commence development at Windy Point this year but this will be postponed until next year on account of other heavy commitments in the Tourist Bureau Department.

PARKING METER REVENUE.

Mr. LAWN (on notice):

1. Has the Adelaide City Council set aside any revenue for off-street parking?

2. How has revenue received from parking meters by the Adelaide City Council been used?

3. Is the said council permitted by law to set aside revenue received from parking meters for the provision of off-street parking facilities?

4. If not, is it the intention of the Government to introduce legislation to give such power?

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

1. Presumably not, as the council has a specific request before the Government to permit them to do this.

2. Specific accounts are not available, but a published statement made by the Town Clerk recently draws attention to the large number of traffic facilities that have been constructed in accordance with the original statement of the council when parking legislation was introduced.

3. No—not beyond the financial year in which it is received.

4. The matter is receiving the consideration of the Government.

BUCKLEBOO-KIMBA RAILWAY.

Mr. BOCKELBERG (on notice):

1. What is the state of the railway line from Buckleboo to Kimba?

2. Is it due to the state of the track that wheat from Buckleboo has to be carried 175 miles to Port Lincoln by road?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Railways Commissioner reports:

1. The line from Kimba to Buckleboo is open to traffic. A portion of the length is subject to speed restrictions. Track maintenance on this section is carried out by the Kimba maintenance gang and a special gang established at Buckleboo. It is expected that the restrictions will be progressively lifted as maintenance work proceeds.

2. No. As far as I am aware, no wheat is being carried from Buckleboo by road at the present time.

OUTER HARBOUR.

Mr. TAPPING (on notice):

1. What are the average depths of water adjacent to the Outer Harbour wharves at low and high tides?

2. What is the width of the swinging basin?

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

1. At average low tide, the depth of water at Nos. 1, 2 and 3 berths, Outer Harbour, is 36½ft. At No. 4 berth, the depth is 38½ft. The depths at average high tide are 39½ft. and 41½ft. respectively.

2. The maximum width of the swinging basin is 1,276ft.

WALLAROO HOSPITAL.

Mr. HUGHES (on notice):

1. Which corporations and district councils contribute on an annual rating basis to the Wallaroo district hospital?

2. What is the amount of such contributions by each corporation and district council?

3. Are all these contributing corporations and district councils eligible to have a representative on the hospital advisory committee?

4. If not, which corporations and district councils are eligible?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The replies are:

1 and 2.

| Local government bodies contributing annual rating to Wallaroo hospital. | Annual contribution proposed for 1961-1962. |
|--|---|
|  | £   |
| Corporation of Wallaroo .. .. .  | 400   |
| Corporation of Kadina .. .. .  | 400   |
| Corporation of Moonta .. .. .  | 150   |
| District Council of Kadina .. .. .                                       | 725   |
| District Council of Bute .. .. .   | 650   |
| District Council of Clinton .. .. .                                      | 325   |
| District Council of Port Broughton .. .. .                               | 100   |
| Total .. .. .  | £2,750                                      |

3 and 4. The Wallaroo hospital advisory committee is appointed for terms of two years. The present term expires on June 1, 1962.

The committee is comprised as follows:—

Two members nominated by the Government—Mr. W. H. Paull, Wallaroo; Pastor A. J. Barnes, Wallaroo.

One representative Corporation of Wallaroo—Mr. L. C. Hughes, M.P., Wallaroo.

Two representatives from the other combined corporations and councils contributing annual rating to the Wallaroo hospital—Mr. D. E. Warmington, Kadina; Mr. A. G. Ferguson, Moonta. Each body has a right to nominate one member. If more than two nominations are received, a poll is conducted amongst the combined bodies.

## FLASHING LIGHTS.

Mr. RALSTON (on notice):

1. Have any country municipal councils contributed towards the cost of installing flashing lights at railway road crossings within their area?

2. If so, what was the cost of each installation and the amount contributed by each council concerned?

3. Have any country district councils contributed towards the cost of installing flashing lights at railway road crossing within their areas?

4. If so, what was the cost of each installation and the amount contributed by each council concerned?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Railways Commissioner reports:

1. No.

2. Vide 1.

3. No.

4. Vide 3.

During the period that flashing lights installations have been carried out in country areas as joint projects, such installations have been concerned with main roads only, and in such cases the contributions have been made by the Highways Department.

## LOAN ESTIMATES.

In Committee.

(Continued from August 24. Page 580.)

Engineering and Water Supply, £10,458,000.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): The sum of £53,000 is provided for water conservation, £50,000 being for tanks at Kimba and £3,000 for minor works and services. The *Whyalla News* of August 18 carries a heading "News from Kimba—Council Inquiry on Iron Knob Pipeline", and states:

The Minister of Works will be asked to inform the Kimba Council whether the proposal to provide a pipeline from Iron Knob to Kimba has been submitted to the Public Works Standing Committee.

Does the Government intend proceeding with this pipeline to provide a better water supply or are the tanks for reticulation purposes?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Works): A contract has been let for the construction of two additional storage tanks at Kimba and that work is in progress. The tanks will be positioned to take water from the Kimba reservoir, which is the primary source of supply, and they will increase the Kimba

storage from the present 2,000,000 gallons to 6,000,000 gallons for the township supply. The present supply will be trebled.

Mr. Frank Walsh: Will that have anything to do with the pipeline?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Not directly! The decision to install two additional tanks was made before any decision about the pipeline. The additional Kimba storage will prevent evaporation from the open reservoirs and will enable more water to be stored when it is available. That was the primary intention, but the tanks will be of substantial service in the overall scheme because they will act as a terminal storage in the scheme and will tie in with one or two other tanks in the Kimba area that can be linked with the proposed pipeline. The proposal to construct a line from Iron Knob to Kimba has not been placed before the Public Works Committee because the details have not been prepared. The department, until recently, has been busy preparing schemes for the present Loan Estimates and it still has several big projects under preparation for the Public Works Committee. One, the Mount Gambier scheme, is before the committee now. It is not possible to reticulate water from Iron Knob to Kimba until the water reaches Iron Knob in June, 1962.

Mr. HEASLIP: I understand that the £30,000 set aside for Jamestown-Caltowie is for the commencement of work on a 12-inch feeding main to improve the supply to Booleroo Centre. Can the Minister of Works say whether this is the first step in a supply for Wirrabara, which has been patiently awaiting such a supply?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The answer to the question is generally "Yes". It would be impossible to adequately feed the townships of Booleroo Centre, Appila and Wirrabara with the present feeder line, which is being replaced. The honourable member will recall that when I turned on the water at Booleroo Centre some time ago I said that the pipeline had been carried from Caltowie northwards to the intersection of the Wirrabara road with a larger main that would enable a take-off from that point to Wirrabara later. The Wirrabara water scheme was originally tied in with the proposed northern route for the duplication of the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline that had to be abandoned for economic reasons some 12 months ago. Wirrabara is not forgotten. We recently succeeded in bringing water to the towns of Booleroo Centre and Melrose in the honourable member's electorate.

The main to which he now refers is being enlarged to enable an adequate supply for Booleroo Centre and, later, for Appila and Wirrabara.

Mr. RYAN: On page 7, under the heading "Adelaide Sewers", appears an amount of £410,000 for the Bolivar treatment works. We have been told that that amount is provided for the commencement of those works and that £420,000 was spent last year on this project. The total cost of this scheme was estimated originally at £11,070,000. The expenditure of £420,000 last year was mainly on the purchase of land, and the £410,000 provided for this year also will be spent on the purchase of land and on the first stage of structural work. The Port Adelaide and Woodville Corporations are greatly interested in any decision on the commencement and completion of this work. At the present rate of progress we might not live long enough to see this job completed. The first page of the Public Works Committee's report on this matter states that the treatment works will replace the existing sewerage plant, which is hopelessly overloaded. I think that even that sweeping remark is an under-statement. A considerable area south of the Islington works is being connected to that overloaded system, yet people nearby are being left out on a limb with no hope of connection to the present system. Some of the people in the Athol Park and adjacent areas of Woodville North have been without sewerage for about 30 years and apparently have no hope of being connected, yet other areas in Woodville and farther up the line are being connected.

The Public Works Committee recommended that in the first year (stage one) £600,000 would be needed and that for stage two, which would cover the second and third years, £2,500,000 would be required. When I have raised this question I have been told that this is a six-year project: the first year for preliminary work; the next four years for the subdivision of the metropolitan area now served by the Islington sewerage scheme; and the sixth year for the completion of the job. The Public Works Committee suggested the expenditure of £2,500,000 in the second and third years, yet we find this year an appropriation of only £410,000 to be spent mainly in the acquisition of land. The Port Adelaide City Council is concerned about the non-sewering of the large reclaimed area set aside for new industry in the Gillman district. The council desires to spend money on kerbing, roads, etc., and would appreciate information about when

that area will be connected to the Bolivar scheme. Under the original scheme, this year would have been the first year of the four years' subdivision of the metropolitan area under the new scheme, but there is no possibility of that being achieved with the amount provided. Will the Minister of Works say what progress has been made on this work? The council is willing to spend money this year on kerbing, roads, drainage, etc., in the Gillman and Ottoway areas, but it does not wish to spend it and then find that the Engineering and Water Supply Department will come along in 12 months' time and dig the roads up. The areas adjacent to Gillman are amongst the most densely populated in the Port Adelaide district. Although Gillman has not been seweraged, I believe that Sassafras, which is the headquarters of the Engineering and Water Supply Department in that area, has been. Members who toured the Gillman area some time ago saw the reclamation that has taken place. The people are anxiously awaiting a decision as to when the area will be seweraged. They believe that some of the preliminary work could be commenced prior to any action to commence the Bolivar scheme.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: There is nothing further to add to the very detailed outline of the project I gave the honourable member some time ago in answer to a question. I agree that there is a large area in the district mentioned that has been in need of sewerage for a considerable time.

Mr. Ryan: Some of it has been waiting for 30 years.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: In some areas in Sydney they have been waiting much longer. The main thing is to get the first stages of the Bolivar treatment works into operation. All other matters then necessarily take second place. It is of no use diverting money from the main objective to an ancillary objective, because nothing is gained. The time of undertaking certain of the works would be still further delayed if we seweraged certain areas, because of lack of treatment facilities. The Bolivar scheme is being pushed ahead as quickly as possible. I believe that contracts have been let for the first part of the mechanical equipment requirements and as far as I am aware the scheme is proceeding as planned.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: An amount of £50,000 is provided for water tanks at Kimba. They will not be the answer to the question of the Kimba water supply, because each summer people are restricted in their use of water,

particularly for gardens. I should like to see a line on next year's Estimates for a main from Iron Knob to Kimba.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I should hope that something could be placed on the Estimates next year, but I am not unwise enough to make promises not possible of fulfilment. The Government and I are keenly aware of the position at Kimba, and to relieve it we have let contracts for the erection of two 2,000,000-gallon tanks which will increase the capacity at Kimba from 2,000,000 to 6,000,000 gallons. There are between 7,000,000 and 8,000,000 gallons at present in the Kimba reservoir and I should think that that would accommodate Kimba's needs during the summer. The honourable member can be assured that the Iron Knob scheme is not being overlooked and when the department can catch up with the work in hand, to which it is already committed, it will then turn attention to the preparation of a scheme for examination by the Public Works Standing Committee.

Mr. RALSTON: An amount of £35,000 is provided for additional extensions to the mains and for water storage at Mount Gambier. Last year £50,000 was placed on the Estimates for this purpose and although a substantial amount has been spent, nothing has been done about water for storage. I agree with the Minister that it would be inadvisable to proceed with the establishment of a 2,000,000-gallon storage tank until the site had been decided. The Minister has assured me that the site is being investigated and will prove satisfactory. The Mount Gambier Corporation has pointed out that the total storage for Mount Gambier is 1,500,000 gallons, but in the event of a major breakdown the city could be out of water during a heat-wave within six to eight hours, unless there were serious restrictions. The proposal to provide an additional tank of 2,000,000-gallon capacity would more than double the storage for the city. I understand that the present pumping capacity is more than sufficient to meet the requirements of the additional storage tank. Additional storage is necessary to tide Mount Gambier over the interim period. I think the Minister will agree that a total storage capacity of 1,500,000 gallons does not leave much margin for safety. Will the amount of £35,000 be used to begin, if not complete, the proposed 2,000,000-gallon storage tank?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The first point I need emphasize is that, contrary to the

honourable member's belief, the pumping capacity is not sufficient to lift the water to the higher levels for the proposed storage. The residential areas are creeping up to the high places. The proposed tank will be at about the highest point, and that will require more powerful pumps and rising mains to serve the area. Of the £35,000, an amount of £10,000 is for commencing the preliminary work on the new scheme, which will be inquired into by the Public Works Standing Committee, and if it is recommended it will then need the approval of the Government; £15,000 is for a new main in Lake Terrace, for which pipes are available and the department is ready to start the work there in two or three weeks; and £10,000 is required for depot accommodation for the maintenance and construction gangs that will have to be on hand for the projects at Mount Gambier.

