

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, October 4, 1961.

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

QUESTIONS.

FORBES SCHOOL.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: It would appear from a statement made by the Minister of Education last night that he would be favourably disposed to consider reducing the number of students at the Forbes primary school, which could be done only by erecting another school. There is an area fronting Raglan Street, Edwardstown, that I presume is still under the control of the Minister of Railways, although I do not know if that is so or not. Will the Minister consider having an investigation made into the suitability of this and any other site he has in mind for another school?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: I said last night, and I repeat, that I think there are far too many prefabricated classrooms at the Forbes primary school. I should like to see many of them eliminated and, in fact, all of them replaced gradually by solid construction buildings. I also consider that the school, which has an enrolment of over 1,700, is much too large; I think the ideal number should not exceed 1,000. This school has the biggest enrolment of any primary school in this State and I should like to see the excess numbers dispersed in some convenient manner. I am indebted to the Leader, as member for Edwardstown, for calling my attention to the possibility of acquiring some other land in an adjacent area. I shall be pleased to have that and any other suggested alternative sites examined.

FLUORIDATION.

Mr. CUMBE: Will the Minister of Works say whether an investigation has recently been carried out into the treatment of water by fluoridation and, if it has, whether the report has been completed? Can he indicate the cost of such treatment and, in particular, the likely cost to the consumer? If the report is not yet available can the Minister indicate when it is likely to be and will it be available to honourable members?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Some time ago I asked the Engineer-in-Chief to look into this matter to see what would be involved, both in regard to the costs and the mechanics of the proposal. He submitted to me a limited

report based upon limited proposals. I had some discussions with the Minister of Health on it. However, it envisaged that only certain areas of the State should be treated, these areas being ones where domestic consumption was of some significance in regard to the total quantity of water provided. For instance, very little of the water pumped through the Morgan-Whyalla main is used for domestic consumption, whereas in the metropolitan area quite a large number of people rely upon the reticulated water for their day-to-day consumption. That is as far as the matter has gone. I do not know whether the Department of Health has come to any firm conclusion on it, but now that the matter has been raised again I will take it up with my colleague, the Minister of Health, to see whether he desires investigations to proceed further, and if so I will take the necessary action.

ROADS IN WHYALLA WEST.

Mr. LOVEDAY: In the new areas in Whyalla West the Minister of Works will know that certain subdivisions are taking place and roads are being put down with the authority of the Housing Trust. Particularly on those roads that abut what will be a new subdivision, a tremendous amount of destruction of road work is being done as a result of the Engineering and Water Supply Department coming along after a road has been constructed, perhaps a week or so afterwards. The road is dug up in a series of excavations at intervals to allow the water to be extended to the next subdivision. As the Minister knows, it is impossible to restore by normal filling methods a road that has been dug up in that fashion. It may be that this is done because there has to be an application for the extension of the water to blocks on the other side of the road before the department proceeds. In other words, they cannot lay the pipes to a property before an application is received. In view of the circumstances pertaining in the big area being subdivided into different sections, could better co-ordination be achieved between the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the road-making authorities so that this problem could be obviated?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: This matter has been discussed on various occasions in the House and I have had repeated discussions with the Engineer-in-Chief thereon. I think that the honourable member has fairly assessed the position in the particular cases he has mentioned and I believe that the best solution

to the problem in an area such as Whyalla West, where extensions are going ahead at such a rapid rate, would be for the road-making authority to refrain from sealing a road until the Engineering and Water Supply Department had had a chance to receive applications and had put the service pipes in.

Mr. Loveday: A contract is let for the whole area.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: That may be, but the honourable member is suggesting, I think, that the Engineering and Water Supply Department should overcome the whole problem. I do not think it is possible for the Engineer-in-Chief to do that, for he will need help from other authorities to overcome it. For instance, until an allotment is occupied and a residence is located on it, the owner does not know, nor is it always easy to determine, just where the service pipes shall go, where the drive-way will be, and what arrangements there will be for fencing. I am speaking of service connections. I think that the honourable member will see that my point is a valid one. Until we know where the occupant or the owner desires the meter to be placed we cannot determine just at what point the service will meet that property. It may be possible, on firm proposals being submitted, to keep the main-laying up in line with road-making or perhaps a little ahead of it, but with service pipes that would be rather difficult. However, I am quite happy to take the matter up with the Engineer-in-Chief to see whether he can overcome the problem. I realize it is desirable not to disturb the road surface after it is made; it is more costly for the department to do it that way, so quite obviously it does not desire to do it that way and if it can be avoided it will be.

EYRE PENINSULA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Because of the adverse seasonal conditions and the lack of rain I am concerned about the water position at the Tod reservoir. Should the dry seasons continue a little longer than in recent years the Minister of Works will have to further consider watering Eyre Peninsula. Can he say what the position is at the Tod reservoir and when it is likely to be connected with the Port Lincoln basin?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: This matter has been taken great care of and I assure the honourable member that he need not be at all alarmed about water supplies on Eyre Peninsula as far as the Tod River system and

the East Coast trunk main are concerned. We took early steps to bring the Lincoln basin into commission, and the work of bringing the water in there is proceeding rapidly. The last time I saw the figures the Tod reservoir held 792,000,000 gallons, and that in itself is rather better than we expected to obtain at the time we commenced to bring the Lincoln basin into commission. The honourable member need have no fear about the existing services: they can provide an adequate supply through the coming summer. It has been necessary, because of the emergency work in the Lincoln basin area, to withdraw certain gangs of men from some approved extensions which have thereby been set back a month or two in their date of completion, but that is the only problem that has actually resulted from the seasonal conditions on the peninsula. I assure the honourable member that the water supply has been adequately safeguarded.

HOUSING TRUST INSURANCE PLAN.

Mr. TAPPING: During the Budget debate I referred to the desirability of the Housing Trust's inaugurating an insurance fund whereby the trust would make a grant of £500 as the nucleus of the fund; the tenants, by voluntary participation, would pay 1s. a week, and in the case of sickness or unemployment they would have no cause to worry and the trust would be assured of receiving the rentals. Will the Minister of Works, as the Acting Leader of the House, take this matter up with the trust to see whether such a scheme would be practicable?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will have the matter examined.

FIRE FIGHTERS' BADGES.

Mr. HALL: Over the past few weeks I have made representations, firstly to the Minister of Agriculture and then to the Chief Secretary, for Government assistance in the design and manufacture of metal badges for the identification of fire control officers in emergency fire services. I spoke on this matter as recently as yesterday, and I believe the Minister of Agriculture now has a reply.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Emergency fire services are under the control of the Chief Secretary. The matter has been referred to the Government, which has approved of the Public Stores Department calling for tenders for metal badges for fire control officers. The tender is being let on the understanding that the supplier will obtain his orders and payment from district councils.

MILLICENT WATER SCHEME.

Mr. CORCORAN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked recently regarding the Millicent water scheme?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have been advised by the Engineer-in-Chief that most of the machinery required for excavating the trenches is now at Millicent and it is expected that mainlaying will be commenced early this month. It is proposed to lay the mains in the South Australian Housing Trust area first so that the Housing Trust can make use of them to give a supply from its own local bore pending the completion of the Millicent scheme. The pumping tests on the five bores have now been completed and arrangements are being made for the preparation of specifications for the borehole pumping plants. The five bores are the deeper bores sunk by the Engineering and Water Supply Department for the permanent scheme.

BOLIVAR SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yesterday the Minister of Works released the first plan for the new Bolivar sewage treatment works. Has he anything further to report about the time table for the work? He may be able to refer to the matter that I have spoken to him about privately and in the House, and mentioned in correspondence, for the sewerage of the area I can best describe as the north-western corner of my electorate. It also takes in the north-eastern corner of the electorate of the member for Port Adelaide, who is also vitally interested in this matter.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Offhand I would not venture to add anything to what has already been said about these two areas. It depends on the time table for the whole scheme, and in particular for the trunk sewer to replace the present sewage farm. I will take up the matter with the Engineer-in-Chief and if I can give the honourable member any further information on this matter I shall be pleased to do so.

ELECTRICITY TRUST EXTENSIONS.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Works any reply to the question I asked on September 21 regarding the Electricity Trust extension line to Pinnaroo? I requested that the Minister obtain a schedule from the trust setting out when the smaller towns along the line might reasonably expect to be given trust power.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have received the following report from the Chairman of the Electricity Trust:

The extension to the township of Parilla is being started at the present time and is expected to be complete by January 1962. Thereafter each of the small towns on the route of the transmission line will be connected in turn, starting at Moorlands. These extensions should be complete by August 1962.

HAWKER WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. CASEY: Some time ago I asked the Minister of Works about the water supply at Hawker. At the time, the Minister showed me a report from the District Engineer; he informed me that this report was being actively considered but that the matter was not finalized. Can the Minister say whether that report has been fully examined and whether a plan has been prepared for the Hawker water supply?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have not yet had the Engineer-in-Chief's recommendation on that matter, but I will see whether he can make a recommendation, and, if so, what it is, and let the honourable member know.

SCHOOL TOILET REQUISITES.

Mr. FRED WALSH: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about toilet requisites in high schools?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: Yes. I have received from the Deputy Director of Education what may be called an interim report, which reads as follows:

Our present policy is to provide paper towels to teachers colleges and practising schools for the use of student teachers. Paper towels are not supplied outright or on subsidy to any other school, either primary or secondary. I think it would be difficult to justify the supply of these towels to secondary schools only, and any supply at all, either outright or on subsidy, would have to be considered for all schools, both primary and secondary alike. Information received from reliable sources indicates that the cost of a paper towel supply would be approximately 2s. a child a year. The maximum annual cost of supply on present numbers would be: secondary schools, 38,000 at 2s.—£3,800; primary schools, 136,000 at 2s.—£13,600, making a total of £17,400.

On a subsidy basis, the annual cost would be at a maximum half of this amount but, as all schools probably would not apply for a subsidy, the amount may be considerably less. It is understood that dispensers would be supplied free. The absorbent qualities of paper towels are not high and it is doubtful whether the Government would be justified in an annual expense which their supply, either outright or on subsidy, would involve.

I have not given that report my personal attention but, as soon as I have time to do so, I shall. I consider that the position is not entirely satisfactory. I should like to

consider it to see whether alternatives exist to the suggestions contained in this report. I shall inform the honourable member and the House in due course.

PORT PIRIE RAILWAY LINE.

Mr. McKEE: Earlier this session, the Minister of Works promised to obtain, through the Minister of Railways, the latest views of the Railways Commissioner on the removal of the railway line from Ellen Street, Port Pirie. Has he anything further to report?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I can add nothing to what I told the honourable member the last time he raised this matter: that negotiations between the Harbors Board, on behalf of the South Australian Government, and the Commonwealth authorities regarding their two properties involved in this matter were being actively pursued. So far as I know, the Railways Commissioner has not directly entered into negotiations because that matter was entrusted to the Harbors Board acting on behalf of the South Australian Government departments involved. When the honourable member last raised this matter, I told him that progress had been made, that it had been agreed in principle that a transfer of the Commonwealth Customs Department's office should be made, and that the Commonwealth would occupy the old courthouse that had been replaced by the new building, thereby vacating the present Customs Department's office. Some machinery used in operating a telephone exchange was involved. In that respect the Harbors Board officers were endeavouring to suggest to the Postmaster-General's Department some alternatives which, if adopted, would make that property available much earlier than the Postmaster-General had been able to indicate earlier. I cannot say that further progress has been made, but the honourable member may be assured that this matter is not being allowed to go to sleep. It is being actively pursued and the Railways Commissioner will take necessary action as soon as the way is clear for him to do so.

STRANGER IN GALLERY.

Mr. LAWN: While the bells were ringing just prior to the commencement of these proceedings a Liberal and Country League organizer was walking about what is known as the Speaker's lobby, and since the commencement of the sitting he has been in the reporters' gallery above your head, Mr. Speaker, although he has not been there all the time, nor is he there now. Are L.C.L. organizers allowed the

run of the House as I have described? If so, Mr. Speaker, does the same privilege apply to Australian Labor Party organizers or, if not, what action will you take to stop a repetition?