Mr. HALL: So far, no expert committee appears to have been appointed to investigate any possible use of effluent from the Bolivar sewage works. The Public Works Committee's report recommended that such a committee be appointed so that the whole question of whether or not economic use could be made of the effluent could be settled with expert advice. Some of my constituents may be involved in any irrigation scheme or the sale of the effluent. Will it be possible to do something with it? Has the Minister of Works thought about this and will the Government appoint a committee to investigate the whole matter?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will discuss this again with the Engineer-in-Chief. So far, it has been regarded as of secondary consideration, but it is of some importance.

Mr. LOVEDAY: I understand that the pipeline from Iron Knob to Lincoln Gap is being laid underground, which is a new departure. Can the Minister of Works give the reason for that? Recently, all our pipelines have been above ground on supports. Also, I understand that the pipeline now being laid is somewhat larger in diameter than originally intended. Is that because of some difference in the requirements of the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited? Further, has the Minister's department compared the individual consumption of residents in Whyalla since the change-over to the new rating system with what it was previously? Some people say, "Now I am on a rate I shall use all the water I can get on the rate." Has that matter been examined?

I believe the Mines Department is boring at Coober Pedy. If it does not find a reasonable supply of water there, has the Minister in

mind anything for that area and also Andamooka? Although I was pleased with the answer I received this afternoon about Andamooka, I have noticed there is a feeling in some quarters that these two places are not really of great importance and are assisted only as a last resort. However, opal exports from those two fields are now worth £1,000,000 a year (excluding what is sold in Australia), and at least 1,000 people are engaged in the industry there. I do not think those two facts are recognized. It was said that the salt works at Port Augusta were a good thing because the exports could be worth nearly £1,000,000 a year, and £450,000 could be made available for equipment there. Also, the opal fields provide a valuable place for natives to earn a good living.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: First, the Lincoln Gap to Iron Knob pipeline is being laid underground because of recent developments in this sort of work. Years ago, all pipelines were laid underground because no other method was known. They were cast iron and had to be underground to ensure the stability of the pipeline. Then steel pipelines were used, the first one being at the Tod River. It was not a great success, for it corroded. It was then proposed to put welded pipelines above ground on concrete chairs, which involved breaking through technical difficulties in the welding of a continuous pipeline. These difficulties were overcome and much pioneering work was done on the pipeline from Perth to Kalgoorlie. That was successful and was the basis of most of our major pipelines in the State for many years.

With the development of successful protective coatings, it became a satisfactory method. However, as is usual when competitive interests work on one another, those who make trench-digging machines have improved their efficiency to a point where it has now become cheaper in many cases to put a pipeline underground rather than overground, the relevant factors being that over the ground a welded pipeline on concrete chairs is easier to maintain and observe but it involves many cross-over problems when laid in a thickly populated area. Therefore, with the advent of better trenching machines the bottleneck in laying pipelines was removed, and we can now dig trenches just as fast as we can lay pipes. With the advent of plastics, efficient outer coverings for the pipes protecting them against corrosion in all kinds of corrosive soils have been evolved, so it is cheaper to put the pipes underground and avoid the concrete

chairs. They are coated both inside and outside, they go underground and they stay there for a long time without much attention. We have also reached the point where pre-stressed concrete pipes are competing closely with steel pipes for underground work and, with the advent of trenching machines, the concrete-making people may succeed in tendering for major pipeline works on a made and laid basis before long.

The size of the pipeline mentioned by the honourable member was enlarged because, after its first request, the company determined it would need much more water than had been anticipated, so the pipeline was enlarged for that purpose. I cannot give the honourable member actual figures of annual consumption, but the new main has been laid with that in view.

Mr. Loveday: Would the present size be large enough to cope with an extension to Kimba?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: It would be large enough to supply a moderate amount to Kimba, but not to the whole county of Buxton on a reticulation basis. However, it will supply an ample quantity of water. The honourable member will appreciate that the supply for Kimba and its environs would be small compared with the total requirements of Iron Knob. I do not know whether the department has taken out figures for the per capita consumption in Whyalla since the rating has been changed, but it is an interesting question and I shall secure information on it. I do not accept the suggestion that the two opal fields are regarded as unimportant. The department's efforts to supply Coober Pedy with water is a denial of that suggestion.

Mr. Loveday: I was not referring to the department.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The fact that we are carrying water 100 miles each way and supplying it free to the progress association is evidence of our good faith. Our attempts to find an underground supply is further evidence of our desire to achieve a permanent solution of the problem. If we fail, I do not know what to suggest. I wish the honourable member could make some feasible suggestion. I shall examine the position at Andamooka in an endeavour to ensure that sufficient water will be available to enable people to get by, which, in the last extremity, is what matters.

Mr. TAPPING: An amount of £431,000 is provided for sewerage in new areas, and I assume it includes a provision for sewerage for

a small area in Royal Park. However, residents in that area have been informed, by letter, that they should forward £27 10s. each to the department for the connection from the main sewer to the boundaries of their properties. Can the Minister say whether that is the normal charge, because it seems costly?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I should like to examine a copy of the letter sent to the residents to appreciate the purport of the question. There is the actual connection of each household to the sewers which, as a matter of hard fact, costs nearer £127 than £27, but which the department makes at below cost.

Mr. RALSTON: In 1958, the Treasurer, in reply to a question, referred to the priorities recommended by the Advisory Committee on Country Sewerage (which included Mr. Murrell of the E. & W.S. Department as Chairman, Sir Stanton Hicks, Professor Cleland, Dr. McQueen and Dr. McCartney) showing that Naracoorte had first priority, Mount Gambier second and Bordertown third. Since then the Government has varied the priority list by giving Port Lincoln sewerage. A further departure is now proposed. There may be good grounds for not adhering to that committee's recommendation on priorities, but the position should be clarified because the Government accepted the recommendation. Can the Minister indicate what is involved in the £40,000 provided for country sewerage and what has happened to the priorities recommended by the advisory committee?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: That committee's recommendations have not been changed substantially. There has been the intervention of forestry towns, for which, incidentally, the Woods and Forests Department has provided the finance. The honourable member is not correct when he says that Port Lincoln was interposed. The priorities recommended were for two groups: the South-Eastern group (which comprised Naracoorte, Mount Gambier and Bordertown in that order), and another group, which included Port Lincoln. The Port Lincoln project was put in hand and is on the way to completion. Naracoorte has been completed, in effect, and there has been no change in the intention to proceed with the work at Mount Gambier. The honourable member can be assured on that point.

Mr. HALL: Under the heading "Beetaloo, Bundaleer and Baroota Water District" it is proposed to spend £1,220,000 on the enlargement of the Warren trunk main. The Treasurer said that it was hoped to complete this year 43 miles of the main. Last year about 30

miles were completed, and some work was done in previous years. This means that most of the 103 miles has been done. Can the Minister of Works say when the work will be completed?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I cannot give a firm date for the completion of this project because many things intervene. I think that the information I gave the member for Wallaroo previously still remains substantially correct. If we cannot finish by June 1962 we will be well on the way with the work, and it will be completed before the following summer.

Mr. HARDING: In connection with country water districts, the sum of £14,000 is to be spent on the Naracoorte water supply. The bore has been tested but I do not think that any pipes have yet been laid. Can the Minister say when it is expected that the bore will be in service during this current year?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I think I can assure the honourable member that the bore will be in service as soon as required.

Mr. HUGHES: I commend the Minister of Works and the department for the progress made on the enlargement of the Warren trunk main. When I first came here I said that if I thought the Government needed a shake-up I would tell it, and that if I thought it should be praised I would praise it. The farmers in the district do appreciate what has been done. In the first summer I was in this place I was driven nearly silly by telephone calls from farmers in and around the South Hummocks area because they were without water for stock, some of them for four or five days at a time. The Minister did all he could to assist them. In the following year I was telephoned by people in the electorate of Gouger asking me to attend a meeting in that area, but I said that under the circumstances I could not go into another member's district to discuss that matter unless I was invited by the member. I was told next day that the farmers in my district and in the district of the member for Gouger had compromised and were willing for me to attend the meeting, which they had made known to the member for Gouger.

A large meeting was held in the Nantawarra hall and as a result we requested the Minister of Works to hurry along with the enlargement of the Warren trunk main. During the next week there were so many bursts in the pipe that one of my constituents in close touch with farmers in the Gouger district wondered if we could cancel the deputation to the Minister and ask him to meet some of the farmers during an inspection of the pipeline. I contacted the

Minister and was pleased that he co-operated in every way in the matter. I know he had to break off other appointments in order to make the inspection, but it is to his credit that he did so, inspected the line and saw its bad condition. Ever since then he has used his influence with the department and I am pleased that from time to time he has reported to me about the progress in the enlargement of the main. When he gave me the last information I was pleased that such good progress was being made. I am confident that the progress made over a short period for such a large job will continue according to schedule, and that about June 1962 the pipeline will be completed. I am ever ready to criticize the Government and to tell it what I think, but on this occasion I think the Minister of Works has done all possible and can do no more. Of course, we do not know what the coming summer will bring forth.

Mr. Clark: What about the remarks of the member for Rocky River?

Mr. HUGHES: He recently said in this place that I knew nothing about farming.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. HUGHES: I know the difficulties associated with farming through the absence of water, and that is the reason why such progress has been made with the enlargement of the trunk main. The Minister is a practical farmer and knows that there cannot be progress unless water is available for stock. The sum of £10,000 is to be spent on mains in the hundreds of Hall and Wallaroo. Can the Minister say which mains are covered? Some time ago I waited on him in regard to smaller mains in my district. Does this expenditure cover them?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am not sure of the details, but I think the money is to be spent on improving mains in that part of the honourable member's district.

Mr. NANKIVELL: An amount of £40,000 is to be spent on "Other Country Sewerage Projects". Can the Minister indicate the priority that Bordertown has in the schedule?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As I outlined to the member for Mount Gambier, the programme for the South-East will be Naracoorte, Mount Gambier and Bordertown.

Line passed.

Public Buildings, £8,380,000.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: In regard to school buildings, the provision last year was:

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
|  | £         |
| The completion of 12 contracts with a total value of £1,329,000 for new schools or major additions which were in progress at 30/9/1960 . . . . . | 823,000   |
| The commencement of 62 contracts with a total value of £11,493,000 for new schools or major additions to schools . . . . .                       | 2,706,000 |
|  | 3,529,000 |
| The actual expenditure on these lines for the year 1960-61 was:  |           |
|  | £         |
| The completion of 17 contracts with a total value of £1,527,000 for new schools or major additions to schools . . . . .                          | 897,000   |
| Work under contract for 24 new schools or major additions with a total value of £4,913,000 still in progress at the end of June                  | 1,687,000 |
|  | 2,584,000 |

In other words, Parliament provided £945,000 more last year than was used by the Government on school building construction. Are we to have the same thing again this year? I think we are. I am not saying that the Government did not spend the money Parliament allocated, but it did not spend it on the things for which it was allocated. For the Seacombe high school, £70,000 was provided two years ago for an oval; this was an outrageous sum when compared with the cost of other school buildings.

Buildings mentioned in these Estimates may not be commenced in the next 10 years. This year £102,000 is provided for additions to the Edwardstown primary school. A similar sum was provided last year, but nothing was done. It is said that this work will be finished in February, 1963. Does the Government intend to convey that because an item appears in the Loan Estimates the work will be done? I say it cannot be done and that the appendix is a cover-up. Last year £945,000 was provided and not used, and the same could happen again this year. The Public Works Committee has been away at week-ends inquiring into certain school buildings so that they could be included in these Estimates, but I wonder whether these projects will even reach the stage of plans being drawn.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): I assure the Leader that the sum provided for schools this year will be spent in its entirety. The department actually wants substantially more money than

is provided. To suggest that the money provided this year will not be spent is not in accordance with fact, as the Government is greatly embarrassed by the rapid demand of the Education Department for additional buildings. This problem will be accentuated next year and, indeed, for several years. The Government is trying to make the money go around and an investigation is being carried out at the moment. Pressure is not so strong on the prefabricated building section and an effort is being made to transfer some carpenters and other workmen from that section to the housing section to enable the Government to keep them employed. I assure the Leader that no more money is provided than is necessary; the department has not had as much money provided as the Government believes it should have, but, as there is so much pressure for public money, the department has not been able to have the amount it requires.