The SPEAKER: It is out of order for any member of the public to be present in the corridors or the gallery the honourable member has referred to when the House is in session or about to go into session.

FACTORY WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. RICHES: The Minister of Works promised to obtain a report from the Engineering and Water Supply Department on an application for a new water main to a cordial factory in Port Augusta. As this matter is regarded as urgent, has the Minister an answer?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The company concerned applied for an improved service, and when the District Engineer (Mr. Steele) was in town last week I spoke to him about the matter. He was attending to the application as one of urgency, but the information he then had suggested that the company's application must be in error because the quantity of water it was asking for was enormous: in fact, a substantial proportion of the total capacity of the Morgan-Whyalla main. Mr. Steele thought that the company must have made some error, either typographically or in its calculation of the quantity required. It appeared to him at that stage that it would be impossible to accede to the application, but that does not mean that an improved service cannot be provided. As I have received no further information from the Engineer-in-Chief since then, I shall see whether any conclusions have been reached.

PUBLIC LIBRARY.

Mr. CLARK: Last week the member for Burnside, during the Budget debate, referred to the position at the Public Library, and I entirely agree with her comments. The annual report of the Libraries Board, tabled recently by the Minister of Education, states that a staff loss of 50 occurred last year. It included 43 resignations, four dismissals and three retirements. The report also states that there has been a loss, by resignation, of 34 per cent of the professional staff during the year and that the salaries at almost all levels for qualified staff are still the lowest in the Commonwealth, and much below those paid in the only other comparable library in this State. I know that the Minister shares my interest in libraries and will be concerned at the position.

Is he prepared to comment and can he say whether any plans have been made in an attempt to offset this grave position?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: I share the honourable member's concern and deplore the loss of trained staff from the Public Library, not only the number, but the high quality of the men and women we are losing to other States largely because of the higher salaries offered there and also because of better terms and conditions, including better working conditions in more modern buildings with more amenities. Considerable correspondence has taken place between the Chairman of the Public Libraries Board and the Public Service Commissioner's office, and I have sent several submissions to the Public Service Commissioner during the last year. The recently appointed Public Service Commissioner, Mr. Pounsett, has taken an active interest in the matter and has seen me two or three times in the last couple of weeks. I understand that he intends to discuss the position with the Chairman of the Libraries Board, Mr. McFarling, and I hope that some good will accrue from this meeting soon.

PENNINGTON PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. RYAN: There have been volumes of correspondence between the Education Department and the Pennington school committee over many years about the building of a new school or additions to the existing school. Because of its locality this school has the highest turnover of students in the State. Recently the department informed the school committee that a new school or additions to the old school would be recommended for inclusion in the 1961-62 Loan Estimates, but neither has been included. Can the Minister of Education say when it is likely that this work will be commenced, or, if not, will he ascertain when this urgently-needed new school will be commenced?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: On the spur of the moment I cannot supply the honourable member with any accurate information, but I shall be pleased to ascertain the position and let him know either tomorrow or next Tuesday.

SOUTH-EASTERN DRAINAGE.

Mr. HARDING: Recently the Acting Minister of Lands reported on the drainage of the eastern division of the South-Eastern drainage scheme. Can the Minister say whether the South-Eastern Drainage Board intends to install a regulator on the outlet at Bool Lagoon in order to keep the water table high in low rainfall years?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have obtained a long report from the Chairman of the South-Eastern Drainage Board. As it is technical I ask leave for it to be inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

SOUTH-EASTERN DRAINAGE.

The design of the eastern division main diversion drain provides for a regulator at the outlet from Bool Lagoon, on the western edge of the lagoon, and for a regulator just west of where the diversion drain crosses the Bakers Range drain. The regulator at the outlet from Bool Lagoon is for the purpose of controlling the flow in the outlet to a maximum of 600 cubic feet a second. Bool Lagoon would be used as an equalizing basin where quantities of water in excess of this flow would be held temporarily. The regulator at Bakers Range drain is for the purpose of controlling the flow in the diversion drain west of Bakers Range drain to its capacity of 1,300 cubic feet a second. It is expected that it will be necessary to operate this regulator only in years of abnormal rainfall.

Bool Lagoon is a basin with a bottom level of about R.L. 263.00. When inundated to R.L. 264.00, an area of 4,000 acres is flooded. The extreme flood level is about R.L. 267.00, when about 7,000 acres is flooded. The existing drain extends only to the western edge of the lagoon. The proposed outlet drain will be 2.50 feet deeper at the western edge of the lagoon than the existing drain. It will extend across the lagoon having a depth of 3 feet near the western edge of the lagoon and about 1 foot on the eastern edge of the lagoon. Under present conditions Bool Lagoon usually becomes inundated each winter, and in a wet winter the water may rise to R.L. 267.00. By the beginning of the summer the water remaining is only shallow and by the end of the summer the lagoon is practically dry, only the lower pockets having water. This is the condition of the lagoon at the present time.

Following the construction of the eastern division main drain it is expected that, when the lagoon is used as an equalizing basin, the flood level will be about the same as at present; i.e., R.L. 267.00. The flood waters will, however, be removed more quickly and no doubt shallow water and relatively dry conditions will be reached more quickly. It is expected, however, that the lower pockets in the lagoon will still retain water as they do at present. The use of the regulator in the main diversion drain at the outlet from Bool Lagoon for the purpose of holding water back in the lagoon during the spring and summer has not been contemplated, as it is considered that the partial drainage of the lagoon at the earlier period of the year would result in a substantial improvement in portions of the bed of the lagoon.

TEACHERS FOR NEW GUINEA.

Mr. LAWN: Has the Minister of Education further information in reply to a question I asked last week about teachers going to New Guinea in a temporary capacity?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: No teachers seconded from the Education Department are in New Guinea at present. Teachers may have resigned to accept appointment in New Guinea, in which case they would work under the New Guinea Public Service. If any application were received from a teacher for leave so that he could take up teaching duties in New Guinea, the conditions under which such leave would be granted would be considered on the merits of the individual case. It is unlikely that such a teacher would lose promotion rights, but superannuation rights would, of course, have to be referred to the Superannuation Board for consideration. It is not the policy of this department at present to second any teachers for teaching duties in New Guinea. In October, 1960, a request was made by the then Acting Prime Minister for the secondment of a limited number of teachers from the Education Department to undertake teaching duties in the territory of Papua and New Guinea. It was pointed out at that time that this State was already supplying more than 120 full-time trained teachers and some administrative staff for about 3,300 pupils in the Northern Territory. On October 4, 1960, I made a report to the Premier, which he transmitted to the Prime Minister. The relevant part of the report stated:

I fully appreciate that the education of indigenous people in the territory of Papua and New Guinea is of considerable national importance. However, I consider that the proposed secondment to the Public Service of the territory of Papua and New Guinea of a number of trained teachers for service in that territory should be made from the other States because in my opinion South Australia is already doing its fair share, or more than its fair share, in providing trained teachers for the Northern Territory. This State is supplying a superintendent, an inspector and 120 full-time trained teachers for about 3,300 pupils in the Northern Territory. In addition, the Director of Education, Deputy Director, Superintendents and other senior officers of the department are devoting more and more time and attention (including personal visits to the Territory) to this problem, thus causing a serious drain on our limited resources of administrative and teaching staffs.

In view of the staffing position in this State, the department felt that it could not reasonably be expected to agree to a further depletion of its available teaching strength that would naturally occur if more teachers were seconded for duty in Papua and New Guinea. The staffing position in this State has not improved sufficiently to justify any change in this policy.

Mr. LAWN: A number of Public Service officers, such as doctors, engineers, and surveyors, who go to New Guinea have their seniority, long service leave, and superannuation rights preserved to them. There are some such officers in South-East Asia and all their rights are preserved to them on their return to the State. Arrangements regarding superannuation are made before the officer leaves the State. Will the Minister of Education see whether teachers can be treated the same as public servants in these circumstances? If, as his reply to a previous question implied, the discrimination against teachers may be the result of the shortage of staff, will the Minister, in view of the recent statement by the Director of Education that the shortage has now been overcome, review the position and grant teachers the same privileges and rights as apply to other members of the Public Service if they go to New Guinea or South-East Asia?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: I am confident that the Director of Education has never said that the shortage of teachers has been overcome. At the most he said that it was gradually and progressively being overcome, which is a very different state of affairs. As far as I know, no teachers have been seconded from South Australia for service in New Guinea.

Mr. Lawn: They have gone there, but have had to resign from the department.

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: I do not doubt the accuracy of the honourable member's statement, but I am not aware of it. I have not received a report of any such case and therefore I do not think that the problem has arisen, because I do not think any teachers have been seconded. In reply to the honourable member's specific question whether I will inquire into the matter, I shall be only too pleased to do so, and advise him in due course what is the position.

WATER MAINS.

Mr. LAUCKE: I have had the experience that, although a reticulation scheme in a rapidly growing area has been designed to provide for a given number of people, when further extensions have been sought the basic main has been incapable of providing for them. The whole matter hinges on the comparative costs of water piping of various diameters. If the difference in the initial cost as between, say, 4in., 6in., and 8in. mains is not prohibitive in a given scheme, will the Minister of Works say whether the department can adopt a policy of providing for larger mains where

there is a reasonable prospect of further extensions being sought?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: This question divides itself into two parts. Is the honourable member referring to suburban or country lands reticulation schemes?

Mr. Laucke: Country lands.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I intended to say that in suburban areas the department knows the requirements fairly accurately and accordingly provides for the likely consumption. In country lands, the problem is to adjust as nicely as possible the economics of the scheme to the requirements of the area to be served. Frequently I have received complaints that mains as originally laid have proved inadequate. That will always be so, as no-one can foresee future requirements or economically provide for the needs of all time. By way of analogy, I suggest that a person in his younger days does not aspire to such a pretentious house, to such a large motor car, or to such adequate furnishing as he may require later. A young man must start to develop a farm in the modest way permitted by his capital and resources. The same applies to a great extent in laying water mains. A 6in. main does not cost much more than a 4in. main, but the difference in cost between an 18in. main and a 30in. main is of real significance.

Mr. Laucke: I referred to mains with a small diameter.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The department used to lay many 2in. mains, but they have long since gone out of use; indeed, they have been replaced in many areas because they have been inadequate, and in other places we have lined mains with concrete to increase the flow and restore them to about their original capacity. As is known to the member for Eyre, who has had considerable experience with smaller mains, the cost can put a scheme completely out of court if the size is not tailored as nearly as possible to actual requirements. Often, where considerable mileage of mains would be involved, the rates required would make the scheme uneconomic for those who would otherwise benefit from it. I assure the honourable member that these factors are carefully weighed and, while we endeavour to provide always that a scheme will be satisfactory, we have to consider the obligations of people to be served in relation to the economic benefit they can derive from the scheme. If these two factors cannot be reconciled, the scheme will fail from the outset.

MOIETIES.

Mr. LOVEDAY: When the owner of a residential block which he has obtained from the Lands Department returns the block to the department (frequently for reasons beyond his control), and kerbing or road work has been done by the council, a moiety is chargeable. The legal opinion of the Municipal Association is that the moiety is payable by the previous owner and not by the Lands Department, although the increase in value passes to the Lands Department. Would the Minister consider either accepting responsibility for the payment of the moiety in such cases or, alternatively, reimbursing the person concerned when the block has been re-sold at an enhanced price, as is usual in such cases?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will look at the question and let the honourable member know.

PRINCIPAL OF ROSEWORTHY COLLEGE.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Last night, when I was speaking on the line "Agricultural College Department", I asked the Minister of Agriculture if he could say whether the new Principal of the Roseworthy Agricultural College had yet been appointed. I believe that applications closed on September 20. Can the Minister make a statement?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: No appointment has yet been made. The position was advertised both in Australia and overseas. Applications were to close on September 30 in London and Adelaide, and possibly in other places. In any case, not all the applications, of which there has been a number, would have arrived yet.

PRESERVATION OF GUM TREES.

Mr. RICHES: For several years I have made representations regarding the preservation of gum trees on the western slopes of the Flinders Ranges. In areas that are otherwise treeless, these lines of gums along the creeks running from the ranges to the gulf are a very valuable asset to that part of the State. Concern has been expressed that no attempt is being made to preserve them. It has been suggested that these trees should be fenced so that regeneration may take place. However, there can be no regeneration whilst these areas are open to stock. This suggestion has been made to the Minister of Agriculture. Some of the older trees are dying, and if this is allowed to continue the loss will be considerable. Will the Minister call for a specific

report from his departmental officers on what steps should be taken to preserve these trees, and in particular ask them to report on the suggestion offered by some councillors in that part of the State that these areas should be fenced.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I shall be glad to do that. However, I shall have to look at the areas mentioned in order to determine the forms of tenure under which the land is held, and so on. I can endorse his wishes in this respect and say that I, too, think it is a good thing to have areas of natural scrub and timber properly fenced away from stock, and (what is of equal importance) away from vermin, if that is at all possible. I am hoping to encourage landholders of all kinds of tenure to go further than they have done in the provision of a small proportion of scrub on their properties. I will get a full report on the matter for the honourable member.

INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT SPECIAL COMMITTEE.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That in the opinion of this House and in conformity with the request contained in the first report of the Industries Development Special Committee and submitted to this House on August 15, 1961, full powers of a Royal Commission should be granted to that committee for the purpose of assisting it in completing its investigations and finalizing its report.

One of the most important points in this motion is the fact that, whilst the late Leader had submitted a resolution during the last session of Parliament on the importance of setting up a Royal Commission to investigate the decentralization of industry in this State, undoubtedly the House will recall that certain amendments were submitted by the Premier on behalf of the Government. The result of the amendments moved by the Government was that the Industries Development Committee was appointed as a special committee to conduct the investigations instead of the Royal Commission recommended. On any matters that are within the terms of the Industries Development Act, the committee has the powers of a Royal Commission, and it is my view that when the motion was passed last year it was the intention of all members that the Industries Development Committee which was appointed as a special committee in this instance would have the powers of a Royal Commission. The intentions

were summed up well both by our late Leader and the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon). The late Leader said, *vide Hansard*, page 751:

The Premier has not justified his objection to the appointment of a Royal Commission. He said that he had no faith in Royal Commissions, in view of his experience of Royal Commissions all over the world and in this State; that he preferred something different. But I would point out that the Industries Development Committee, to which this important inquiry is to be referred if the motion as amended is carried, is a Royal Commission. There is not a scrap of difference between what I propose and what the Premier asks the House to accept. The Premier suggests that we should accept the Industries Development Committee as a substitute for the Royal Commission.

The member for Onkaparinga said (*vide Hansard*, page 749.):

I do not intend to debate the merits of the Leader's motion or the amendment of the Premier. I do not think that aspect needs much debate because, after all, both seek to achieve the same object.

The Industries Development Committee, as a committee, has the powers of a Royal Commission on any inquiries that it makes on matters that are referred to it by the Treasurer for investigation, but when it comes to the same committee, consisting of the same personnel, inquiring into the possibilities of decentralization of industry in country areas, a doubt has been raised that it has not the standing of a Royal Commission. Consequently, I am in accord with the request contained in the interim report of that committee which is being printed and which indicates firmly that it desires the standing of a Royal Commission to be incorporated in its terms of reference. If this were done it would give to the committee the status to which it is justly entitled. It would give the committee the right to call witnesses with the knowledge that witnesses could be compelled to attend if it were in the interests of the State's advancement. It may be desirable to have powers to subpoena a witness to appear and submit valuable and important information which may be excluded from the committee's present inquiries. For example, if the management of a certain business undertaking was presenting evidence, it might be desirable also to call employees of the same firm to give evidence. These employees may be willing to give evidence, but, at present, the fear of dismissal from employment would prevent them from appearing before the committee. In addition, the status of any committee which is set up by Parliament should be maintained

wherever any inquiries or investigations are taking place. The request from the committee states:—

The committee has taken an opinion from the Crown Solicitor to the effect that it has no power to require witnesses to give evidence. Some difficulty could thus be experienced in obtaining witnesses who could give valuable evidence. Members consider that their investigations would be aided if they had that power. The motion I have submitted to the House is in accord with the intentions of all members when passing the motion on the inquiry into the problem of decentralization in this State, as well as the request contained in the interim report of the special committee. It would provide the appropriate status for the committee of inquiry appointed by Parliament, and would aid the investigation by the members of that committee. Therefore, I confidently anticipate that my motion will have the complete support of all members of this House.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

GLENELG BY-LAW: TRAFFIC.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I move:

That by-law No. 31 of the Corporation of the Town of Glenelg in respect of traffic, made on November 8, 1960, and laid on the table of this House on August 22, 1961, be disallowed. Firstly, I shall briefly outline this by-law which, as the title discloses, is one dealing with parking. The by-law is in five parts, and it is only the fifth part which, as far as I am aware, has caused any controversy. Part I is "Definitions and Repeal"; Part II also deals with repeal; Part III refers to stopping and standing, and lays it down that vehicles when they are stopped at the kerb shall be within a foot of the kerb; Part IV deals with angle parking, and lays it down that parking at various angles can be resolved upon in various parts of the town; and Part V, the part upon which I will have to put something to the House, deals with leaving vehicles in streets.

I say again that the first four parts of this by-law contain no matters of controversy. No objection has been taken to them, but, of course, as neither the Subordinate Legislation Committee nor either House has the power to recommend the excision of a part of a by-law or the amendment of any part of a by-law, there is no alternative to recommending the disallowance of the whole by-law, even though, as I say, four-fifths of it apparently contain nothing objectionable. I refer particularly to Part V of the by-law regarding the time limit on parking, section 1 of which reads:

Between the hours of 8.30 a.m. and 5.30 p.m. Mondays until Fridays inclusive, and 8.30 a.m. to 12 noon Saturdays, no driver or rider of any vehicle shall allow the same to remain stationary for more than sixty minutes in any street to which this section applies. This section shall apply only to any portion or portions of the area to which the Council by resolution pursuant to section 636 of the Local Government Act 1934-1959 declares that this section shall apply.

That is, of course, a blanket power to allow the corporation to resolve that any street anywhere within the town of Glenelg shall have a one-hour parking limit. That is the only time that is mentioned: it is only a one-hour limit or no limit at all. The explanation which accompanied the by-law makes it clear—and, in fact, this came out in evidence subsequently—that the Glenelg Corporation is only interested at present in a time limit in Jetty Road and Moseley Square, and, Mr. Lewis (Town Clerk) said, perhaps one or two other places. Its main aim at the moment is to get a time limit in Jetty Road—which I suppose we can call the main street of Glenelg—and Moseley Square, although, as I pointed out, under this particular section of the by-law the corporation could subsequently apply it to any street anywhere in the town of Glenelg.

If I correctly caught the drift of the debate on the Mount Gambier parking by-law, some members object to this power of resolution under section 636 of the Local Government Act. I personally—as I have made clear on other occasions—do not share that view. To me this section as it stands is merely the exercise of a power that has been specifically given by Parliament under that section, and I believe that either House would be very foolish to disallow any by-law on that ground alone. The remedy, if Parliament does not like the section, is to repeal or amend it. So far as I am concerned, and I speak for the members of the committee, the form of the by-law is unexceptionable. I do not want to presume to pass judgment on the pros and cons of a one-hour or a two-hour parking limit. That is a matter for the local corporation to determine. Members may therefore ask why there is this recommendation for the disallowance of the by-law. The answer is related to the negotiations which led up to the making of the by-law and those which have proceeded since the by-law was made on November 8, 1960.

Mr. Clark: Negotiations by whom?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The members for Gawler and Adelaide are most eager in this matter. I shall give the history of the way in which the

by-law came to be made. That should make it clear to those honourable members just what has gone on. Evidence was given to the committee by five witnesses. The first witnesses were members and representatives of the Glenelg Chamber of Commerce (Messrs. Raven, Steele and Frost), and the second witnesses were from the Glenelg Corporation (Mr. Parkinson, the Mayor, and Mr. Lewis, the Town Clerk). On August 19, 1960, the Chamber of Commerce approached the Glenelg Corporation and requested that a parking time limit be introduced in Jetty Road, Glenelg. The object was to prevent what has now become known as the "all-day parker", that is, the person who leaves his car all day in Jetty Road and goes by tram to Adelaide, or goes about his business in Glenelg. The chamber thought that that should be prevented. It therefore suggested to the corporation that there should be a two-hour parking limit for Jetty Road. The suggestion was received by the corporation and the next the chamber knew was that the corporation had decided on a limit of one hour. That brought forth what we can best term violent objection from members of the chamber. It was followed by meetings, a petition and a deputation to the corporation.

Mr. Clark: Why did they object?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The chamber objected to a limit of one hour because it said it was too short. The chamber felt that people would be frightened away from the shopping area in Jetty Road to shopping areas not far away where there were no parking limits.

Mr. Lawn: We still have a half-hour limit in the city of Adelaide.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That may be so. I said that I did not propose to go into the pros and cons of a one-hour or a two-hour limit. I suggest that that is irrelevant to the real reason for the recommendation for the disallowance of the by-law. I gave members the reason given to the committee by the chamber.

Mr. Lawn: What is the committee's reason?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member is a little impatient. I am doing my best to get to it. A great deal of opposition had sprung up in Glenelg when it was known that the corporation had decided on a limit of one hour. In spite of the opposition the corporation persevered and the by-law, in the form in which it was laid on the table of each House, was made on November 8, 1960. The dates are perhaps significant.

Mr. Hall: Do you think that public opposition is relevant to the disallowance?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, for the reasons that I shall give in a moment. Apparently the honourable member finds it difficult to contain himself. The by-law was made on November 8, and members will know that that would not have allowed sufficient time for the by-law to lie on the table of each House before the last session of Parliament ended, because there must be 14 sitting days, which is equivalent to about five weeks. The result was that the by-law was not laid on the table of either House until August, 1961. On November 24, about a fortnight after the by-law was made, and after protests and agitations about the by-law a meeting was held in the mayoress's parlour at the Glenelg town hall between representatives of the corporation and the chamber. The Minister of Education was present in his capacity as member for the district. The holding of the meeting was the crux of the whole matter. Apparently it was inconclusive in that no real agreement was reached between the parties. The corporation said it wanted a 60-minute parking limit and the chamber said it wanted a two-hour limit. However, the representatives of the chamber were left with the impression that no further action would be taken to lay the by-law before either House of Parliament until the summer season had ended and there had been another meeting between the representatives of the chamber and the corporation. That was the impression in the minds of the members of the chamber after the meeting on November 24.

Mr. Hall: Your committee has considered the views of the Chamber of Commerce?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and the views of the corporation.

Mr. Lawn: The chamber has recruited your committee to help it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is right. The summer ended and time went by, but no further meeting was called. The chamber had been waiting for the meeting and assumed that nothing would be done until it was held. Finally it was discovered in some way or another by the members of the chamber that the by-law had been laid on the table of the House on August 22, 1961. Then, as Mr. Lawn succinctly put it, the chamber requested the opportunity to give evidence to the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation.

Mr. Ryan: Is that the reason for the refusal so far?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, so far; we are only about two-thirds of the way through. The position is that the chamber expected to hear from the corporation that there would be another meeting before the by-law was laid on the table of the House. There was no meeting and it was therefore assumed by the members of the chamber that no action was being taken on the by-law. Mr. Raven was the chief representative on behalf of the chamber, and this is the way he put it in the evidence that has been tabled for anyone who wants to read it. In answer to me, he said this:

The council agreed at that meeting to give further consideration to two-hour parking and promised that no action would be taken until a further conference was held with the chamber, approximately in May, 1961.

So that was the impression left in the minds of the members of the chamber. On the other hand, the representatives of the corporation denied that that was the arrangement that was made, and Mr. Lewis and Mr. Parkinson referred to this when they gave evidence subsequently. Mr. Lewis said, on the question of a subsequent meeting:

On that, there may have been some undertaking that after the summer—mark those words!—we would have another pow-wow with these boys but meanwhile there was no intention at all on the part of the council not to proceed with the by-law.