Mr. DUNSTAN: In last year's Loan Estimates £78,000 was provided for precast concrete additions to the Marryatville primary school. In this year's Loan Estimates is a line for this work, but the sum this time is £79,000. The money provided last year was not spent and the work has not yet commenced. As I have had complaints about this matter over a considerable period, I should like to give the history of this matter. I think it is illustrative of the Government's method of budgeting. In 1955 this matter was first raised in this House. At that time the Minister of Education had owned for a considerable time a site bordering on Dankel Avenue and Shipster Road, Kensington, for a new infant school to be attached to the Marryatville school. The infant department is now on a site together with the primary school at Kensington Road, Marryatville.

There was considerable feeling on the part of local residents that the Government should have spent a large sum in acquiring property bordering on the original primary school site and there was a suggestion, in a letter from a senior officer of the department, that houses bought on the Dankel Avenue site were to be demolished on the commencement of this school. I protested about the demolition of the houses and the Minister said, at the time in Parliament, that evidently the member for the district and the citizens did not want a new school at Marryatville so he intended not to put it on the Estimates as he had intended to do. I made a personal explanation in Parliament and that apparently seemed to satisfy the Minister, because he then gave the impression

that he intended to proceed with his original intention. However, unfortunately, the line did not appear on the Estimates that year.

At the beginning of 1958, when there was still no sign of this modern infant school displaying the facilities about which the Minister spoke in 1955, a petition from many residents of the surrounding district was handed to me and I passed it on to the Minister. The petition pointed out the necessity of providing a proper and up-to-date infant school on the site at Dankel Avenue. I raised the matter in 1958 on the Loan Estimates and I was given a further reply. But, finally to my delight, following on various questions, we seemed to get somewhere and in 1959 I raised this question and said, as reported on page 572 of *Hansard*:

Provision is made for major additions to the Marryatville School. The Treasurer has already explained that there is to be a new infant school building close to the present primary school. Is it proposed that it should be on the site at Kensington previously acquired by the department, or is it to be on the existing school site?

This was the first time it had appeared on the Loan Estimates. The Treasurer promised to get the information for me and I was informed, in due course, that it was to be on the Dankel Avenue site. Although provision was made for that new infant school in the 1959 Loan Estimates, we did not get it. I raised the matter again in 1959 and, as reported in *Hansard* on page 1635, I said:

In this year's Estimates, there was provision for the building of an infant department at the Marryatville school in Dankel Avenue in my district, but up to the present there does not appear to have been any activity there. Can the Minister of Education say when the project will be commenced?

The Minister of Education replied:

All I can say is that it is hoped it will be commenced as soon as possible. I had hoped that it would be commenced a long time before this. As the honourable member is aware—and he has referred forcibly to the great leeway in the Education Department building programme—I join with him in desiring this school building to be erected as soon as possible, but so many more urgent buildings are crowding in.

In 1960 I had occasion to refer to the matter again, because all that existed at Dankel Avenue, Kensington, was a large block with some weeds growing on it and a mouldering cricket pitch in the middle. No sod had been turned, no brick laid. I am reported on page 135 of the 1960 *Hansard* as saying:

On the Estimates last year there was a line providing for a new infant school to be

attached to Marryatville school, but to be built in Dankel Avenue in my district. So far, this land is nothing but a waste of weeds and has a mouldy-looking cricket pitch in the middle. The residents of the district submitted a petition through me to the Minister a considerable time ago asking for urgent work to be carried out in providing an infant school. Can the Premier, representing the Minister of Education, say when something is likely to happen?

Sir Thomas Playford replied:

I do not know the facts, but I will get a report.

By this time this matter was sounding like a cracked record. I subsequently asked the Minister of Education a further question and this is recorded on page 306 of *Hansard* as follows:

Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question relating to the Marryatville infant school?

The Hon. B. Pattinson: The Director of the Public Buildings Department has reported that the new infant buildings for the Marryatville school are planned for completion by school opening in February, 1962. Drawings are now being prepared and it is expected that a contract will be let by the end of this year to enable the buildings to be completed by February, 1962.

I do not know whether the contract has been let, but if it has, all I can say is that work has not been started and the provision is increased by £1,000 as work to be started this financial year. This is the third time it has appeared on the Loan Estimates so I can only comment in the words of the old adage that "hope deferred maketh the heart sick", and in my district hope has been continually deferred on this matter. When the Minister promised last year that the school would be ready for the 1962 school year, I, in my innocence and naivete, informed the people in my district that here at last was something definite. They were going to have their school for which they had petitioned years before and which they had been promised many times. I thought that I could take the Minister's statement as gospel and that they would be getting their school all right. I'm afraid that years of seeing this sort of thing go on in Parliament is beginning to encroach upon my naivete and I am becoming a little disillusioned. I think the Government has changed the adage to suit itself and it seems to me that, according to the Government, it should state: "Works deferred getteth the votes quick".

We are obviously getting announcement after announcement of works that are to take place and the Treasurer can tell members they are

to take place in the financial year, but they do not take place. There is a great announcement that so many millions are to be spent on school buildings but the money is not spent. That is not satisfactory in this State and it is not a satisfactory way of budgeting for Loan works. Members are entitled to complain of instances of this kind. The people of my district have been very patient about this matter but their patience, after three years of seeing this on the Loan Estimates and nothing commenced, has worn more than a little thin.

Mr. RALSTON: The Treasurer, when explaining the Loan Estimates, spoke of major additions to high schools and £1,439,000 is provided. When presenting the Loan Estimates the Treasurer said that additions to the Mount Gambier high school, of pre-cast concrete construction, would cost £162,000. The Public Works Committee's report tabled in this House in November last year indicated that the additions to this school would be in Mount Gambier limestone and would cost £115,000. In July of this year a letter I received from the acting Minister of Education stated that tenders would be called for these additions during that month, but we are now nearing the end of August and tenders have not been called. I am very surprised that the estimate has grown by nearly £50,000 and that the additions are to be in pre-cast concrete. I know the cost of major additions in pre-cast concrete is substantially more than in local limestone, but I am very surprised at the discrepancy. This matter should be explained. I know the Minister of Education investigated certain proposals that could account for some additional amount, but I am concerned about the additional cost and about the fact that the recommendations of the Public Works Committee regarding material to be used have been departed from. I do not think the taxpayers of this State would agree to this substantial increase in cost unless it could be justified.

Mr. CORCORAN: I am concerned about the figure of £334,000 for about 18 primary and infant schools, including the Millicent South primary school, and about the figure of £311,000 for seven area schools, including Kangaroo Inn. I should like to know what portions of those amounts are likely to be spent during the current financial year on the Millicent South primary school and the Kangaroo Inn area school. I should also like an assurance that work on the latter school will be commenced this financial year, because rumours are abroad to the contrary. The Government should be candid about the matter and say whether it

is handicapped to such an extent that it cannot commence that work. Another item that concerns me is the £98,000 for craftwork and domestic art centres, including one for the Kingston area school. Can the Minister say whether that work will be commenced during this financial year?

Mr. CASEY: Two projects which are scheduled to be completed during this financial year are a new schoolhouse at Cockburn and a new school residence at Hawker. I assume that those matters are included in the item of £150,000 for new residences, but I should like an assurance on that matter. During a talk I had with the Minister and the Director of Education early this year I pointed out that the standard of accommodation for secondary students at Hawker was most unsatisfactory. The room occupied by the scholars was very poorly ventilated and had only one door and a small window, and with a temperature at about 108 to 110 degrees, it was like a Turkish bath.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I am pleased that the Coomandook area school, which commenced operations last February, will be completed, to the great satisfaction of the people who pressed for it for so long. The Keith area school is also in the process of construction. On last year's Estimates there was a line for a combined court house and police station at Bordertown, but no progress has been made on this project. On inquiry I found that it was held up because it was considered unsuitable to combine a court house and police station at Bordertown. Instead, it was decided that to make the accommodation for all purposes adequate for Bordertown's requirements a separate court house would have to be built. Am I correct that in the Estimates provision is made for a separate court house?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I cannot answer some of the specific inquiries of honourable members. As to education buildings, for a number of years the department has decided the order of priority and these priorities are forwarded to the Minister of Works for reference to the Public Buildings Department, which then proceeds with the buildings most urgently required. For a considerable period the Education Department has been planning its overall requirements. A schedule in the Loan Estimates shows what the plans are for a considerable time ahead. If the department planned for only the current year, obviously it would soon get into considerable difficulty. The member for Norwood, Mr. Dunstan, mentioned the question of the

purchase of land. Frequently, we know from the development that will take place that land will be required in a certain area. The Government has often been held to ransom in the last few years because there has been no overall plan for the development of schools, and suddenly when a school was required no land for it had been acquired.

In the past some schools have been erected on a very small area, with barely enough room for the building, and with no provision for playing fields. We are trying to avoid that kind of thing. Frequently, the Government has bought land well ahead of requirements and this will pay handsome dividends, because it assures logical development for schools and public buildings. If we did not secure the land in this way, the Government would be called upon to pay exorbitant prices when the time came to use it. I will get for each honourable member specific information on the projects about which he has inquired, and I hope to have the information by Thursday. I will also get for Mr. Dunstan information regarding the reason for the delay on the submission of plans. Often a plan has been developed, but for some reason not apparent at the time we have to provide for additional classrooms and other things not considered in the original proposition. If it is a substantial departure from the original scheme, it is of course referred back to the Public Works Standing Committee, but if we are advised by the Crown Law Office that it is not a substantial departure, obviously the committee does not want to see it. On some occasions I consult the chairman of the committee (Mr. Shannon) whether it would be desirable to have the matter sent back to it or not. If it were only an additional classroom for a school that has already been designed, there would be no point in resubmitting it to the committee, but if it is an alteration or addition of some importance, it is resubmitted to the committee. We are governed by facts that are sometimes outside the control of the Government, particularly in relation to alterations in industrial conditions. Sometimes, if we get an estimate drawn up there may be a lapse of two or three years before the scheme is finally prepared and considered by the Public Works Standing Committee and in that time the cost of building has altered materially.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: The Treasurer has stated that although the Public Works Standing Committee may make a recommendation two or three years may elapse before the work

is commenced. The Loan Estimates provide for about 80 projects. It may be well to consider whether the Treasurer is of the same mind this year as he was last year when he placed the Loan Estimates before us. Last year's Estimates provided for 62 school projects, of which 30 were never commenced; so the Government achieved about half of its estimate. For minor works, including drainage, £346,000 was provided last year, whereas this year £300,000 is provided for this type of work. Although £346,000 was provided last year, £916,000 was spent. Apparently, money allotted for certain items can be transferred. There is a big difference between £346,000 and £916,000. If provision is made in these Estimates for projects that were inquired into by the Public Works Committee immediately before these Estimates appeared, how can we expect that committee to be concerned about any plan or preparation for them? If something is to be inquired into, at least a plan should be provided before an inspection is made. Can the Treasurer give the House an assurance that the money allotted for these projects will not be used this year as similar amounts were used last year? I query the great increase in expenditure to £916,000.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: To a certain extent, this matter is controlled by Parliament itself. True, last year's amount was exceeded by a considerable amount on that one item, although the overall amount expended was slightly over the estimate. Two things control this. The first is the rapidity with which contractors carry out their contracts. The Government has not much control over that; it is controlled by outside circumstances. The second is that honourable members opposite made many requests for additional work to be carried out in their schools. Frequent requests to that effect were made in questions in the House and in correspondence. I do not think the Leader would suggest for a moment that the Government should not take into account such requests. We try to meet them wherever possible. If it is stated here that a particular school requires attention, that another is in bad repair and needs attention, or that in a third additional lavatories are required, naturally we consider that and, if possible, meet the views expressed. If the Leader desires it, I will get for him a list of the reasons for the alteration in that particular item, though it will take some time.