Mr. Parkinson said:

Minutes were taken of that meeting which stated clearly that, if another meeting was required, the parties concerned would request the mayor to call a meeting.

That, then, introduced the question of the minutes kept at the meeting of November 24. I asked several questions about who took the minutes and whether we could get a copy (they did not bring the minutes with them); we were told we could get a copy, and then Mr. Parkinson went on to say:

It was clearly stated in the minutes that the mayor would be requested to call another meeting by the members of that particular meeting. So that we have up to that stage what one might term a contradiction—the Chamber of Commerce saying that it was agreed at the meeting of November 24 that there would be another meeting before the by-law was laid on the table of either House, and the corporation, on the other hand, denying that there was any arrangement for a meeting at all, but saying that minutes were kept at the meeting.

Mr. Ryan: By the corporation?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. In fact, as honourable members will see, Mr. Lewis said:

There was no intention of ever doing anything but going on with the by-law.

That is how it was left when the evidence of the representatives of the corporation concluded. However, subsequently, the corporation was kind enough to send a copy of the minutes and with it came a covering letter to me (dated September 27, 1961) as follows:

Dear Mr. Millhouse, I enclose herewith a roneoed copy of the minutes of the conference held in the mayoress's parlour on Thursday, November 24, 1960. Copies of these minutes were sent to all members of the council and were taken as read and adopted by the council at a meeting on November 29, 1960—

which was five days later—

which was open to the public, and the press were present. As far as I can ascertain, no copy was forwarded to the individual members of the Chamber of Commerce or the Minister of Education, who attended.

That was the covering letter that came with the copy of the minutes, which are voluminous and I do not propose to read them all; they set out only the discussions at the meeting. The only part I do propose to read is the last paragraph of the minutes, kept, as I have explained, by the corporation itself, circulated to members of the corporation, and subsequently confirmed by it. This is the last paragraph:

The meeting with general unanimity agreed that both parties would make a careful examination of the problem during the next six or seven months and ask the mayor to call a further conference between both parties prior to the by-law being laid on the tables of the Houses of Parliament some time in June or July next.

Once we had read that final paragraph in the minutes, there seemed to be no doubt at all what the arrangement had been at the meeting of November 24. That minute, prepared by the corporation itself and circulated, and confirmed by the members of the corporation, showed clearly what the arrangement was, because the meaning of that paragraph (to me, at least) is that the intention was that a subsequent meeting should be held before this by-law was laid on the table.

That, of course, was the construction that had been put upon it by the members of the Chamber of Commerce who attended. The corporation in some way (I do not propose to reflect upon it in any way) had overlooked the import of their arguments and the apparent arrangements that had been reached at that meeting. That being so, the members of the Joint Committee believed that the Chamber of Commerce was entitled to the further meeting, as had been agreed, obviously, on the face of that minute, and, in view of the evidence that we had been given, the Subordinate Legislation Committee believed that the

Chamber of Commerce was entitled to the meeting before the by-law went through. It seemed to us to be only fair that that should be so, because the arrangement (one could almost call it "the undertaking") had been made, but that meeting, apparently, for one reason or another (I cannot go into those reasons because I do not know them) had not taken place. The only way in which the further discussions can now take place is by the disallowance of this by-law. The matter has hung fire now for 12 months. In view of this unfortunate happening, I suggest it will have to wait another 12 months, perhaps, because we believe the Chamber of Commerce was entitled to rely upon the arrangement made at that meeting of November 24 being carried out. That is the reason for the recommendation of the disallowance of this by-law.

Mr. Clark: Under which of your terms of reference are you asking for the disallowance?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Under paragraph (b) of Joint Standing Order No. 26, which states:

Whether the regulations unduly trespass on rights previously established by law.

While it may not be established by law, we feel that the Chamber of Commerce has the right to be heard again in view of the undertaking given. That is without doubt a moral right.

Mr. Clark: Do you think that the committee has the right to make decisions on that ground?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes.

Mr. Clark: Under your terms of reference?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, I do. I confidently put it this way: where there has been a breach of the arrangement (obviously, on the face of the evidence before us), we think we have the right to interfere. That is the reason why this motion for disallowance has been moved.

The member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) asked me how I distinguished between this by-law and the Mount Gambier by-law. I should think that he could draw the obvious distinction now between the two. As far as Mount Gambier is concerned, the corporation has apparently done nothing that it should not have done. It is not beholden to anybody, nor has it given an undertaking to anybody: it has simply exercised its power under the Local Government Act. Here, the Glenelg Corporation has exercised the power given under the Local Government Act but it did make an arrangement with the body of ratepayers protesting, and that has not been adhered to, for one reason or another. That is the vital

distinction, I suggest, between the two by-laws. I had hoped that my explanation of the distinction would satisfy the member for Gouger, and I see from the receptive look on his face that it does. Those are the reasons why the committee moved for the disallowance of the by-law. The committee suggests that where an obvious arrangement has been breached it is up to us, as a Parliament, to make sure, if that can possibly be done, that such arrangement should be adhered to. The only way that can be done in this case is by disallowing the by-law, for which I accordingly move.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I hope that the House will not carry the motion, which deals entirely with a local government matter. Glenelg conducts corporation elections, when necessary, under the terms of the Local Government Act and, therefore, the people have decided who shall be their councillors, aldermen and mayor. The Town Clerk of Glenelg has held office for many years and has a complete understanding of the Local Government Act. I place him in the same high category as several other town clerks who really understand that Act. The member for Mitcham indicated, in no uncertain terms, that when the corporation drafted the proposed by-law the Glenelg Chamber of Commerce agreed with the corporation in principle. Mr. Millhouse said that the Subordinate Legislation Committee believed in the principle contained in the proposed by-law, but he came into the House this afternoon and said that, because of a certain meeting held in November, 1960, when certain minutes were read and adopted, the by-law should now be disallowed. The minutes adopted on November 29 last suggested that both the people's elected corporation representatives and the Chamber of Commerce would meet within six months to consider whether they could come to a unanimous agreement on the by-law.

I do not dispute that the members of the Chamber of Commerce may be ratepayers but I dispute the right of that body, which attended the meeting that was also attended by the member for the district, to upset a decision made by the corporation under the provisions of the Local Government Act by taking the question to Parliament. Mr. Frank Lewis indicated that the corporation would proceed in principle with what it had already adopted.

If the Subordinate Legislation Committee intends to usurp another power, about which its chairman is not 100 per cent certain, it can reject out of hand the principles contained in

the Local Government Act. That is the stage we are reaching today. I have not, at any stage, been a member of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation but I believe that the general procedure is to examine proposed by-laws. In the past the committee has always been courteous enough (and I see no reason why it should not be courteous in future) to provide the local member of Parliament with a copy of the proposal to enable him, if necessary, to have further inquiries made. The committee then meets and satisfies itself that it fully agrees with the principle contained in the by-laws. However, in this case, because an unelected body of people now says that it did not hold a meeting before this matter was submitted to the committee, the by-law must go overboard.

What is the Glenelg Corporation to do in the meantime? If this motion is rejected the by-law must go back to the corporation. What time will it have to get this matter again before its members and bring it back to the Subordinate Legislation Committee this session? Let us examine this matter from another angle. The Glenelg Chamber of Commerce may have some elected members of the corporation amongst its members but it does not consist entirely of elected members of the corporation although it may comprise interested business people from Glenelg. I assume that those people desire to do business with the public and the by-law provides that certain markings shall be put down and that one hour's free parking shall be allowed. No charge is proposed as was the case in the Mount Gambier by-law. The corporation could finance the policing of the by-law.

The Glenelg Chamber of Commerce apparently disagrees with the corporation, but I believe that the Chamber of Commerce stands to gain if this by-law is enforced, because no doubt its members have business premises in Glenelg and the rates they pay will not be increased. The corporation will have to find additional revenue to pay the wages of those who police the parking in the business area, and the general ratepayers of Glenelg will be called on to meet that cost. The Subordinate Legislation Committee has been given a mandate by Parliament to examine these by-laws, after they have been received from the Crown Law Department, and to determine their merits. The committee did so with this by-law and said, in effect, "This by-law may be in keeping with the Local Government Act and would be in the interests of Glenelg, but because a certain meeting was not held our

Chairman shall move for its disallowance." The motion is contrary to a principle of local government, and I believe it has been moved because of a division of opinion between an elected body (the corporation) and an organization that may include some ratepayers of Glenelg (the Chamber of Commerce). I hope the House will not support the motion and that Parliament will enable the by-law to become law.

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla): After listening to the member for Mitcham it was apparent that the only reason for this motion of disallowance was that the corporation failed to carry out something that was alleged to be in its minutes. The corporation agreed that a careful examination of the problem should be made during the next six or seven months and before the by-law was tabled in Parliament. It seems to me that the Subordinate Legislation Committee has made its decision on the question of whether or not the corporation carried out what is alleged to be a promise to the Glenelg Chamber of Commerce. I believe that such a decision is beyond the province of the committee. When the member for Mitcham was asked under what terms of reference his committee made its decision he read out what he said was the term of reference, but he did not pursue it from the legal viewpoint. He said the corporation had a moral obligation to carry out a promise made at a meeting or discussion with the Chamber of Commerce. That seemed to me to be beside the point. The by-law has been approved by the Crown Law Department, and surely the committee's function is to determine the question of its legality.

Apparently there is an objection to the parking limit of one hour. The only alternative to that is to lay down some other period or to give the corporation an open go for any period it determines in its regulation. That, however, does not solve the problem. The corporation has a right to decide what should be done. The member for Mitcham said that this Parliament had already given councils and corporations authority under section 686 of the Local Government Act, and it is interesting to examine that section, which states:

(1) Any by-law to which this section applies may provide that the by-law shall apply only within such portion or portions of the area as the council may by resolution direct.

(2) The council may pass any such resolution, and may by resolution revoke or vary any such resolution, but no such resolution shall be passed except at a meeting of the council at which at least two-thirds of the members then in office are present.

Not only is a majority of two-thirds of the corporation members necessary to put the by-law into operation, but the resolution may be varied or revoked.

Mr. Shannon: Not a majority of two-thirds, only a simple majority.

Mr. LOVEDAY: I stand corrected. However, the Act provides that such action is not to be taken lightly or easily, and there are plenty of safeguards. My objection to this motion is that the issue has apparently been decided on what seems to be an argument between the corporation and the Chamber of Commerce and not on the question of whether the by-law is desirable and whether the corporation should have this authority. That is the crux of the question. There is a grave tendency by the Subordinate Legislation Committee to take away from councils and corporations the power conferred on them by the Local Government Act. Those bodies have little enough power and if it is to be whittled away in this manner, they may as well give up the ghost and hand all their power back to Parliament. It is undesirable that this situation should have arisen and that a corporation should have been questioned on ordinary matters of procedure between it and organizations in its district. I strongly oppose the motion.

Mr. CLARK (Gawler): My objection to this motion can be summed up briefly. The Chairman of the Subordinate Legislation Committee who moved for the disallowance of this by-law took a long time in giving the history leading up to the by-law coming before his committee. He could have left it all out because until he came to the last small section it had nothing to do with the objections his committee had to the by-law. It appears that the only reason why the committee decided to move for the disallowance of this by-law was the purely domestic argument between the Chamber of Commerce and the corporation. I, and, I think, some members of the committee, and possibly the Chairman, can see that, if this committee intends to take into account such arguments when deciding the fate of by-laws, it will have much tittle-tattle and argument in the future that it could well do without. This will lengthen the sittings of the committee and weaken the chance that by-laws will be passed.

I specifically asked the member for Mitcham under which term of reference the recommendation was made. I was a member of the committee for seven or eight years—possibly longer than any present member—so I have had some

experience of these matters. I do not reflect on the present members or say that they were ignorant in making the recommendation, but the reason given for moving for the disallowance of this by-law was that it unduly trespassed on rights previously established by law. I should have liked the member for Mitcham to give details to show how this by-law unduly trespassed on rights previously established by law.

Mr. Lawn: The sooner that committee is abolished the better!

Mr. CLARK: I would not go as far as that, but it appears to me that the honourable member did not seem confident about it himself. I find it hard to see that it unduly trespasses on rights previously established by law; I cannot see any law regarding this.

Mr. Shannon: It has something to do with the use of the Queen's highway, hasn't it?

Mr. CLARK: I suppose it has some vague relationship with that. Whether people can park for one hour or two hours in a busy street in Glenelg should not have been decided by this committee; I do not think that that is, or was ever intended to be, its function. I do not like to criticize the committee; I know how much important work it does. However, the decision in this case was made by the duly elected representatives of the people and, if the ratepayers were dissatisfied, they had a remedy. It appears that the decision of the committee hinged on the argument between the Chamber of Commerce and the corporation, and I say emphatically that it is not the function of the committee to act as an arbitrator or to make a decision (as it did). In this case, the decision was against the corporation.

I am not taking sides on what was promised at the meeting held in the Glenelg town hall, as I do not think that that has anything to do with us or the committee. I think, and I know the mover will agree, that the only matter under discussion is whether it should be one-hour or two-hour parking. In an issue such as this some are in favour and some are not, but I submit that it is not the function of the committee to recommend the disallowance of a by-law simply because it has decided which side it is taking.

Mr. Quirke: In the eight years in which you were a member of this committee, did it ever recommend the disallowance of a by-law?

Mr. CLARK: Not often, although in the latter part of my term the committee did more of it.

Mr. Shannon: Periodically, disallowances have been moved.

Mr. CLARK: I think so. I oppose this motion not on any political grounds but on the ground of common sense. In this case (and I think it is unusual) the committee has erred. The mover gave me the impression that he was doubtful that the heading under which he was moving for the disallowance covered the matter. I am more than doubtful; I cannot see that a by-law for a parking limit of one hour unduly trespasses on any rights previously established by law. In fairness to the corporation, I think the by-law should not be disallowed, so I oppose the motion.

The Hon. B. PATTINSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

POLICE OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 27. Page 915.)

The Hon. B. PATTINSON (Minister of Education): I support this Bill, and commend the member for Wallaroo for introducing it. My only criticism is that its scope is too limited. The Bill refers only to refrigerators, ice chests and ice boxes, whereas I think other domestic and commercial appliances and equipment, because of the method of their construction, are at least a potential source of danger to children. I recall that on September 21, just a week before the honourable member introduced this Bill, the Premier referred to these sources of danger and, in reply to the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse), said:

A number of things can cause danger from time to time to young children. Some years ago (and we still have it with us, though it is somewhat controlled) we had the problem of young children drinking from lemonade bottles in which kerosene had been kept. Another problem mentioned here the other day was that of abandoned refrigerators, where the shelves had been taken out and children could get into them and be locked in and suffocate. . . . After discussion by Cabinet, it was decided to try to draft a provision to amend the Health Act to enable the Government from time to time to make regulations covering this type of thing as and when it arose. The type of regulation necessary is being studied at present by the Crown Law officers so that, when any of these new dangers arise, a regulation can be drafted to meet it.

However, he concluded by saying:

I return to the fact that the coroner himself stated strongly that there was no legislative action that the Government could take that could be nearly as effective as education and care by parents. Everyone realizes that. Education and care

are essential ingredients if we are to achieve the utmost safety for young children.

I respectfully agree with those observations. Cabinet had discussed the matter and decided that it should take the earliest opportunity to move an amendment to the Health Act to control not only the particular sources of danger which the honourable member for Wallaroo had in mind, but all other real or potential sources of danger. The honourable member took the initiative, as he is entitled to do, and for which I have already commended him. I think that the Bill will serve a very useful purpose, but I should like to take it further. I have an amendment placed on honourable members' files as follows:

Page 2, after line 15, insert the following subclause—

The SPEAKER: The Minister would be out of order in dealing with an amendment that is to be dealt with in Committee.

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: I am anxious to widen the scope of the Bill to provide that it shall cover such other domestic or commercial appliances or equipment which, because of their construction, are potential sources of danger to children. I desire greater flexibility than is possible under the Bill, the scope of which is limited; and its operation is also limited by the fact that once it is passed nothing more can be done under it than the carrying out of its precise provisions. The Government desires to have power to make regulations from time to time dealing with these three particular matters referred to in the Bill, and any others that may arise from time to time. If it did not approve of any such regulation, Parliament would have the right to object. I do not seek to detract from the Bill in any way and I support the second reading.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): I thank the Minister and the House for having accepted the Bill so far. I have had a look at the Minister's proposed amendment and I should be quite happy to accept it and any other amendments, the objects of which were to safeguard children from the hazards involved. Recent headlines in the press have told of the need for a continuing and vigorous campaign against the dangers associated with refrigerators and freezers. Since I introduced the Bill last week my attention has been drawn to an article in a special issue of *Refrigeration Cold Storage and Air-Conditioning*. When presenting the Bill I gave certain statistics and since then my attention has been drawn to a further loss of life. Therefore, I think it may be of

interest if I read what is contained in this special issue. It is as follows:

Two boys die in refrigerator—A nine-year old boy, trapped in a large refrigerator for 22 hours, was found alive after his brother and another boy had suffocated. The boys entered the disconnected refrigerator at Huntington (New York) school. The door slammed on them and locked. The dead boys were Roger Keith Bias, 9, and Johnny Carter, 11. Police Sergeant S. Watkins described the survival of Johnny's nine-year old brother, Henry Carter, as "a miracle." Sergeant Watkins said there was a small drain plug near where Henry was lying in the refrigerator. It may have let through enough air to keep the boy alive. Henry, who was admitted to hospital, was later reported to be well. The school, near the boys' homes, had been searched several times before Sheriff J. Frankel looked in the refrigerator.

That goes to show that not only are children aged about four, five or six trapped in refrigerators, but this can happen also to boys aged between nine and 12 years. Therefore, I consider that the operation of this Bill would be the means of reducing the number of such happenings. The secretary of the Western Australian Branch of the Institute of Refrigeration Service Engineers has advised that there was published in the *Daily News* in Perth on September 7 the following:

Children die in refrigerator—Bellflower, Cal. (Wed.) (A.A.P.): Two small children died yesterday when they crawled into a newly-connected refrigerator in the kitchen of their home and could not get out.

The Minister of Education mentioned that in its present form the Bill did not go far enough. I entirely agree with him, because there were several things I should like to have included regarding private property, but I did not want to take it too far because I thought it might not be acceptable to the House. I am pleased to know that the Bill as prepared is acceptable to the House. When I presented the Bill last week I gave certain statistics regarding the United States of America and drew attention to certain happenings in New South Wales. To my knowledge nothing of this kind has happened in South Australia, but my attention has now been drawn to the fact that there had been such a happening at Port Augusta, but the person who informed me about it had nothing to substantiate it. Since I introduced the Bill there has been a near tragedy in South Australia and this shows the need for some such legislation. The following appeared in the *Advertiser* only yesterday:

Ordeal of boy, 4, in freezer—Murray Bridge, October 2. A four-year-old boy, nearly suffocated after having been trapped in a

refrigerator, was revived when his mother turned a hose on him at The Point, near Murray Bridge, on Friday. The boy, Fred Kessells, son of Mr. and Mrs. L. Kessells, was playing with the refrigerator with his two-year-old brother Joseph on the semi-enclosed front verandah of their house. Fred climbed into the refrigerator and Joseph apparently closed the door after him and was then unable to open it. When their sister, Lindy, 5, arrived home from school Joseph told her that Fred was "in there", and she ran to their mother. Mrs. Kessells opened the door of the refrigerator and the boy rolled out semi-conscious.

Had it not been for the timely arrival of that little girl it is likely that a different happening would have been reported in this House this afternoon. Nobody was more pleased than I to learn that that little girl arrived home when she did, for it was her quick action in drawing the mother's attention to the other child's being in the refrigerator that saved the little boy's life. I thank the House for the attitude it has adopted, and I appeal to all members to make sure that the community of which they are representatives is made aware of this hazard.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Enactment of section 58b of principal Act."

The Hon. B. PATTINSON (Minister of Education): I move to insert the following subclause:

(4) After the making of regulations for the purposes of this subsection (which regulations the Governor is hereby empowered to make) a person shall not, except as prescribed, sell, hire, offer or expose for sale or hire any prescribed domestic or commercial appliance or equipment, container or other article which is of such a kind or is so constructed that it might be dangerous to young children.

This amendment is designed to help the honourable member and those who support the Bill. It will extend the scope of the Bill and also give it greater flexibility, for we shall be able to meet any dangers or potential dangers from time to time by regulation. If such regulations are not in a form that is desirable or effective they can be disallowed and others put in their place. I commend the amendment to the Committee.

Mr. KING: Does the Minister's amendment apply only to refrigerators and ice-chests, or is it proposed to cover a far wider range of articles such as electrical appliances and such things?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: It is designed to cover any other domestic or commercial appliances or equipment that may be prescribed from time to time and about which nothing can be done until the appropriate regulation is laid on the table of both Houses of Parliament.

Mr. Shannon: It may apply to equipment that has not yet been thought of.

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: Yes. The honourable member's Bill is good as far as it goes but it refers only to refrigerators, ice-chests and ice boxes, whereas there are other potential sources of danger.

Mr. Frank Walsh: Such as plastic bags.

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: That is one item the Government had in mind; it was the subject of a coronial inquiry into the cause of one death, and I think there have been two deaths in this State—there have certainly been some in Australia—as a result of this very serious potential or actual source of danger which is not covered in the Bill as introduced.

Mr. Quirke: Who would be the authority to institute regulations?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: The Governor in Council would prescribe the particular equipment or appliance, and then a regulation dealing with it would have to be laid on the table of both Houses.

Mr. Frank Walsh: The Subordinate Legislation Committee would have the opportunity to scrutinize it.

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: Yes; it would be subject to all the checks and safeguards of that body. Apart from that, it is the right and privilege and duty of all members of Parliament to scrutinize every regulation and by-law and not shelve this responsibility to that very estimable body, the Subordinate Legislation Committee.

Mr. KING: I thank the Minister for his explanation. The Bill was introduced to deal with refrigerators, ice-chests and ice-boxes. The amendment is very wide in its scope, and I am pleased to know that the Minister and the Government are introducing it with those other things in mind.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

COUNTRY ELECTRICITY TARIFFS.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Frank Walsh:

That in the opinion of this House, the Government should take steps to assist the decentralization of industry and help retain population in country areas by insisting that the Electricity Trust of South Australia institute a system whereby all country tariffs are reduced to the same as those now operating in the metropolitan area.

(Continued from September 27. Page 931.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): In concluding the debate on my motion to assist the decentralization of industry in this State by reducing country electricity tariffs to the same tariffs as those now operating in the metropolitan area I shall deal mainly with the criticisms by the Premier, because other members of his Party are apparently dancing to his directive. Firstly, I shall deal with the views expressed by some of the members of his Party prior to his directive. If the Premier has not issued a directive, then why do members opposite, who earlier this session advocated cheaper electricity charges for country areas, now say that it would be wrong to reduce the country tariffs and bring them into line with metropolitan tariffs? The member for Rocky River has previously urged the Government to reduce country electricity charges. The member for Albert has done likewise, and the most recent statement on this matter by a member opposite was by the member for Gouger, who said:

There is no justification for having a different price for country and city consumers. At present there are about 65,000 country residential users and 162,000 city residential users. The ratio of country industrial users to city industrial users would not be near as great, because of the concentration of industry in the city. When I first investigated the matter of tariffs I expected the cost of an equalization programme of tariff charges would be far more adverse. I contend it is feasible for the trust to immediately implement a policy of justice in electricity charges.