Mr. Frank Walsh: Don't worry about it!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Innumerable requests are involved. We are making substantial progress in the Education

Department. The amount of accommodation we are building today exceeds substantially the new enrolments for our schools; in other words, we are getting more adequate accommodation for our school children. That is most necessary for we have overcrowding. More than that, we are drawing up a long-term plan so that we shall have a school programme to work to with orderly development. We shall plan to get the land and all school requirements provided on not an emergency but a properly regulated basis.

Mr. CORCORAN: On page 9 of the Estimates £103,000 is provided for combined police stations and courthouses. A number of places are mentioned, but I am concerned with Millicent. I want to express my pleasure at seeing Millicent included in this item, because I have advocated for some time improvements for Millicent. I realize that £103,000 would not be sufficient to cover the total cost, but is it intended to earmark some of that money for the Millicent police station and courthouse, and will that work definitely be proceeded with during the current financial year?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will get the information for the honourable member.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Although the Treasurer mentioned overcrowding in our schools just now, I say it is not a question of overcrowding at the moment. Will the Treasurer also get information about the erection of substantial buildings where for many years we have put up with portable buildings—for instance, at Forbes, Ascot Park and South Road primary schools? It is forecast that we shall need more schools in the ever-growing area of Mitchell Park, in view of the amount of planning being undertaken by the Housing Trust. I do not want to beg for pennies but should like some definite information in that regard in the interests of both children and teachers.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I touched on this matter a few moments ago. Immediately after the Second World War, we had no hope of catching up with the lag, occasioned through the war, without using timber buildings. The Government installed a plant that has, over the years, supplied the timber classrooms required. However, the Government does not want to continue with the rate of construction that has applied. On the other hand it does not want to disemploy those men who have worked satisfactorily with this plant for many years. The Minister of Works is investigating to see whether these men can

be diverted to constructing dwellinghouses that are required by the department. When a plan has been determined I will advise the Leader.

Mr. TAPPING: Can the Treasurer say whether, in the planning of a police training college at Fort Largs, provision will be made for the police band? Can he say what amount will be spent on the Semaphore police station?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will see that the honourable member gets the information.

Mr. CLARK: Gawler is included in the list of new police buildings. Will the Treasurer obtain information on what is proposed at Gawler?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes.  
Line passed.

Miscellaneous, £3,959,000.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I was pleased to receive the information from the Treasurer at the end of last week purporting to show further amounts of money over and above those provided in the Loan Estimates for housing, but was disappointed with the result. Naturally, the Treasurer requested his Under Treasurer to prepare a statement showing that the Government was doing more to overcome the housing shortage and unemployment in the building industry than it did last year. However, I am afraid that he set his Under Treasurer an impossible task. I was amused by the Treasurer's statement that there was some slight measure of duplication in the figures supplied because, in my view, the slight measure of duplication in the figures supplied is approximately one-third of the total figure: for example, during 1959-60, £10,700,000 was shown as the expenditure by the Housing Trust on dwellings and associated works, but no mention was made of the fact that of this figure £6,616,000 was reimbursed through the other finance institutions mentioned, such as the Savings Bank of South Australia, the South Australian Superannuation Fund, and the State Bank. No mention was made of any other lending institutions, such as the Commonwealth Savings Bank, private lending institutions and the War Service Homes Division.

Another duplication was the figure for guarantees under the Advances for Homes Act, because this does not involve the Government in any expenditure. The result of the schedule is made misleading by too much duplication, and, in addition, many lending institutions are not mentioned at all. However, if we accept that the total given by the Treasurer—namely, £24,900,000 proposed this year—gives a reliable comparison, he has condemned himself

in his own words, for, on a per capita basis, the amount proposed this year for housing is less than that provided last year, and at present we have a serious lack of housing and unemployment in industry. I will have nothing further to say on the Treasurer's schedule other than to point out that more than half of the alleged increase is shown as coming from two private institutions—the Savings Bank of South Australia and the South Australian Superannuation Fund.

The schedule is interesting, but not truly informative, and therefore we must revert to the Loan Estimates which are before Parliament in order to assess the Government's shortcomings in the housing field, and what action, or lack of action, it is proposing during the current financial year to overcome the housing shortage as well as to provide continuous employment in the building industry. The Government's shortcomings are demonstrated by the completions of Housing Trust houses, which, when converted to a per capita basis, show that the Government is losing ground with the housing problem. I submit the following table showing an index of completions by the Housing Trust during the last five years converted to a per capita basis and based on figures released by the Housing Trust:

| Year.             | Index to Housing Trust completions per head. |
|-------------------|--|
| 1956/57 . . . . . | 100  |
| 1957/58 . . . . . | 94   |
| 1958/59 . . . . . | 95   |
| 1959/60 . . . . . | 93   |
| 1960/61 . . . . . | 95   |

This table demonstrates that on a per capita basis the Government completed 5 per cent fewer houses through the Housing Trust last year than it did five years ago. We then come to the fact of how much finance the Government itself is proposing to inject into the building industry in order to overcome the housing shortage as well as to provide employment. Even though we are discussing the Housing Trust line, it is still necessary to consider finance to be made available for housing both from Housing Agreement funds and ordinary Loan funds in order to assess whether the Government is overcoming the problem, and this is demonstrated by the following table:

| Government funds for Housing. | Proposed Expenditure 1960/61. | Proposed Expenditure 1961/62. |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
|                               | £                             | £                             |
| State Bank . . .              | 4,794,994                     | 4,250,000                     |
| Building Societies            | 430,000                       | 400,000                       |
| Housing Trust . .             | 4,379,000.                    | 4,290,000                     |
|                               | <hr/>                         | <hr/>                         |
|                               | £9,603,994                    | £8,940,000                    |

It can be seen from the table that the Government is providing £663,994 less this year than it spent last year, in spite of the fact that there is unemployment in industry and a severe housing shortage. Is there a guarantee that the Savings Bank will be able to assist this year in the same way as last year? I do not know how much the Treasurer will get as the result of his approach to the Commonwealth Government for more money. With due respect to the Under Treasurer, I do not think the housing proposals for this year measure up to what they did last year. The Government is not providing as much money and is depending on outside organizations to help. The position is not as good as the Treasurer would lead us to believe.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: When money for housing comes from a number of sources, some not directly subject to Parliamentary approval, there must appear to be variations in the figures from year to year. I have already explained why they take place. This year the Government wanted people to get money for housing at as cheap an interest rate as possible. The same amount could have been provided as was provided last year but, if that had been done, more would be paid in rent and interest charges. That is why we used a greater percentage of the money available under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, which is not concerned in this item, than we did previously. We wanted to avoid heavy interest payments. A difference of one per cent in the interest rate is an important matter. If we had provided as much money as we did last year the Leader would be happy, but it would mean greater interest payments for tenants and house purchasers. That sort of thing does not make sense to me and I do not think the Leader wants it. We all want interest charges to be as low as possible. Next year, if there is a similar set of circumstances in the Loan Council, I shall be negligent in my duty if I do not take the same action. If we can get £8,000,000 of cheap money instead of only £4,000,000 or £5,000,000 for housing, we should get it.

The money provided for housing this year is actually greater than was provided last year. Notwithstanding wage increases we shall have a slightly greater programme this year. One significant point is that we have money available at a lower interest rate, and the saving will benefit house occupiers. The Housing Trust is not a profit-making concern and it seeks to provide houses as cheaply as

possible. The figures I gave the Leader the other day were incomplete. I did not say that they were complete as they did not take into account money available from the Commonwealth Bank, which is not a State instrumentality, and as I have no control over it I do not know what money it will provide. The War Service Homes Division is not a State instrumentality. Again, I have no control over it and I do not know what it will provide for housing. Before these Loan Estimates were brought down I ascertained from the Savings Bank how much money it would have available this year for housing, so I had no delusions about the amount it could provide. I also ascertained what money would be available elsewhere. For instance, I learned how much would be provided for semi-governmental programmes. In fact, I had already arranged to borrow a substantial part of that money before the Loan Estimates came before Parliament. The programme provided this year is capable of providing, and will provide, more houses than last year and it will have a significant advantage over last year as the interest charges will be somewhat less. We have about £3,000,000 more of cheap money than we had last year.

Mr. CORCORAN: For a slipway at Port MacDonnell, £31,000 is provided. I accept the Minister's assurance that it is expected that this work will be completed by June 30 next, and I appreciate what is being done, but I hope that nothing will upset plans for completing this work.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I understand that that is the position.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I have been told that the manager of the Leigh Creek coal-field (Mr. Robbins) is now in Adelaide being trained in selling electrical equipment. Will the Treasurer say whether there has been a change of officers and, if so, whether it was necessary?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I know that Mr. Robbins is a highly respected member of the Electricity Trust. I have heard nothing but commendation of him, and I have heard no suggestion of a transfer. If there has been a transfer it could have taken place only because he applied for promotion or a transfer, but I doubt whether there is any basis for the rumour the Leader has heard.

Mr. RALSTON: This year £180,000 is provided for 123 cottage and villa flats, of which 118 are to be built in the metropolitan area and five in country areas. This is the first time the Housing Trust has extended the

principle of building cottage and villa flats to country areas, which I have advocated previously because of the large number of elderly widows and single women living in the country. Rental grant homes are built in the country for people of limited means. Last year 11 of these were built, but apparently this year none will be built, although five villa flats will be erected. That is a limited number of such houses for the whole State. Will the Treasurer say whether more than the five mentioned in these Estimates will be built?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: For many years the Housing Trust confined this type of building to the metropolitan area. However, three or four years ago an Act was passed that enabled the Government to make available to the trust free of charge a substantial sum of money to build houses in the country. As the money is in the form of a grant, there is no interest charge to the trust. It is a revolving fund; all rents collected must be paid into a trust account and be used to build further houses. That is happening irrespective of the Loan Estimates and outside this line. As soon as the rents accumulate, automatically the trust tenders for construction of additional houses in the country. Usually it anticipates rents, and builds a little ahead of rent receipts. The figure of five does not represent the trust's interest in country housing.

Mr. LAUCKE: For the purchase of land under the Public Parks Act, £12,000 is provided. I commend the Government for a constructive policy in providing open spaces and recreation grounds. In introducing these Estimates, the Treasurer said that councils were subsidized on a pound for pound basis, but councils have experienced difficulty in providing their half share. The Tea Tree Gully Council, because of rapid development in the district, could not pay its half for land sought to be purchased. The Treasurer said that the £12,000 could be borrowed by councils through the State Loan fund and repaid by them, with authority, over a stipulated period. This opens up a new approach to assisting councils by means of a direct Government loan. Does this mean that a council may have access to money from Loan Account on long-term loans to provide open areas?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Not from Loan Account. Loan Account moneys are provided for public works and if that money is diverted to other than public works we automatically lose that when calculating

our quota for another year. We have provided assistance in some cases through instrumentalities such as the State Bank, the Savings Bank and so on, but fundamentally the Government desires that councils should assume the responsibility for raising half of the money. We have made some amelioration in certain instances and given them time to pay. If the Government initially owns the land it is easy to allow time to pay because no financial transaction is involved, but if the land has to be purchased for hard cash we try to accommodate the council if it cannot find the money. Fundamentally, the Government will provide half the money on the valuation of an approved proposition. We do occasionally assist councils, but it is a council responsibility.

Mr. CASEY: Last year £30,000 was provided for uranium production, but this year's provision is only £5,000. I take this to mean that the Government does not expect Radium Hill to exist for the full 12 months, but it may be that the mine is self-supporting and doesn't need as much money as in the previous year.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This is merely a nominal amount that may be necessary for some small modification of plant. That is all that is involved in it.

Line passed.

Grand total, £30,748,000, passed and Committee's resolution adopted by the House.

#### PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL.

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

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution:—That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to authorize the Treasurer to borrow and expend moneys for public works and purposes and to enact other provisions incidental thereto.

Motion carried.

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

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

It appropriates the moneys required for the works and purposes provided for by the Loan Estimates which the House has considered. Clause 3 defines the Loan Fund. Clause 4 provides for borrowing by the Treasurer of £27,000,000. The allocation to South Australia out of the borrowing programme approved by the Loan Council in June last is

£25,148,000 for works other than under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. However, in the present state of the economy I propose to keep in touch with the Premiers of the other States and with the Prime Minister to see if it may be possible to arrange a further Loan allocation this financial year. With this in mind I have set the borrowing authority in clause 4 at £27,000,000 to avoid having to call the House together again should it be possible to arrange an increased borrowing programme early in 1962.

Clause 5 provides for the expenditure of £30,748,000 on the undertakings set out in the first schedule to the Bill. Clause 6 deals with expenditures on Loan undertakings which were included in the Public Purposes Loan Bill of 1960, and for which additional appropriation was given by warrant by His Excellency the Governor under powers conferred on him by the Public Finance Act. Clause 7 makes provision for borrowing and payment of an amount to cover any discounts, charges and expenses incurred in connection with borrowing for the purposes of this Bill. Clause 8 makes provision for temporary finance if the moneys in the Loan Fund are insufficient for the purposes of this Bill. Clause 9 authorizes the borrowing of £10,000,000 for the purpose of carrying on Loan works at the commencement of next financial year and until the Public Purposes Loan Bill for 1962 is considered by the House.

Clause 10 gives the Treasurer power to borrow against the issue of Treasury bills or by bank overdraft. In fact, the Treasurer possesses and exercises this authority under other legislation, but it has been deemed desirable to make that authority specific year by year in the Public Purposes Loan Bill as is done with other borrowing authority. Clause 11 deals with the duration of certain clauses of the Bill. Clause 12 directs that all money received by the State under the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act shall be credited to a special account to be paid out as required for the purposes of the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act. Clause 13 provides for this Bill to operate as from July 1, 1961. I commend the Bill for consideration of members.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I think we can claim that we have thoroughly considered the Loan Estimates, and even if we have not been satisfied on all matters we at least have had some assurance that further information will be supplied on individual matters that have been raised. The Treasurer said that he proposed

to keep in touch with the Premiers of other States and with the Prime Minister to see if he could arrange a further Loan allocation for this financial year. He has provided for a figure of £27,000,000.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The Leader would support that?

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Yes, but we must keep the unemployment question in mind. In the past we have been fortunate in that our secondary industries have been able to absorb unskilled and semi-skilled labour. I think the question of the absorption of some of our unemployed workers should be reviewed. Councils that desire to carry out projects in their own areas and so relieve unemployment cannot go on borrowing money, and Commonwealth grants are needed to enable them to employ more labour and carry out those projects. I maintain that Loan money could be allocated to various projects to absorb some of our unemployed. The Government should formulate a plan for a programme of works and particularly for the necessary restoration of the railways system. I believe there is room for great improvement in that system, particularly in the West Coast division. If councils' works are to help in solving the unemployment problem, I say that not loans but a Commonwealth grant must be made available, because ratepayers cannot pay the interest on additional loans. Projects to improve our water supplies and our railway works can be embarked upon with Loan funds, and this would assist in relieving unemployment. I support the Bill.

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

#### ADELAIDE PARK LANDS ALTERATION BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Agriculture): I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

By section 368 of the Municipal Corporations Act, 1890, which has since been repealed, certain reserves and portions of the park lands of the City of Adelaide were withheld from the care, control and management of the Corporation of the City of Adelaide. Section 852 of the Local Government Act, 1934-1959 provides in effect that the lands which, immediately prior to the commencement of that Act, were not under the care, control and management of that corporation shall continue to be excluded from such care, control and management.

By virtue of section 3 of the Adelaide Park Lands Alteration Act, 1917, an area which had been withheld from the control of the corporation and which surrounds the parade ground north of Government domain was placed under the care, control and management of the corporation, but there are a footway and an irregular shaped piece of land lying within that area which had not been dealt with by the 1917 legislation. The corporation has indicated its willingness to maintain that footway and piece of land and this Bill seeks to place them under the care, control and management of the corporation. If this Bill becomes law the whole of the area immediately north, west and south of the parade ground will be under the control of the corporation. I commend the Bill for favourable consideration by all members.

Mr. LAWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

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

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

The object of this Bill is to remedy a weakness in the legislation dealing with the licensing of buildings used for the purposes of rest homes. Section 146a of the principal Act deals with the licensing of rest homes. Subsection (1) of that section defines a rest home as any building (other than a building licensed under an enactment specified in the definition) in which any person receives any other person (not being a relative) to board or lodge and who undertakes for fee or reward to exercise oversight, care or control over such other person by way of nursing treatment or treatment applicable to aged, infirm or helpless or partially helpless persons. Both the Central Board of Health and the Municipal Association of South Australia have drawn the Government's attention to the difficulty arising from that definition in establishing that oversight, care or control is undertaken or exercised for fee or reward in cases where the fees for such services are included in the fees charged for board and lodging. This difficulty had in fact been experienced in a recent case and the Government is concerned that the weakness in the legislation could afford a means of evading the law with regard to the licensing of buildings used for the purposes of rest homes.

To remedy the weakness paragraph (c) of clause 3 of the Bill inserts in section 146a of the principal Act a new subsection by virtue

of which a building or part of a building will be deemed to be a rest home or used for the purposes of a rest home if during the relevant period a person exercised over another person boarding or lodging in that building or that part of that building any oversight, care or control by way of nursing or other specified treatment, unless it is shown no fee or reward was paid or given or agreed to be paid or given for such oversight, care or control and that no fee or reward for such oversight, care or control had been included in any payment made or agreed to be made for the board or lodging of that other person during the relevant period. The Government feels that this provision would not place any undue burden on any person conducting an unlicensed rest home as the fact as to whether or not a fee or reward for the oversight, care or control was paid or payable or included in any payment for board or lodging would be within his peculiar knowledge. Paragraphs (a) and (b) of clause 3 clarify, and make drafting improvements to, subsection (1) and (2) of section 146a, respectively.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

*(Sitting suspended from 5.55 to 7.30 p.m.)*

#### APPRAISERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

*(Continued from August 24. Page 566.)*

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I consider that the intention of the Auctioneers Act was that auctioneers' clerks could carry out auction sales, which is quite satisfactory, but the provisions of the Appraisers Act, 1934, automatically appointed these clerks as appraisers. Under the Auctioneers' Act, 1934-1953, a person who desires to become an auctioneer must apply to the local court of limited jurisdiction nearest his place of residence and substantiate his claim, whereas an auctioneer's clerk can be made an acting auctioneer solely by the payment of a fee at the Treasury. However, I believe that this was solely to facilitate the work of an auctioneer who was enabled to appoint his clerk to carry out an auction sale.

Because of the qualifications of an auctioneer, which needed to be established by the operations of the Auctioneers Act, 1934-1953, I believe it was the intention of the Appraisers Act, 1934, to exempt them from the payment of further fees in order to be able to act as appraisers. However, a person who is acting for an auctioneer has not proved his

qualifications to a court and may not be a suitable person to act as an appraiser, and, therefore, I consider that the latter should not be exempted from the operations of the Appraisers Act, 1934. The Bill, by clause 3, clarifies the point that acting auctioneers will not automatically become appraisers, but that persons who are licensed as auctioneers will still be exempt from the requirements of the Appraisers Act. I support the Bill.

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

#### BULK HANDLING OF GRAIN ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 24. Page 567.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): The Bill is similar to the provisions under section 4 of the principal Act, because the Government acted as guarantor for £500,000 when an earlier advance of £1,000,000 was made to South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. by the Commonwealth Trading Bank. The company now wishes to extend its silo facilities, but its rate of extension is being limited to the tolls and charges imposed on the grain received. In order that it may continue with its extension programme more readily, it has sought a further £1,000,000 from the Commonwealth Trading Bank on similar terms and conditions to its earlier loan, and the bank has agreed to make the advance, provided the Government acts as guarantor for £500,000. Provided that Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited remains financially sound, and I see no reason why it should not, this guarantee will not involve the Government in any expenditure, but merely provides additional security to the bank.

There are, however, several matters that need clarification. I believe that in the early stages the Public Works Standing Committee thoroughly investigated bulk handling, particularly in relation to Wallaroo, but I do not know whether that committee was concerned with any of the matters relating to this Bill or whether the Industries Development Committee was concerned with them. My understanding of past operations is that when the company determined where silos were to be

erected there was a consultation with the Commissioner of Railways as to the location of the silos on railway property, which ensured that suitable railway services were available to cart the grain to shipping ports. In view of the fact that the Government is to be guarantor for such a large sum, I sincerely trust that the co-operation that has existed between the Railways Department and the company will continue. I support the second reading.

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa): I have spoken on the Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited earlier this session during the Address in Reply debate, and I shall be brief tonight. I commend the Government for agreeing to stand as guarantor to the company for a total sum of £1,000,000, which it will receive through the Commonwealth Bank. It is most necessary for costs incidental to primary production to be kept as low as possible to enable farmers to compete on world markets. It is also necessary that our primary products be supplied in the form desired by the purchasers. Overseas buyers of wheat—and for that matter barley—are increasingly seeking purchases in bulk, which fits in with their installations and methods. From personal experience of bulk handling, and noting the costs of handling the wheat through the installations in wheat-producing areas firstly and then through the terminals into the ships, it is obvious that great savings have been effected to the farmers since the inception of this laudable company.

Overseas buyers of wheat, barley or oats are faced with the same difficulties that we experience in keeping costs down, and so there is a trend in overseas markets to have wheat, barley or oats received in a form that will enable the receivers to handle the cereal expeditiously, efficiently, and at the lowest cost. I regard the system of bulk handling of cereals as parallel in efficiency to the modern tractor age as compared with the old days of horse and waggon when wheat and other cereals were bagged. Today we have a modern approach to farming, and the bulk handling system fits in completely and effectively with that approach. The company has proved, through its actions, that it is worthy of the confidence and trust that was reposed in it at its inception. Since then it has proved worthy of our further support. I can imagine that there would be set up a feeling of frustration to an efficient and keen organization, as is the company, were it necessary to defer a more comprehensive

system of silos because of lack of capital. It has proved able to handle grain efficiently and is worthy of our support. I trust that the House will completely support the Government in its proposal to provide this further guarantee. The company has endeavoured to give as wide a coverage as possible in providing facilities, and it has approached the matter of location of silos fairly and equitably.

I think it has been wise in adopting a policy of caution in not over-supplying capacity at given points, but there is a need for major expansion boxes, as it were, at the ports. In the Port Adelaide division there is a need for a major silo installation that would, at harvest time when the carefully planned country installations were filled, enable the excess to be expeditiously sent to an expansion box at the terminal point. If there were at Port Adelaide a major installation to cope with the excess at harvest time it would be a help. The farmer, who contributes so well to the system, would be able to deliver his wheat in bulk to the local installation and the wheat would soon be on hand ready for shipment from the terminal. That which has been proved to be so beneficial to the wheat-grower could be of equal benefit to the barley-grower and the oatgrower. The barleygrower has made use, to his great advantage, of the installations at terminals for the bulk disposal of barley, and three cargoes of oats have been sent from South Australia over the company's installations. I hope that there will be an atmosphere of co-operative approach by all farmers, whatever their cereal may be, in order to avoid overlapping of installation, administration and costs incidental to a duplicated system. The farmers who have a common interest, whether they be barleygrowers, wheat-growers or oatgrowers, should work together in a way that will be to the ultimate undoubted benefit of the producers generally. I have pleasure in supporting the Government's very laudable action in agreeing to stand as guarantor for Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited for the sum of £500,000 to enable the company to receive from the Commonwealth Bank an advance of £1,000,000 in order that as soon as possible it can meet the requirements of South Australian producers. Every passing season without bulk handling installations means added costs to the growers.

As soon as we have complete bulk handling equipment throughout the State, adequate terminal facilities and so on, the better it will undoubtedly be for the growers, the State and the nation. We must produce as cheaply as

we can, and where there is an opportunity to make a saving in any aspect of production or distribution we must take it. Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. has given the answer by assisting the growers to dispose of their crops efficiently and at a minimum of cost through the modern method of bulk handling.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): I support the Bill. Following on a perusal of the principal Act, there are one or two matters I want to mention. The preamble to the Act says:

Whereas South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited, a company limited by guarantee and without a share capital, has been incorporated and registered under the Companies Act, 1934-1952, with the principal object of establishing, maintaining, and conducting in the State of South Australia a scheme or system for receiving, handling, transporting, and storing wheat and other grain in bulk and exercising powers incidental to that object:

The method of receiving, handling, transporting and storing grain at Wallaroo is to be commended, although I have heard a number of complaints regarding the receipt of grain at that terminal. Many farmers maintain that an alteration should be made to the grid system to enable a quicker receipt. During the harvest period there have been weeks when some farmers have had to wait practically the whole day whilst taking their turn in the unloading. It is the unanimous feeling that if an alteration could be made to the system to speed up the receipts it would assist the farmers to return earlier to work on their properties. I hope consideration will be given to this matter. No doubt the bulk handling people have been consulted by people in the district, and I leave the matter with members in the hope that the company will consider it.