Recently it was suggested that there was not much sincerity about my moving this motion. It came from the member for Gouger, but I remind him that I have never spoken in this place unless I have believed in the cause for which I was speaking. Whenever I have spoken I have been sincere, but when I compare the remarks of the member for Gouger on this motion with his remarks on another matter relating to electricity charges I have grave doubts about his sincerity. I suggest that he be consistent with his sincerity. I

will leave the matter there. In speaking against my motion, the Premier said:

The trust also gets a certain amount through semi-Governmental borrowing and, believe me, at present it is having the greatest difficulty in getting all its semi-Governmental allocations filled. The most substantial part of its extensions are provided from internal funds, through the utilization of appreciation of assets and of any surpluses it may have in its own account.

Let me give my views. If there is the greatest difficulty in filling loans, as the Premier would have us believe, then I ask him, "Who is to blame for the destruction of business confidence of the whole community at present?" The second part of his statement is without foundation. I examined the Auditor-General's report for the year 1960-61 and found that capital expenditure by the trust on fixed assets was £6,290,000, and that of this figure only approximately £1,800,000 was financed from the internal funds of the undertaking. In any case, fixed assets with extended lives should be financed from loan funds and not from the current earnings of the undertaking. I do not mind legitimate criticism on any motion I move in this House, but I do object to criticism being made with the object of defeating the motion when the criticism is not based on fact. Another statement made by the Premier was:

Honourable members do not need to be reminded that one of the chief items in industrial cost is electricity. I know from my own personal knowledge that when an industry is deciding whether or not to come to South Australia, the first comparison it makes is that of industrial tariffs in South Australia with those in other States.

Surely this criticism rebounds on the Premier himself, because industries that may consider establishing themselves in the country areas would also look to the tariffs being charged, and make a comparison between the metropolitan and country tariffs in order to assess how one of the chief items in industrial costs would affect their business potential.

In giving the illustration in relation to the possible establishment of a large industry at Mount Gambier, the Premier said in effect that the stumbling block was the question of electricity supply and that the proposed establishment of the company was only proceeding on the understanding that it was not compulsory for it to be connected to the State electricity supply. Surely this is an admission that the tariffs charged by the Electricity Trust are not sufficiently competitive to encourage the establishment of new industries in that area.

I can give another example. What would the cement company at Angaston be saving in

electricity tariffs if it received the same concession as similar industries in the metropolitan area? Is this not another example of the Government's retarding the decentralization of industry in this State? I think that would stand any investigation, and there would be no reflection on the member for Angas. I think, Mr. Speaker, that you will agree with my statement. I have demonstrated clearly that the Premier's criticism of my motion is not based on fact. Members opposite have stated that the cost to the trust would be about £375,000 per annum. As the trust's surplus for last year was £414,000, the indications are that my suggestions are financially possible. As the reduction in country tariffs to bring them into line with metropolitan charges would give a positive indication of the Government's intention to encourage the decentralization of industry and lead to the balanced development of the State, I am sure that in spite of the Premier's directive I shall receive substantial support from Government members. In fact, it is my firm view that those members to whom I referred earlier (the members for Rocky River, Albert and Gouger) are obliged to support my motion unless they are prepared to answer for the insincerity of their remarks on this subject, and I am still confident that the motion will be carried.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (16).—Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan, Huglies, Jennings, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Ralston, Riches, Ryan, Tapping, Frank Walsh (teller), and Fred Walsh.

Noes (18).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Dunnage, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Jenkins, King, Laucke, Millhouse, Naukivell, Nicholson, Pattinson, Pearson (teller), Quirke, Shannon, and Mrs. Steele.

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Hutchens and Stott. Noes—Sir Cecil Hincks and Sir Thomas Playford.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.
Motion thus negated.

MOUNT GAMBIER BY-LAW: PARKING METERS.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Hall: That by-law No. 47 of the Corporation of the City of Mount Gambier in respect of metered zones and metered spaces for vehicles, made on June 23, 1960, and laid on the table of this House on June 20, 1961, be disallowed.

(Continued from September 27. Page 933.)

Mr. RICHES (Stuart): I oppose this motion and express my regret that the member

for Gouger (Mr. Hall) has seen fit to move it. I also regret the manner in which he moved it, after deciding to go outside his district and pose an authority on traffic matters for Mount Gambier. It was quite unnecessary. I shall not take much time answering the case he has presented to the House, because I think he has presented no case at all. However, one or two issues have arisen upon which I want to express an opinion. First, I congratulate the Mayor of Mount Gambier on the way in which he has conducted himself throughout the whole of what must have been at some stages an embarrassing situation. Whenever pressure groups attempt to bring pressure to bear on local government, those who seek to serve the people in that way find themselves in a most difficult position. It is something new, I think, in the history of local government for these groups to succeed in getting some member of Parliament in a remote part of the State, scarcely heard of in important circles, to come in on their side against the elected representatives of the people. I am more concerned about the attitude Parliament is generally adopting towards local government, and it is on that angle that I wish to speak. I was much concerned at the attitude of some members, and particularly the member for Stirling, who spoke in this debate. Mr. Jenkins professes to have a great interest in local government and to be a supporter of it. However, he would limit still further the powers of local government and he came forward with an extraordinary suggestion that before local government could exercise the rights that Parliament has given it, in certain circumstances there must be a unanimous council decision. If we ever reach that stage I might agree with the honourable member that there would be no need for local government: we could quite easily run that sort of procedure under a dictatorship. The actual words of the member for Stirling were:

I am not particularly concerned about the Mount Gambier by-law, but I suggest that when similar by-laws come before the Subordinate Legislation Committee, instead of accepting them and enabling the council to have such vast powers, it should examine them more closely.

I remind the House that Parliament decided that it might be desirable in some areas to install parking meters. Parliament also decided that the decision as to whether meters should be installed in certain areas was a matter for local government to determine in the interests of the people living in the locality. It was to be determined by the representatives of the

people in the locality, to be determined by people answerable to people living in the locality. I certainly would not ask that the people of Mount Gambier, when exercising the right given to them by Parliament under the Act, should first of all consult me or any other member of Parliament living in the north of the State as to whether it was desirable that they should exercise those powers.

The member for Stirling went on to say that any by-law passed by a council should be carried unanimously. I do not believe that needs arguing, but it does show the difficulties some members found themselves in when supporting the motion before the House. The Mayor of Mount Gambier has been criticized. The Premier came to the assistance of the member for Gouger, but I have the feeling that if a vote had been taken after the Chairman of the Subordinate Legislation Committee had replied to the member for Gouger, the member for Gouger would not have had a colleague with him on a division.

Mr. Millhouse: Hear, hear! It was a good speech.

Mr. RICHES: It was a good speech, but you did not maintain the standard this afternoon.

Mr. Millhouse: I went to great pains to show you the distinction.

Mr. RICHES: I think the member for Gouger placed himself in such a ridiculous position that it was incumbent on the Premier to go to his rescue. Of course, the Premier's having done that meant that so many other members of the flock had to gather around and accept everything the Premier said. They follow the leader whether they are convinced of the soundness of the argument or even if they are not convinced. What were the arguments advanced by the Premier against this motion? Apparently he had some disagreement with the Adelaide City Council and he drew a red herring across the track that could be smelt across the borders of the State. He said the business of the member for Gouger was not to monkey with Mount Gambier business that did not concern him, but the honourable member was frightened that somebody might install parking meters in district council areas in his own electorate.

Parliament agreed to give municipalities the right to have by-laws gazetted, but it did not give that right to district councils. Parliament agreed that municipalities could be entrusted to reach a sound decision as to whether it was desirable to facilitate the movement of traffic by installing parking

meters by means of by-laws similar to the one the House has before it. That is a power that can be properly entrusted to local government, but at no stage has Parliament considered that a case could conceivably be made for the installation of parking meters in district council areas. Nobody has asked for that power and it has not been given, so to suggest that there was any fear that this power would be abused by district councils if the by-law were agreed to was certainly drawing a red herring across the track and was completely irrelevant to this debate. The House should note that this by-law was properly drafted, that it was drafted in accordance with the policy laid down by this Parliament and that it was good at law according to the certificate of the Crown Solicitor.

Mr. Shannon: No by-law ever gets past the Crown Solicitor unless it is good at law.

Mr. RICHES: I agree. The House should have regard to the fact also that it has borne the scrutiny of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation. I do not always agree with the findings of that committee, but I do always listen to its findings. This is the finding of the committee and I ask the House to pay special attention to it this afternoon. Its finding was that this motion, if carried, would be an affront to local government in South Australia.

Mr. Millhouse: Be quite accurate. That is what I said and it was my personal opinion on it.

Mr. Loveday: It has been shown that the committee does not lean unduly to local government.

Mr. RICHES: I will accept the statement of the member for Mitcham, but I shall read, for the benefit of the House, what *Hansard* reports him as saying and, unless there has been some change of mind on the part of some members of the committee since, the honourable member said it in good faith. The *Hansard* report reads:

Disallowing this by-law will not do anything to help him in his fear of these parking meters. Bearing all those things in mind, because the Subordinate Legislation Committee did bear them in mind, we came to the conclusion that, apart from matters of opposition voiced at Mount Gambier, it would be a real affront to local government if we were to move for the disallowance of this by-law.

Mr. Millhouse: I said earlier that I was speaking for myself. I used a Royal "we".

Mr. RICHES: I understood that the honourable member was speaking for his committee.

He is most particular about his speeches, and he said:

Bearing all those things in mind, because the Subordinate Legislation Committee did bear them in mind, we came to the conclusion that, apart from matters of opposition voiced at Mount Gambier, it would be a real affront to local government if we were to move for the disallowance of this by-law. Speaking for myself, I am a very strong upholder of the position of local government in South Australia. I believe it has a real function to fulfil and that, subject to over-all control by Parliament, it should be independent within that sphere. They were the best words he has uttered in this House, and it gives me great joy to be able to commend him on that statement and to express the hope that at some time in the future we may again hear him say something as equally profound and equally correct.

Mr. Millhouse: I can feel a halo forming now.

Mr. RICHES: It slipped badly this afternoon.

Mr. Casey: Was the committee's decision unanimous?

Mr. RICHES: If it were, some member has apparently changed his mind because that is the inference I draw from Mr. Millhouse's interjection. The Premier suggested that the Subordinate Legislation Committee was not carrying out its functions. He said:

There seems to be some confusion in members' minds about the function of the Subordinate Legislation Committee, which was set up to consider by-laws and regulations. That committee was set up as a result of an amendment that I moved many years ago, when I was a back-bench member, to meet a position that arose at that time and of which members were only too conscious: that when Parliament met, a whole mass of subordinate legislation was dumped upon the table and, in my opinion, no regard was given to whether it was properly scrutinized or not. I moved an amendment that was ultimately adopted in, I think, a slightly altered form, and as a result the Subordinate Legislation Committee was constituted. The objection to the setting up of the committee was one that was widespread in Parliament, but it was afterwards met by some alteration of the original suggestion. It was never suggested that the committee should have power to approve a regulation or by-law or to investigate the desirability of a regulation.

Later he said:

Local government legislation has been the source of much trouble for a long time.

Note how he came to the assistance of the member for Gouger in this attack on local government. He continued:

For many years subordinate legislation was dealt with in the ordinary way; regulations came before Parliament in the normal way.

It was not satisfactory and led to many problems. Firstly, the legal advisers of the councils frequently advised incorrectly about the councils' powers.

He continued in a similar strain, stating that the Subordinate Legislation Committee was set up by Parliament to deal with by-laws drafted by councils and that councils had a tendency to go beyond their powers in gazetting by-laws. If that had been the reasons for the setting up of this committee something would have been said about it when the committee was established. Actually, the committee was set up in 1937 when the Premier was a back-bencher. The Bill was introduced as an amendment to the Constitution Act which provided for a five-year Parliament. There had previously been a Labor Government and when the Liberal Party assumed office it thought the fruits of office were extremely tasty, and its first step to ensure its retention of those fruits was to extend the life of Parliament from three years to five years. Subsequently, it introduced the gerrymander.

When Parliament discussed the five-year Parliament the Premier introduced an amendment to provide for the setting up of the Subordinate Legislation Committee, but he never mentioned councils or by-laws in his speech. The object of the committee was for it to deal with regulations promulgated by the Executive and not by local government at all. The Premier alleged malpractice by Government departments that were trying to over-ride an active Parliament and the committee was established to deal with any malpractice. I do not know why the Premier went to such lengths to misinform the House and to bring that matter into a debate on this motion unless it was because he had no other grounds for asking for support for the member for Gouger. He certainly had no material with which to answer the case presented by the member for Mitcham.