When wheat is going into the hold of a ship it is necessary for men to go down to operate the spreaders. It is not a fit place for men to work. I have been down there on several occasions, and when looking down into the hold of the ship it is difficult to see the men operating the spreaders. If something could be done to perhaps take away the dust from the grain before it reached the hold it would be appreciated by the men who work down there. It is now necessary for the waterside workers to don a type of plastic hood that is pulled down over their shoulders, and to have a tube underneath the hood to enable them to get a reasonable amount of air to breathe. I know they are not down in the ship's hold for long but, no matter how long they are there, it is too long under the conditions. I know that

there are dust collectors along the belt and that a cloud of dust comes away from them, but perhaps a more thorough investigation could be carried out into collecting dust after it leaves the silo and before it reaches the ship's hold. The second part of the preamble provides:

And whereas the company has been formed on a co-operative basis so that all growers of wheat as defined in the Articles of Association of the company may become members thereof, but the company has no power to declare or pay dividends and the net profits of the company are to be applied in carrying out its objects and in maintaining and improving the facilities of the company;

I think this policy is excellent. I am glad to know that the company is operating in this way. The third part of the preamble provides:

And whereas it is desirable to confer certain rights and powers upon the said company and to regulate and control the bulk handling of wheat and other grain in South Australia in order to ensure that proper service is given to growers, millers, merchants, and other persons concerned in the marketing, handling, and disposal of wheat and other grain;

The mere fact that this legislation has never been amended shows that the principles it contains have been observed. That is a fine tribute to the Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited. The amendment contained in this Bill is only a machinery matter to enable the company to give primary producers better handling of their wheat. I realize that there was strong opposition from Wallaroo people towards bulk handling in the initial stages because for about 70 years a labour force had been attached to that port for unloading grain from farmers' conveyances and putting it into ships' holds. Not many years ago farmers brought in their grain in trolleys and German waggons. I can remember when my father and others carried grain into the Wallaroo wheat yards in the old German waggons. I cannot claim to have done that, but on many occasions I carried it in on a table-top trolley with an eight or nine horse team and, as we progressed, we were able to afford a lorry.

For the last 70 years a labour force has been attached to the port; between 800 and 900 men were once employed in shipping wheat. I can remember when sailing ships came to Wallaroo to take away the grain. They were a pretty sight, as I am sure the member for Rocky River will agree, and it was a great treat for children to see them. Nothing is more beautiful than one of the old grain ships leaving for a destination overseas. Although once between 800 and 900 men were employed at Wallaroo in shipping wheat,

because of modern equipment only 150 men, including those required at ship's side and those attached to the Harbours Board, are engaged. As time passes automation takes over, and we must keep pace with progress. Nobody wants to go back to the old days of four-bushel bags, of which the men at Wallaroo carried many thousands. I think man is intended for something better than that. The introduction of bulk handling took the load off the lumper's back and at the same time conferred a benefit on the primary producer. Like many other people, including many primary producers, I maintain that, when Parliament assented to bulk handling in 1955, it was its responsibility to provide some other means of employment for the people affected by its introduction.

Mr. Jennings: You are not talking about so-called primary producers?

Mr. HUGHES: No, about primary producers in their own right. I have said in this House before that the Wallaroo people did not desire to hinder progress, although many people in 1954 and 1955 thought they did. They agreed with the introduction of a properly considered system that would benefit primary producers, and they were entitled to some consideration by Parliament such as giving them some alternative method of employment in their home town.

Mr. Hall: What do you suggest?

Mr. HUGHES: It does not matter what I suggest. I could suggest many things to the honourable member. Some of the men who were affected were third generation residents who had been faithful under trying conditions. The honourable member would not have any idea of the trials many of these men had to undergo in the early days in lumping thousands of four-bushel bags on their backs. If he did, I think he would be more sympathetic. Like many primary producers in my district, I felt that the men who had been handling grain had been let down by the Parliament of 1955, as it was prepared to introduce automation but was not prepared to find alternative employment. Although the people did not object to progress, they asked for something reasonable, but it was not forthcoming.

Mr. Hall: Tell us what you think they should have had.

Mr. HUGHES: Perhaps the member for Gouger does not know much about four-bushel bags but my father knew plenty about them and merely because they had that system 50 years ago we do not want it today. Perhaps

the member for Gouger will agree with me. We want progress and Wallaroo accepted progress, but the honourable member is apparently not willing to give them some alternative or he would not be advocating four-bushel bags in 1961. I am not going to be sidetracked by the young member for Gouger or he might need some more support from the Premier.

The SPEAKER. Order! The honourable member will come back to the Bill, which deals with a guarantee.

Mr. HUGHES: I am talking about the handling of grain but I got away from the subject because of the interjections. In the march of progress some alternative method of employment should have been given to the people of Wallaroo, but that was not done. Now, apparently, the Port Pirie people have similar fears because they can see what happened at Wallaroo. The Public Works Committee's report on bulk handling for Port Pirie, said that Mr. Connelly—

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable member is going beyond the ambit of this Bill. It deals with a guarantee whereas, if the honourable member reads clause 3, he will find that he is dealing with an entirely different matter. I cannot, on this Bill, allow a very wide debate dealing with all aspects of bulk handling.

Mr. HUGHES: I was of the opinion that because money was being guaranteed by the Treasurer I might discuss bulk handling because it concerns Port Pirie.

The SPEAKER: The Chair has allowed some latitude to all speakers but there must be some limitation of this debate and I suggest that honourable members confine themselves within reasonable limits to the clause I have mentioned.

Mr. HUGHES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I will do that. I wish to comment on a report that appeared in the *Advertiser* today.

Mr. Lawn: It is not *sub judice*, is it?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HUGHES: It deals with silos planned for South Australia and I believe that the money the Treasurer is guaranteeing under this Bill, which I wholeheartedly support, is

The SPEAKER: If the honourable member for the building of silos.

confines his remarks to the Bill I will not object.

Mr. HUGHES: The article states:

Sixteen silos planned for S.A.—Sixteen wheat silos will be built at S.A. country centres and additions will be made to silos at three S.A.

ports in time for the 1962-63 harvest. The general manager of the S.A. Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. (Mr. P. T. Sanders) yesterday announced a £1,750,000 expansion programme. He said that tenders for the building of the first five storage silos, at Minnipa, Warrambo, Waddikee, Wirrulla and Cummins had been awarded to a Melbourne company, Ascom Pty. Ltd.

These silos would each have a capacity of 300,000 bushels. A £400,000, 1,000,000 bushel terminal silo for Port Pirie was included in the programme. The co-operative's capital expenditure after the completion of the programme would have reached more than £5,000,000.

The Commonwealth Trading Bank had recently loaned £1,000,000 toward the programme while the balance would come from growers' tolls. Another £1,000,000 loan from the bank was already being used for the building of silos in S.A. Other silos would be built at Caltowie, Jamestown, Taldra, Loxton (220,000 bushels each); Yongala, Orroroo (150,000); Waikerie, Keith, Wilmington and Melrose (100,000).

The next part of the report, in which I am interested, states:

The capacity of terminal silos would be increased by 600,000 bushels at Ardrossan (present capacity 1,000,000 bushels); by 750,000 bushels at Wallaroo (1,500,000); and by 750,000 bushels at Port Lincoln (1,250,000). The Wallaroo terminal is the only grain installation in Australia equipped with grain temperature measuring equipment and grain aeration equipment, and the terminal is considered the most modern bulk grain terminal in Australia. I am proud to represent the district, knowing it has the most modern bulk grain installation in Australia and I commend South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. for the steps it is taking to improve the facilities for the primary producer. I am delighted to know that Wallaroo is to have added to its terminal further silos capable of holding 750,000 bushels.

Although I have been somewhat limited in my remarks I shall confine myself to those statements and support the Bill as outlined by the Treasurer because it will further assist the co-operative to enlarge existing terminals and to build new ones in South Australia.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River): Without hesitation I wholeheartedly support the Bill. It is now six years since the first Bulk Handling of Grain Bill, under which the South Australian Government guaranteed £500,000, was passed in this House. Today, in addition to that sum the present Bill provides for a further £500,000 guarantee. I want to take members back to the time when the first Bill was introduced in this House and when everyone voted for the

second reading. However, many people doubted whether the scheme would work but I do not think that view applies generally today. No-one today would doubt the wisdom of guaranteeing another £500,000 for this purpose. All members would probably agree that this is a very wise move. I shall refer to what some members said when the first Bill was introduced. Firstly, the member for Hindmarsh said that by introducing this legislation we were saddling the producers with something that would make their calling uneconomical. The then member for Wallaroo (Mr. McAlees) said, "This Bill could be the beginning of the end of Wallaroo." The then Leader of the Opposition (the late Mr. O'Halloran) referred to the probable failure of the company and said that the Government, as a result of its guaranteeing £500,000, would lose and the taxpayers would have to pay up.

Mr. Riches: Could you quote the page number?

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes, it is in *Hansard* for 1955, in the debate in Committee. The member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) spoke of the probability of the Government's having to take the company over. In the Legislative Council the feeling was that as a result of the guarantee the Government would have to run the bulk handling authority. Generally speaking, the Legislative Council members thought there would be enough assets to cover whatever money was advanced or guaranteed by the Government: in other words, the producers would pay in tolls sufficient money to cover the Government's guarantee. No-one on that occasion had any confidence that the bulk handling company would succeed. The feeling was that the directors, whose names were then available, were primary producers and not business people and that they could not make a success of it.

Mr. Clark: Quite a number did not think that and said so.

Mr. HEASLIP: Very few in this place. I was one.

Mr. Clark: Then how did the legislation pass?

Mr. HEASLIP: Many members talked against it, but no-one voted against it. I admit that the member for Gawler favoured the legislation, but I have quoted a few—and I could quote more—who doubted the capacity of primary producers to run their own affairs and the wisdom of this Government (and Parliament) in guaranteeing £500,000. Those members said that if Parliament guaranteed the money the undertaking would ultimately go

bankrupt and revert to the Government. Since that time the primary producers have proved that they are capable of running their own show. The bulk handling company has proved itself to be an efficient organization, and as a result I do not think anyone today will oppose this guarantee. What a change over those five years! We were lucky to get the legislation passed in the first place. The Leader of the Opposition spoke about the co-operation given by the Railways Department. I pay a tribute for the co-operation and assistance that department has given to the bulk handling authority. That co-operation has been given although rolling stock is partly run down and we have a narrow gauge in South Australia. We have had a record harvest, and the Railways Department has done a wonderful job in getting that harvest to the ports.

The member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) said farmers had had to wait all day to deliver their loads. This big undertaking, starting from scratch as it did, has certainly made mistakes, but it has benefited from those mistakes. The record amount of wheat that we had to receive in the last harvest was never visualized, and in any event the grills through which the grain runs were not big enough to receive the wheat and take it away quickly enough. The company has learned from those mistakes, and the terminals being built today have been enlarged to receive and take the wheat away far more efficiently than did the original installations. I only hope we get a record crop again next year, even if we have the same trouble as we have had in the past year through not being able to take the grain quickly enough.

Mr. Hughes: Wallaroo can take only 200 bushels an hour, but in future it will be able to take 400 bushels an hour.

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes. In addition, when the plans for Port Pirie are carried out the need for bigger grills at Wallaroo will not be so important, because much of the grain will go to Port Pirie instead of being railed to Wallaroo. That will relieve the receipts at Wallaroo to a great extent. The member for Wallaroo also referred to the spreading of wheat in the ships and the dirty and dusty conditions that waterside workers must contend with. He also said that those workers did not have to stay in the ships very long.

Mr. Hughes: They couldn't.

Mr. HEASLIP: I understand that the member for Wallaroo has been a primary producer. I do not think he is old enough to have been

on a stripper, but he probably has been on a header and a harvester, and I think he could vouch for the fact that the man driving one of those implements has much to contend with in a hot north wind, and not for only eight hours of the day.

Mr. Frank Walsh: What has that to do with the £500,000 guarantee?

Mr. HEASLIP: It has a lot to do with whether or not we guarantee that amount to the co-operative.

Mr. Frank Walsh: We are not granting: we are only guaranteeing.

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes, granting a guarantee, and that is what we are debating tonight.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must come back to the Bill.