The Premier supported Mr. Hall's attack on the member for Mount Gambier. Every fair-minded member will agree that that was unnecessary, uncalled for and did not help Mr. Hall's case, apart from the fact that the criticism was wrong. I cannot conceive of any member of any district doing more for his district than the member for Mount Gambier. No member of the Legislative Council, representing the same district, would have dared to take the step that the member for Gouger took outside his electorate. Those Legislative Council members have a responsibility to the Mount Gambier people, who should be considered in this

matter as well as the corporation and the pressure group. My constant concern is for the people. Councils are close to the people and if the people do not like a council's actions they have a right to express themselves each year at the council elections. At Mount Gambier, both before and after the elections, the voting strength was the same. If the people cannot be trusted to decide this issue, whom are we prepared to trust? What do we want of local government? This is a direct frontal attack on the powers of local government. The Premier demonstrated his lamentable lack of knowledge of local government standing orders when he said that the matter was not properly before the corporation and that the mayor had given a wrong ruling. He stepped outside the bounds of decency in saying this.

Mr. Hall: But he was right.

Mr. RICHES: He was not right, and no authority on local government would say he was. That is about the only matter on which the member for Stirling was right. He has had many years of experience as a mayor and did not hesitate to say that the Mayor of Mount Gambier was right in every respect—and so he was. The Premier quoted a decision given by Mr. Cartledge, but with great respect I say that the decision was a matter of opinion and that perhaps more eminently qualified legal men would give a ruling the other way than would give a ruling in line with that given by Mr. Cartledge on whether a mayor is a member of the council for the purposes of voting. I say it was a proper ruling for the Mayor of Mount Gambier to give on a by-law on which the member for Stirling would say the council should be unanimous.

Mr. Jenkins: Reasonably unanimous, at any rate.

Mr. RICHES: That is a decided improvement, and I am glad to accept it; the honourable member said "unanimous" before. The member for Gouger and the Premier would have us believe that a decision on a by-law should be decided on an equal vote, but the Mayor of Mount Gambier said that that was not a sufficient majority and that the motion was lost. Surely that is a proper ruling to give on an important issue of gazetting or rescinding a by-law.

Mr. Corcoran: It is standard practice.

Mr. RICHES: It is proper practice, and it is moral and correct. It is difficult for us to understand why the Mayor, having done that, should have been attacked by the Premier. It seems to me that the Premier felt that he had

to go to great lengths to support at all costs the member for Gouger to get him out of the serious difficulty in which he found himself by submitting this motion and making the gross mistake of attacking other members of Parliament, many of whom have forgotten more about local government than he will ever know.

Whether parking meters should or should not be installed has nothing whatever to do with this debate; that is a decision entirely for the corporation of the city of Mount Gambier and the people of that district, through the machinery set up by Parliament and exercised under the Local Government Act. I do not think I am any more competent than any other member to say whether traffic in the streets of Mount Gambier needs parking meters. I wish some other way could be found to provide for the movement of traffic, as I was never enamoured of parking meters even when Parliament gave these powers to local government. It seems to me that they are one-armed bandits but, so long as councils feel that they are an acquisition in a town and render a real service in moving traffic, I shall vote for their right to determine this issue. That is the crux of the debate. If we do not believe that councils should have that right we should amend the Act to take it away from them; we have expressly handed over that responsibility to them. No arguments have been adduced and no rule has been made to take away that power. If the member for Gouger thinks that Parliament made a mistake he should move to make this apply everywhere, but he is asking the House to say only to the Mount Gambier corporation, "You shall not have the power but every other council shall."

I think the Premier said that the by-law would be more acceptable if it set out the streets. Where will we get if we require every council making a by-law controlling traffic to name every street where it is to be controlled? That has been tried with ordinary traffic movement and found to be unworkable, which is why Parliament in its wisdom introduced the amendment under which councils, by resolution, declare areas of controlled traffic. It takes a long time to get a by-law through and, although limited parking in one area might be advisable at the time of gazetted a by-law, I have known places where business has moved away from that part of the town and there is no need for a regulation. It is then desirable to have limited parking in another part of the town. Section 608 of the Local Government Act, about which we heard

this afternoon, was introduced so that there could be flexibility. The responsibility of controlling the movement of traffic and the parking of vehicles should be in the hands of the people who live in the district, who do business there, who elect representatives to control the business of the district, and to whom those who promulgate by-laws are answerable.

After hearing and being fortified by the report made by the Chairman of the Subordinate Legislation Committee, who heard the evidence submitted from both sides and gave a considered report that the committee felt that if it took any action it would be a definite affront to local government, I say that in all conscience this House cannot give that affront to local government, and, while the Act remains as it is, vote for this motion.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): There has been much debate on the motion. The member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) has demonstrated that he is very much engulfed in the quicksands of the legal fraternity. I think he has fallen into the error of his ways from the aspect of the legal profession. I am not casting any aspersions on his sincerity, but lawyers tend to see things both ways. He, certainly, has seen both sides of the question. Undoubtedly, there has been a different attitude, which is not explained, regarding another matter that was before the House today. He has explained that the Subordinate Legislation Committee did not take into account public feeling at Mount Gambier, yet today on another matter we heard him say that the committee did take into account public feeling. In one instance the committee has taken full account of public opinion, and in another has completely ignored it. The honourable member said that there was undoubtedly tremendous opposition to this by-law at Mount Gambier and added that it was perhaps well-founded, but was irrelevant so far as the consideration of either the disallowance or the allowance of this by-law was concerned. Why did he not apply that reasoning to the by-law that was discussed today?

Mr. Corcoran: We cannot understand.

Mr. HALL: Nor can I. I cannot understand why the committee performed a *volte-face* in its opinion in an issue of such vital importance. Mr. Millhouse said that the consideration of public opinion was outside the ambit of the provisions of the Act under which the committee operated. If the committee's attitude was correct on another motion that was before the House today, so it should be correct in this case. Mr. Riches' main thought seemed

to be that we should not disallow a by-law so long as it was worded correctly. In that case, he does not believe in the Subordinate Legislation Committee; there is no other inference to draw from his speech.

Mr. Quirke: If one clause of a by-law is at fault, we have to disallow the whole by-law.

Mr. HALL: That is the main inference to be gained from Mr. Riches' speech. It is a rather peculiar statement that we should delegate the powers of Parliament to local government, when it comes from a member who believes in centralizing power. That is the policy of the Opposition, but in this case we are going to have the decentralization of power, which is completely opposite to the Socialistic principle.

Many Bills are passed by Parliament that members are not sure that they can support fully, but they know they will have a fresh say in each application of the law. It is a very valuable power and I hope that it will not be taken from us. There have been times when we have closely looked at matters before the House to make sure that they are put into operation by regulation and not by proclamation, because then each time we can have a second look at them. I do not like a by-law that gives a council the right to put meters in every street it desires, and I am sure that in the next year or so this law will be amended so that a by-law states the exact positions in which meters are proposed to be erected. The Royal Automobile Association pointed out in a letter that I read to the House when moving for the disallowance of this regulation that motor revenue was being used for garbage disposal. I do not agree that we should do away with the Subordinate Legislation Committee by saying that we should not disallow any by-laws. Mr. Loveday stressed the great interference with councils, as is expressed in the motion, but he supported another motion regarding parking in the Campbelltown district.

THE SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot allude to another debate in the present session.

Mr. HALL: If members consider what has been said during the debate, they will see no reason why they should not support the motion so that our country areas will not be faced with wholesale applications for meters for revenue purposes, which was one of the reasons put forward by the Mount Gambier Corporation in its evidence to the committee.

Mr. Loveday: Why don't you move to abolish local government?

Mr. HALL: I have already answered the member for Whyalla's point. It has been argued that we should abolish the Subordinate Legislation Committee. It is a mistaken idea of many of the speakers in this debate that that committee has all the powers of Parliament vested in it. Actually, it has the power to examine, under four principles, the legislation referred to it. It does not have all the powers of this Parliament which we should guard and, if necessary, use. I am sure there is nothing inconsistent with members' voting for legislation and then voting for the disallowance of the application of that legislation on individual matters where they do not think it should apply. Perhaps it should apply in 50 per cent or 75 per cent of cases, but members may have reservations about the other cases, and it is legitimate for them to vote against the application of that legislation in those instances. I hope the House will carry this motion and thereby protect the rights of country voters.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (13).—Messrs. Brookman, Coumbe, Dunnage, Hall (teller), Harding, Heaslip, Jenkins, King, Laeke, Nicholson, Pattinson, Pearson, and Shannon.

Noes (17).—Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan, Hughes, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Millhouse (teller), Quirke, Ralston, and Ryan, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Tapping, Frank Walsh, and Fred Walsh.

Pairs.—Ayes—Sir Thomas Playford and Mr. Stott. Noes—Messrs. Riches and Jennings.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

THE PARKIN TRUST INCORPORATED ACT AMENDMENT BILL (PRIVATE).

Second reading.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is a private Bill of the first class referred to in Standing Order 9 of the Joint Standing Orders relating to private Bills. It was introduced in another place on the petition of the Parkin Trust Incorporated, a body corporate, incorporated under the Associations Incorporation Act, 1858. That body is known as the Parkin Trust, and its sole business is the trust fund in question. The main object of the Parkin Trust is to maintain the Congregational

ministry in an adequate degree of learning. This object is carried out by the establishment and maintenance of the Parkin College at Kent Town, a college where candidates are trained for the Congregational ministry.

The property of the Parkin Trust comprises in the main three groups of assets: namely, the land, buildings, furniture, and library of the Parkin College at Kent Town; a row of shops and other buildings at Jetty Road, Glenelg; and mortgages and other interest bearing investments. The total fund is about £125,000. The terms of the trust have already been altered by a private Act—the Parkin Trust Incorporated Act, 1926.

The present Bill seeks further statutory amendments found to be needed after the passage of the 36 years since the 1926 Act. These statutory amendments are found to be needed to keep the machinery of the Parkin Trust up-to-date, and to fit into modern requirements certain of the trust provisions. Clause 4 clarifies the handling of the income of the trust. Originally the Governors had one set of duties until the net income reached £1,000 a year, and a different set of duties thereafter. The income is now of the order of £6,000 a year, so only the second provisions now apply. The original requirement as to setting aside reserves did not provide how reserves could be used in later year. In fact, nearly £6,000 has been accumulated to date, and the Bill provides a limit on the rate at which these reserves can be used. Clause 5 eases a restriction on part-time teaching staff at the college. The present provision limits them to other educational employment. There now seems no need for this restriction, provided the persons concerned are themselves suitable as lecturers or tutors.

Clause 6 alters the date for retirement and re-election of governors to fit in with the altered date of the annual assembly of the Congregational churches. Clause 7 introduces postal voting in the election of governors. Of the other provisions the most important is clause 11 which clarifies doubts as to the powers of sale and investment. Clause 2 of the original trust deed not merely authorized but directed the investment of trust funds in the purchase of real estate until the trust income should reach £1,000 per annum. It is now felt to be desirable that the power to invest in real estate should be extended. Other powers of investment are also sought. Clause 22 seeks to extend the ambit of the trust to include female students and staff. The

original trust of 1876 (naturally enough for those days) restricted both to males.

Mr. DUNSTAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

THE PARKIN CONGREGATIONAL MISSION OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA BILL (PRIVATE).

Second reading.

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This is a private Bill of the first class referred to in Standing Order 9 of the Joint Standing Orders relating to private Bills.