Mr. HEASLIP: I am merely repeating some things that have been said by the Opposition.

The SPEAKER: Order! I called the honourable member for Wallaroo to order, and I expect the honourable member for Rocky River to confine his remarks to the guarantee referred to in the Bill.

Mr. HEASLIP: Whether or not we guarantee this £500,000, the employment position in Wallaroo will not be affected very much. Because we guaranteed £500,000 five or six years ago, is there is a big unemployment problem at Wallaroo today?

Mr. Hughes: They have left.

Mr. HEASLIP: There is a bigger problem in the city. Wallaroo has not died because £500,000 was guaranteed to the bulk handling company. It has enabled farmers to dispose of their wheat much more economically than under the old bag system. If we do not guarantee another £500,000 on this occasion we cannot hope to compete in overseas markets. If our wheatgrowers cannot compete in those markets, how can we establish overseas credits? The building of more silos will establish a wonderful asset and assist exports, without which secondary industries cannot carry on. If the legislation is agreed to part of the money will be spent on a terminal at Port Pirie. The honourable member for Wallaroo said his terminal was the most up-to-date in South Australia, although I would not say that the Port Lincoln terminal is not as modern.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: They are identical.

Mr. HEASLIP: Except that the Port Lincoln terminal was built later, and whatever

mistakes were made on the earlier installations they have been remedied in the more recent installations. As far as can be done, that will apply to the building of the Port Pirie silos. When they are completed they will relieve Wallaroo considerably. The present waiting time will not exist and, far more important, the cost of production will be cut down. If primary production is to continue to exist, we must cut down our costs; and if we are to build up overseas credits to keep our secondary industries going, the primary producer must be efficient. Without doubt bulk handling makes for improved efficiency in the handling of grain.

When the Bill was being considered in 1955, the then member for Stanley (Mr. Quirke) said that if we were to introduce bulk handling the grading of wheat would be lowered and not built up; but the opposite has happened. Today we are selling far superior grain overseas than we ever did in bags. Semi-hard and semi-soft wheats can be segregated; if a buyer wants semi-soft wheat, he can get it and the same applies to semi-hard wheat, but under the bag system one had to take it as a whole. One did not know whether one was getting hard or soft wheat. So, the introduction of bulk handling has enabled the primary producer to present a far better quality article than ever before. As a primary producer, I know what I delivered in bags and I know that the same cannot be delivered in bulk. If I produced and delivered the same quality of grain as I did in bags, I would be told to take it back. We have raised the standard of graded wheat that is being sold overseas, and we are able to sell to markets in which we could not sell before. If we want to dispose of our products, we must keep the grade up. I know beyond doubt that in agreeing to guarantee this £500,000, about the wisdom of which certain members in this House were doubtful five or six years ago, it will be a great help not only to the producers, but to South Australia as a whole.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart): We have just listened to a most extraordinary speech, and I have been at a loss to understand what the honourable member hoped to gain by misrepresenting the attitude of the Opposition at the time the original proposal was before the House. Because he said members on this side were opposed in principle to bulk handling and he referred to a statement made by the then Leader of the Opposition, I shall put the record straight. I notice that in closing the debate on the second reading of the Bill on

that occasion the then Minister of Agriculture (Mr. A. W. Christian) said:

Firstly, I express my sincere appreciation of the fact that bulk handling has been supported generally by all members of this House. I think it is particularly creditable on the part of the Opposition to lend their support to the Bill seeing that it involves a substantial displacement of labour. We are all concerned about that, but it affects one or two Opposition members more particularly.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. O'Halloran) objected to the method by which the Bill was introduced: it was introduced before the House had placed before it the report of the Public Works Committee, which investigated the bulk handling proposal on two occasions. I notice that I had a few words to say and I indicated that I would not vote for the measure until the report of the committee was given to the House. The Minister went on to say:

I assure Mr. Riches that I do not intend to proceed with the Bill once it reaches the Committee stage until the report of the Public Works Committee is to hand, which I am assured will be on Wednesday next.

Mr. O'Halloran made the attitude of the Labor Party clear on this issue when he said:

Regarding the broad general principles of bulk handling I can say the Opposition agrees with a properly considered implemented system that would benefit our primary producers. I realize that Opposition members have been charged with being opposed to bulk handling because of its effect on the labour force at various country centres, and particularly at shipping ports; but that movement is a humanitarian movement.

We believe that man is destined for a better destiny than carrying bags of wheat on his back, whether it be at a country siding or a shipping port, and that, if any method can be devised that will confer a benefit on primary producers in the first instance, and take the load of wheat off the lumpers' back in the second instance, it should be encouraged. The chief proponent of the Bill at that time was the member for Ridley (Mr. Stott), and he seemed to be the only one who knew the financial arrangements. The House considered that the information in detail concerning the financial arrangements of the bulk handling scheme should have come from the Government, and that it should have had the benefit of the report by the Public Works Committee. It was significant that members of the Public Works Committee were the strongest opponents of the measure at that time.

Mr. Heaslip: How have I misrepresented the position?

Mr. RICHES: The honourable member said that the then Leader of the Opposition (Mr.

O'Halloran) opposed bulk handling and doubted that the scheme could be a success.

Mr. Heaslip: I did not; I said that in Committee he spoke of failure.

Mr. RICHES: He did nothing of the kind.

Mr. Heaslip: Look at page 417 of *Hansard*.

Mr. RICHES: The clause that the honourable member for Rocky River has referred me to is substantially the same as the clause in this Bill. The Leader of the Opposition was merely asking for information about the terms and conditions of the guarantee in the event of failure by the company.

Mr. Heaslip: I did not misrepresent anything.

Mr. RICHES: Yes, you did. The question was:

Will the Commonwealth Bank step in and run the business of the company as the lender, or will the Government as the guarantor do so? The Leader of the Opposition did not express the opinion that the company would fail but, through lack of information given to the House, he wanted to know who was really giving the guarantee—the Commonwealth Bank or this Parliament. The Treasurer has not given us much more information on this Bill than he did when the original Bill was before the House. I want the information tonight and I hope that in his reply the Treasurer will be good enough to give it to me.

I want to make one or two comments on the matter before I sit down. The first is that I welcome bulk handling. In doing so, I take the same stand as the then Leader of the Opposition and the then member for Wallaroo (Mr. McAlees) took on the original Bill when they went on to say that bulk handling meant that men were displaced from employment and there was an obligation on the part of the State to make provision for the men who were displaced. But we marched with the times and we progressed. Surely nobody could quarrel with that attitude, that there should be some protection for the men paying the price. I am glad that this Bill has been introduced because it indicates a complete change of front on the part of the Commonwealth Government which, when first approached by the bulk handling company for a loan guaranteed by the bank, refused it.

Mr. Stott: In the original instance?

Mr. RICHES: No, I mean in this proposition here. The Commonwealth Bank advised that it was instructed during the period of the credit squeeze that credit could not be made available either with or without the Government guarantee.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Did the honourable member say the bank refused?

Mr. RICHES: Yes. The letter from the bank said that it had been instructed by the Government not to make the money available.

Mr. Stott: That is not correct.

Mr. RICHES: It is correct. I am glad that that position has been corrected and that we had the Treasurer's word, when he explained the Bill, that the bank was now prepared, following representations by the Government, to make the money available. The Treasurer said:

Following representations by the Government, the Commonwealth Trading Bank recently agreed to make the additional amount available to the company on the condition that the State Government should provide a guarantee for £50,000 as before.

I am glad that that situation has been corrected because surely, if there was any industry in Australia that was firmly—

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: I think the honourable member misunderstood the words of my statement. As far as I know, the Commonwealth Bank never refused.

Mr. RICHES: No. The Commonwealth Bank said (and I can cite it almost word for word) that it was not permitted to grant additional loans because of the directive from the Commonwealth Government.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: I do not think so.

Mr. RICHES: That matter has been cleared up and I am expressing my pleasure that the situation has been reversed. Another matter upon which this House is entitled to express an opinion is whether the bulk handling storage capacity that will be financed under this Bill should be concentrated at shipping ports or whether additional storage should not be built at sidings other than those enumerated by the bulk handling company. There is a division of opinion on that. I am not setting myself up as an expert.

Mr. Heaslip: Can't you leave that to them?

Mr. RICHES: There are two sets of interests to be considered here and somebody should speak for the farmers at the small sidings.

Mr. Heaslip: They are not complaining.

Mr. RICHES: The honourable member may think that they are not complaining but I know some who are uneasy and have expressed their uneasiness at the policy of the company in concentrating additional storages at the ports, when the railways and farmers could benefit if smaller silos were erected at intervening sidings.

Without wishing to trespass, I know that the member for Frome (Mr. Casey) has had strong protests lodged with him, and doubtless he will mention them during this debate. I have had doubts expressed to me by farmers in and around my electorate on the policy to be adopted, wrapped up with the broadening of railway gauges. Some people have been told that the location of silos will be determined after the board has learnt from experience.

Mr. Heaslip: You don't know what you're talking about. They have all been decided.

Mr. RICHES: After the board has had an opportunity of reviewing the situation and determining how far farmers are prepared to cart wheat, for instance, to Port Pirie.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have allowed the honourable member some latitude in this matter. The Bill deals solely with the matter of the guarantee to the Commonwealth Trading Bank. I do not mind the honourable member's making a passing reference to bulk handling but he must confine his remarks in the main to the subject matter of the Bill.

Mr. RICHES: I am directing all my remarks to the guaranteed amount, which is to be spent on the erection of silos at country sidings and shipping ports. That is the purpose for which the money is being borrowed and the guarantee given. I think that this House could have been better informed on this issue when the Bill was explained. The Treasurer might have given us more definite information. It does not give us much comfort to be told that we are not allowed to introduce these matters. Farmers paying the levy and attending public meetings in my electorate have asked me, "When will a silo be erected at Port Germein?" They are paying the levy but present indications are that they will never get a silo. That applies to other sidings that have also been mentioned to me but, as they are not in my district, I shall not refer to them here. There is a division of opinion as to whether the storage, which this money will finance, should be constructed at ports and central depots or whether there should not be a greater distribution of silos throughout the State at railway sidings. We should have that information before us. No-one will oppose this Bill, but we are entitled to the information we have sought. I would not have spoken had it not been for the clumsy attempt to make Party-political capital out of this measure, which should be completely divorced from politics.

Mr. STOTT (Ridley): I am sorry that acrimony has entered this debate. It is totally unnecessary. Some remarks were obviously designed to engender some opposition to the Bill, which merely provides a guarantee of £500,000 to enable the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. to get £1,000,000 from the Commonwealth Trading Bank. To clarify the position, I had best put the record straight. I propose to delay the House while I endeavour to give the information that members seek. Members are entitled to this information and I welcome their inquiries. I can understand the anxiety of the member for Stuart.

Mr. Riches: I am not anxious, but the farmers are.

Mr. STOTT: The honourable member is expressing their viewpoint. Originally the Commonwealth Trading Bank was approached for a loan of £1,000,000 and as I was the principal architect in the framework of this company it was my task to approach the bank. At that time we had no thought of a guarantee from the State Government. We received the utmost co-operation from the bank, and when I interviewed the Sydney manager to finalize the details he said that there was nothing wrong with the company's finances, that the company was soundly based and that the bank would make the advance to the company provided the State Government was prepared to guarantee 50 per cent of it. I said that we were not happy about that because our original concept was that the State Government should not be involved. The general manager said that there could be some opposition to this revolutionary changeover in South Australia and that if the Government were involved to the extent of a guarantee of £500,000 we would get greater support and less opposition. I saw the wisdom of that and a recommendation was made to the provisional directors, which was accepted. When this second application, which we are debating now, was considered, an approach was made to the bank for an additional £1,000,000. We interviewed the Adelaide manager and subsequently submissions were made to the Sydney office. There was no opposition although there was some concern about the credit squeeze. The bank had no objection.

Mr. Riches: I referred to the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. STOTT: I thought the honourable member was referring to the bank. The manager of the bank was on the same aeroplane when

I was returning from Sydney and I told him what we had in mind. He said, "You have Buckley's chance of getting £10,000, let alone £1,000,000. Don't you know there's a credit squeeze on?" I said, "Yes, but this is an export industry and as the Commonwealth Government's policy is to encourage export trade, because of our balance of payments overseas, it could not possibly put the credit squeeze on an advance to this company, because it would be contrary to its policy." He said that it would not hurt to sound the Treasurer out and the company appointed a subcommittee which journeyed to Canberra to interview the Commonwealth Treasurer, Mr. Holt. He raised no opposition and said it was a matter for the company and the bank. We immediately communicated with the bank in Sydney because we wanted to finalize arrangements. However, one or two details about the repayment of the previous £1,000,000 advance and other minor details had to be considered. We returned to Adelaide and proceeded with negotiations. We approached the State Treasurer for a guarantee of £500,000. He communicated with the Commonwealth Bank and with the Commonwealth Government, and a letter was written to the Prime Minister. There was no hitch throughout the negotiations.

Mr. Riches: At what stage did you approach the Industries Development Committee and what evidence did you put before it?

Mr. STOTT: There was no hitch in the negotiations.

Mr. Riches: Do you know anything about the evidence given before the Industries Development Committee?

Mr. STOTT: No, I did not give the evidence.

Mr. Jennings: Would Mr. Shannon know anything about it?

Mr. STOTT: I do not know whether he would. I do not want this debate to become acrimonious. The Treasurer's views were communicated to the Commonwealth Trading Bank in Sydney and we were notified that the £1,000,000 was available. It is now necessary for Parliament to pass this Bill to ratify the Government's 50 per cent guarantee on this additional advance. Members may ask what the company plans to do with the additional £1,000,000. It may assist if I outline what the company has done since its inception. It has been so successful that last year it operated in 41 centres, and it had the co-operation of the flour millers in 12 centres.

That meant that the company could move considerable quantities of wheat, and as soon as possible, was able to get the wheat to terminal points where shipping took place. In the 1960-61 season it moved 41,870 tons in the Eyre Peninsula division, 10,070 tons in the Wallaroo division, 19,649 tons in the Port Pirie division, and 12,639 tons in the Port Adelaide division.

The SPEAKER: Order! I pointed out earlier that members were not confining their remarks to the provision in the Bill. I remind the honourable member that he must take notice of my ruling. It is not proper for him to give the history of the company's operations, because the Bill deals solely with a guarantee. He must link up his remarks with that matter.

Mr. STOTT: I intend to do so, but it has been said that some farmers are complaining because there is no silo at their siding. They want to know how the £1,000,000 will be spent.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is giving historical information. He must link up his remarks with the matter in the Bill.

Mr. STOTT: The guarantee will enable the company to spend £1,000,000. Some of it will be spent on extensions to shipping terminals at Port Lincoln and Wallaroo. Some people say that more money should be spent on country silos, and perhaps that is justifiable, but last season we had a big crop and some farmers could not get their wheat into country silos. There was also difficulty at terminal points where delivery of wheat was taken direct because the country silos were full. Because they were full and because the Railways Department was unable to move the wheat to the ports, farmers had to keep their wheat in the paddocks. In other words, there was insufficient storage capacity at the terminals, which prevented the Railways Department from moving the wheat from country silos. As I said, it was an abnormal season. This season if we build more country silos and do nothing at terminals we shall again be in a mess. That is why the company must dovetail its action in this matter. We do not say that all the money should be spent at terminals and none in the country. We are doing things in a balanced way. As we build additional country silos we shall provide extra facilities at terminals. I am sorry that I am unable to give more information about the company's activities, because you, Mr. Speaker will rule me out of order if I do.

The Bill must receive the blessing of all members who understand bulk handling methods, and what they have meant to the State. On Eyre Peninsula prior to the advent of the company—

The SPEAKER: Order! From his own remarks the honourable member appreciates my ruling. I would appreciate it if he would again confine his remarks to the matter mentioned in the Bill.

Mr. STOTT: I intend to link up my remarks with the Bill and to do it in this way. Obviously Parliament would hesitate to pass a Bill providing for a 50 per cent guarantee of a loan of £1,000,000 unless there was the assurance that the loan would be repaid. In the 1960-61 season the company collected £712,720 in tolls. By the collection of money in this way the loan of £1,000,000 will soon be repaid, and in consequence the Government's guarantee will be safeguarded. The programme visualizes the building of 15 additional country silos and extra terminal accommodation. The 6d. a bushel toll, as against 2d. a bushel for wheat delivered in bulk, will mean that the additional silos will be built more quickly, and the sooner they are built the sooner will the money be repaid to the Commonwealth Bank and the State Government's guarantee not needed. The company is in a strong financial position and has received the support of all farmers in the State. It now has 17,000 members. In the early stages of its operations there was doubt amongst some farmers as to the wisdom—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. STOTT: I am going to link up my remarks.

The SPEAKER: I do not know that the honourable member will do so.

Mr. STOTT: If you, Mr. Speaker, will have a little patience I will show you how I propose to do it.

The SPEAKER: I would be pleased if the honourable member would link up his remarks immediately.

Mr. STOTT: There is no opposition by farmers to becoming members of the company. Their only criticism is that more country silos should be built. The Government has been wise in supporting the company and its willingness to provide the guarantee of £500,000 shows the confidence it has in the company, which is progressing to greater things in the future. The passage of the Bill without opposition will give a blessing to a wonderful

company, whose growth has been fantastic. The Bill must have the support of everybody.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): I thank some members for the lesson they have given in ancient history, but in deference to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, I shall not trespass in that way. In this matter the Government knows that it is backing a winner. If there is any bone of contention attached to the legislation it is related to human interest. There is certainly no bone of contention in the Bill. Bulk handling arrangements have been so successful that the company has been embarrassed in providing for all those wanting facilities. This measure will be a step that will greatly increase those facilities and provide a service for those who are still waiting for it and for a large section of the South Australian agricultural community. One difficulty that may have been touched on tonight is that when the programme is completed there will still be some people in different areas wanting a silo in their locality. This will provide a basis for some argument, because the Act stipulates that silos shall be built in areas that have had a specific bushel delivery in a certain five-year period. I hope that when the programme is practically complete these difficulties will be ironed out and we shall get a compromise between the sites of the silos and the distances over which the grain has to be carried.

I do not intend to speak at length on this measure, which is a move for the future. We are going to progress, and, as we know the company's success, there is no need to go into the past. When the programme is completed in about three years practically all of South Australia's wheat will be handled by this system, and I hope that at that time we shall be able to turn our attention to increasing the quality of our export grains. Not only may we do it by using the silos for segregating various qualities of grain but we may, if we use the facilities aright, be able to see that our grain is exported in first-class condition, free from impurities of any sort. We should see that the—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is drifting from the Bill.

Mr. HALL: I am endeavouring to point out that from this loan we are guaranteeing by this Bill we shall complete the silo system, that we should then be able to look forward to having grain passing through but a few port facilities, and that at those facilities we should be easily able to clean the grain mechanically.

That could be as great an advantage in our export markets as the very institution of bulk handling itself. I know that there is room at the Wallaroo silo to install a cleaning and grading plant. I have seen the space there, and I trust that all new silos will have this space included and that, when the programme is completed by means of this loan, the controlling authority (I take it that it would be our selling authority, the Wheat Board) will go deeply into the question of sending our grain overseas from our bulk silo system in first-class condition so that it can compete with the intense competition we get overseas.

I think this matter has been largely overlooked in this State, and I think it can be seen that it is one of the biggest advantages we will get from the bulk handling system. In commenting on this loan and supporting the Bill, I make a plea that we look to the future and conduct investigations so that we can put a system of cleaning and grading into operation when the time comes, and we can do it mechanically with the set-up we shall build. I have much pleasure in supporting this Bill.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): I, too, support this Bill. The member for Rocky River gave me to understand that he thought the Opposition was opposed to the measure, but I assure him that is not so. Earlier this year, when I was on a visit to Western Australia, I heard a wheat buyer from West Germany say quite emphatically that unless Australia exported bulk wheat it would not receive a market overseas. From that it can be seen that we have no alternative but to install bulk handling facilities in South Australia to meet overseas commitments. The member for Rocky River complimented the South Australian Railways; to his remarks I add that many bulk ore trucks were built in the railway workshops at Peterborough but lack of co-operation between bulk handling personnel and the railways was responsible for much wheat that could have been moved on the railways being moved by other means. This caused a good deal of embarrassment to the Railways Department. I hope that in the future there will be more co-operation between the Railways Department and the bulk handling authorities. With these few remarks, I support the Bill.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): I should like to say a few words and perhaps issue a word of warning. I am not in any way opposed to what the Government proposes to do in this matter in guaranteeing the

Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited so that it can extend bulk handling facilities, but two factors must always be kept in mind. One of these was raised by the member for Stuart. The member for Gouger I think blinds himself to one factor, and I wish to draw attention to it—that, if we establish at terminal points and at certain selected country centres an adequate storage capacity to handle grain, the small intervening sidings can forget for all time having facilities for delivering wheat in bulk. Anyone who does not look at that picture (which is facing us) fails to realize that expenditure on bulk handling has its obligation, in my opinion, since this Parliament has given this company a charter for the sole right to handle wheat in bulk. I think the company has an obligation to make certain that its policy gives as good a service to the man who grows wheat as is humanly possible.

Mr. Hall: It has that obligation by statute, hasn't it?

Mr. SHANNON: The honourable member must bear in mind that the company, by virtue of the policy at present pursued and which it is proposed to extend (the additional facilities for storage at ports), converts what would normally have been a transit silo for the shipment of grain into a storage silo. Those storages at ports are not the cheapest method of finding storage accommodation for farmers' grain; probably they are the most expensive sites. I am not denying that the company last year had a very difficult season in quitting wheat sold overseas in the time at its disposal but this occurs periodically and grain has to be disposed of in a hurry. It was slightly embarrassing to the company that the Railways Department could not bring wheat down from the country centres as quickly as the wheat shippers thought it should have been delivered. Nevertheless it would be a waste of time if the Government, which is as vitally concerned with this matter as the co-operative, did not know some of the things mentioned by the member for Stuart. I cannot see much to cavil at in his request that we should know the co-operative's policy on spending this money. That appears to be an appropriate approach to the legislation before us.

I am a little concerned that we may have an excessive storage capacity in ports in lean years because that will encourage wheat growers to road haul their product longer distances than usual. It will encourage the movement of grain by road to the detriment

of rail freight. Evidence to that effect was tendered to the committee on the zoning of silos and it has a strong bearing on the State's economy. Since the matter we are discussing is financial these aspects should be the concern of the Treasurer to make certain that State instrumentalities are not embarrassed as a result of the policy pursued on the location of the additional storages.

I make these few remarks not in any critical way, but in a constructive manner so that those who direct the policy of the South Australian Bulk Handling Co-operative Ltd. should have regard to such factors. The State has given the authority a great benefit in bestowing on it absolute sole responsibility for wheat handling in this field and that implies a responsibility on its part to make certain that the State providing the facility is not embarrassed by that policy. I say this because I can see a picture emerging where we will have more than adequate storage for a normal grain harvest. I am referring to an average crop and not to a light crop, but our harvests vary with the seasons and we will have more than adequate storage to deal with them. This money will more than meet the gap between an average crop and the storage capacity. For those reasons the officers guiding the co-operative should confer with the Treasurer now guaranteeing this finance to make certain that the policy does not cut across the interests of the State's port and rail facilities.

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

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT (CITY OF ENFIELD LOAN) ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 24. Page 569).

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): About four hours ago—it seems like that—I was in one of the interviewing rooms being interviewed by a couple of my constituents when I received a message that I was required in the Chamber because this Bill was likely to be debated in a moment. Apparently someone's time machine went wrong because I have been waiting ever since. This Bill is probably the best that has ever been introduced into this House from the Government side because it had the unique advantage of having me on its drafting committee. I knew it would not take us long to draw up the Bill and in fact

it only seemed to take the time the Premier would take to walk from his place to the Bar of the House.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It was a good, efficient committee.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, and no acrimonious note was sounded. True, the Bill does just what another recently discussed did: grant under guarantee a little more money for a good purpose, and the Premier in giving his second reading explanation mentioned the areas to be served by this drainage work. I notice, however, that he mentioned that one of the areas to be served was "Angel" Park, but, as good as Enfield is, generally speaking, I do not think anyone could claim that there

was any "Angel" Park in it. With those few remarks, and realizing that this Bill is a hybrid one and therefore will have to be referred to a Select Committee, I have much pleasure in supporting it.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of Messrs. Coumbe, Hall, Jennings and Ryan and Mrs. Steele; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, to adjourn from place to place, and to report on Thursday, September 28.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.22 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 30, at 2 p.m.