The Bill was introduced in another place on the petition of the Parkin Congregational Mission of South Australia Incorporated, a body corporate, incorporated on January 13, 1888 under the Associations Incorporation Act, 1858: that body is known as the Parkin Mission, and its sole business is the trusteeship of the trust fund in question. The trust property comprises in the main a piece of land on the northern side of Rundle Street, Adelaide. The whole of this land is leased to the Myer Emporium (S.A.) Limited and forms part of the retail store of that company. The main object of the Parkin Mission is to maintain travelling Congregational missionaries, or their present day equivalent, and to minister to the needs of the less settled areas until those areas can support their own church of that denomination. This Bill therefore comes in with two main provisions:

- (a) to obtain from Parliament power in the Parkin Mission to sell the land which it holds on the trusts mentioned:
- (b) to obtain from Parliament powers of investment beyond those provided by the Trustee Act:

and whilst these matters are before Parliament other less important amendments to the provisions of the trust deed are sought. There is some machinery set up by the trust deed itself. Clause 18 is needed for amending the terms of the trust. The solicitors to the Parkin Mission took the opinion of the late Mr. F. E. Piper, Q.C. (as he then was) to the effect that an amendment to permit the sale of the Rundle Street land could not safely be made under clause 18 of the deed, and that if a sale were to be made with the approval of the Supreme Court, the proceeds must be invested in trustee securities.

Turning to the contents of the Bill, the amendments sought by clauses 3, 4 and 5 are of minor importance, and not vital to the measure. The purpose of those clauses may

be briefly described as follows. Clause 3 brings up to the present equivalent in money the provision for financial assistance for widows set out in clause 3 of the Deed of Settlement. Clause 4 introduces postal voting in the election of governors. Clause 6 provides a fee for the attendance by governors at meetings. It is a fee in fact more by way of covering expenses of getting there than a remuneration for services.

Clause 8 increases the number of governors from five to seven. Clause 7 contains the crux of the matter. The proposed new clause 22 of the deed would enable the Parkin Mission to sell any of its property. In fact, its only present property for which such a power would be necessary is its Rundle Street property already referred to. The existing buildings on the land are old, and there has been talk of the Myer Emporium proposing to rebuild its Rundle Street store at some time in the future. In other words, the Parkin Mission land has reached or will soon reach the stage when the improvements are not worthy of the site, and when the owners must either lay out money in rebuilding (which the Parkin Mission has not the funds to do) or else obtain an inadequate rent in relation to the capital value of the land. It is obviously of benefit to the Parkin Mission to be able to negotiate with the Myer Emporium before that company embarks on any major rebuilding programme.

Clause 7 also contains the proposed new clause 23 of the deed, giving wider powers of investment of the trust funds. These powers would be needed mainly for investment of the proceeds of sale of the Rundle Street land. Indeed, some form of investment in the purchasing company might well be offered as part of the purchase price, and wider powers of investment thus be of use in the actual process of sale.

Mr. DUNSTAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

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

Read a third time and passed.

THE ESTIMATES.

In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from October 3. Page 1032.)

MINISTER OF IRRIGATION.

Department of Lands, £483,825—passed.

MINISTER OF MINES.

Mines Department, £684,172—passed.

MINISTER OF MARINE.

Harbors Board Department, £1,580,800.

Mr. RYAN: I have led various deputations to the Minister of Marine requesting that the personnel of the Harbors Board be increased in number in order to provide better administration. There appeared in last year's Estimates a sum of £4,187 for the General Manager and a sum of £3,310 for the Chief Engineer, who combined the dual position of Assistant General Manager and Chief Engineer. This year, however, the only sum voted is £4,219 for the General Manager. The offices of Chief Engineer and Assistant General Manager would appear to have been deleted. For some years there were the two positions, which were then amalgamated into one. Mr. Meyer was the Chief Engineer and also General Manager but, on the appointment of Mr. Sainsbury, the two positions were recreated. But now that Mr. Sainsbury has been appointed General Manager, the board has decided to cut out the positions of Assistant General Manager and Chief Engineer. It seems strange that this has happened. The only person now available to act as Assistant General Manager would be the Secretary of the department. I think this new arrangement will lead to inefficiency rather than efficiency, especially in view of the great Harbors Board programme ahead, which will entail much work on engineering projects. What are the Minister's views on this?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Marine): The changes in administration have occurred because of re-organization within the department, which was envisaged when Mr. Meyer retired and has been further canvassed and discussed since Mr. Sainsbury's appointment as General Manager. It is correct that at the moment the positions of Chief Engineer and Assistant General Manager are vacant. The proposed re-organization contemplates the appointment of a personal assistant to the General Manager, and also a Ports Traffic Manager. That is a new line this year.

Mr. Ryan: That is only £1,441, though.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Exactly, but it is intended that the Ports Traffic Manager shall take over the management and control of both Port Adelaide and the outports, that he shall relieve the General Manager of that type of work, and also that he, because of his qualifications and experience, shall act as Assistant General Manager, should the need arise.

The whole re-organization is not complete because the Ports Traffic Manager has not yet been appointed. The Public Service Commissioner is at present engaged on making an appointment to that office. The matter has been discussed by the board for some time and has been investigated by Mr. M. L. Dennis, one of the most able of the Public Service Commissioner's staff. His conclusion was that the board would be best served by an arrangement of this type. I was consulted about it and I said I thought it would work satisfactorily; and I think it will.

As regards the board's efficiency, I believe that the new General Manager has settled well into his position. He is an able administrator and a first-class engineer, which is the basis of his appointment to the Harbors Board. He has won the confidence of the other members of his staff and of the board. I, too, hold him in high regard for the capacity he has already displayed. I am satisfied that any economies effected by this arrangement will not affect the efficiency of the board. I am of opinion that perhaps there was a little too much top weight on the board previously, which this re-organization will overcome if that was the case.

Mr. TAPPING: With reference to the line "Maintenance of wharves, jetties, etc.—£687,859", I have often raised the question of the Darling wharf at Birkenhead and plans for tug pens there. I have been told that this is not urgent enough to warrant provision for it on the Estimates from year to year. About three years ago the board came before the Public Works Committee (of which I was a member) and we were told then that the matter was urgent. I subscribed to that viewpoint, but the matter has been deferred. Because of the state of disrepair of the wharf between Birkenhead bridge and the sugar company's works and because the tugs are on the wrong side of the bridge, thus necessitating many openings of the bridge that otherwise could be avoided if the tugs were sited where the board first intended them to be, this matter is urgent.

The Minister once said that the tug companies were not now as keen as they were initially. I could not follow that argument because the tug companies have to pay the normal berthing fees or harbour dues wherever they go. Whilst the suggested new arrangement would provide an amenity for the tugs, it would also improve the position at the Birkenhead bridge, where the tug pens, being on the upstream side of the bridge, cause too many openings, which disrupt the flow of

buses over the bridge. The position is more acute today because trust buses that previously used the Jervois bridge are forced to use Birkenhead bridge because of the load limit of three to four tons placed on Jervois bridge. This causes congestion.

The Highways Commissioner argued, some years ago, that Birkenhead bridge would reach its capacity in 1959 and I believe we have reached that position. If the Government could provide money to build tug pens traffic could be handled more expeditiously over Birkenhead bridge. A deputation to Mr. Jude some years ago told him that frequent openings of the Birkenhead bridge often caused employees to return late to work at Birkenhead because they were held up at the bridge. Some were even sacked. This matter is urgent. What are the Government's plans for the future of Darling wharf? If tug pens were built that would help generally.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I cannot give any further undertaking on this matter. Although the Harbors Board desires to build tug pens as part of the amenities, they would be an extremely bad economic proposition for the board.

Mr. Tapping: Why were they proposed three years ago then?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I do not know, but the then General Manager was keen to tidy up the southern side of the river near Birkenhead bridge and I agree that is necessary. It is not a very salubrious prospect to look across the river and see the existing situation. The revenue to be derived from tug companies prepared to pay for the use of tug pens does not represent a fraction of the cost of the money needed. For that reason other more urgent productive works have been given priority—I believe rightly so.

The member for Port Pirie would not want the Port Pirie wharf reconstruction programme to be held up while we diverted money into unproductive enterprises such as tug pens in the Port River. That story could be repeated over and over again. The Harbors Board has been able to use the whole of its loan resources for productive enterprises and, while that position continues, the Government will maintain its present attitude that tug pens, desirable as they may be from many points of view, are less important than other work the board is pressed to do. I do not deny that advantages could accrue to transport etc., if this work were done but it is less urgent than other important work.

Mr. RYAN: I believe that the important position of Ports Traffic Manager will materially assist in the efficiency of the Harbors Board but, as that officer would ultimately rise to be Assistant General Manager, I am surprised to find that the new position carries a salary of only £1,441.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: That is for only portion of the current year.

Mr. RYAN: I accept that explanation. The Harbors Board is not now prepared to build tug pens. It is well known that the reason why the tugs are required to go through the bridge is that they may be berthed as near as possible to the offices of the tug company. Last night I attended a meeting regarding Jervois bridge. The traffic congestion at Port Adelaide has to be seen to be believed and it is caused primarily by unnecessary opening of Birkenhead bridge. Many of the openings are unnecessary. I have spoken to the Minister and have introduced deputations to him on this question.

Often two tugs will cause two openings of the bridge, although one tug is only about 100 yards behind the other, merely because tugs are allowed to berth on the western side of the bridge to bring them only a few yards from the company's office. Traffic congestion in Port Adelaide is so great that if the Harbors Board does not intend to construct the tug pens it should stipulate that the tugs must berth east of the Birkenhead bridge. Some men have been sacked for arriving five minutes late for work, but frequently workers are delayed for 15 minutes while the bridge is open. Will the Minister refer this matter to the board?

Line passed.

Miscellaneous, £30,550.

Mr. LAUCKE: It is vital that our beaches should be preserved. An amount of £1,050 is provided for the construction of groyne. Can the Minister say whether these groyne are designed to protect our beaches and preserve the sand thereon?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Groyne are constructed at the request of seaside authorities that are confronted with the problem of erosion of their beaches caused by waters from the inland or by the action of the sea. Groyne can assist in preserving the beaches. The groyne are not automatically constructed when a request is received, but each request is considered and determined on the merits.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: How many applications, if any, have been lodged by seaside

councils for the construction of groyne? I believe that the construction of groyne would be more economical than the constant expenditure on repairs to the seaboard. The damage to our beaches is associated with the south-western suburbs drainage scheme. At present the main drainage outlet from the Sturt Creek is overtaxed when there is a reasonable rain. This, and other outlets, must be enlarged if we are to preserve our beaches.

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

Mr. FRANK WALSH: A break-water has been built at Outer Harbour for shipping purposes and has kept the beaches in reasonable condition. With a big volume of water coming from the West Beach outlet when there is a high sea and high wind, the beaches could be appreciably affected. If groyne were constructed, beaches could be improved over the years. Granite is in plentiful supply at Victor Harbour and Granite Island, and this is a suitable stone for constructing groyne. It is not used in building, so it cannot be said that there is not adequate stone to carry out this work. If we are to retain our beaches I think we should investigate the value of groyne. Much repair work is being done to restore the Glenelg beach but, instead of going out to meet the situation, the work is being done only on the beach. I hope that soon we shall do something to retain our beaches for future generations. The position will be aggravated when a great volume of water comes through the four outlets that will be constructed under the drainage scheme.

Mr. JENKINS: My experience has been that groyne have been most effective. Some 10 or 12 years ago, after damage to the foreshore at Victor Harbour, the Premier, the General Manager of the Harbors Board and Sir Malcolm McIntosh (Minister of Marine) inspected the area and as a result two experimental groyne were constructed 80 or 90 yards apart near the Hindmarsh River at a cost of £1,800. Although previously with each high tide a portion of the sandhills disappeared, after their construction the sandhills were not affected. On the south coast of England groyne are common.

Mr. Loveday: And on the east coast, too.

Mr. JENKINS: Yes, and they protect the foreshore. It would be economically wise to build groyne rather than to continue to repair the sea wall at high cost. The damage is done not by heavy seas but by seas that come in obliquely and undermine the sea wall. Groyne, which are at right angles to the sea, break up the wash.

Mr. Hall: How far out into the sea are they?

Mr. JENKINS: In some places where the beach is flat it is necessary to go out for some distance but where there is a shelf they need not be so long. I realize that when the tide is high they obstruct traffic, but openings can be made through them. I feel that groynes along our beaches will fulfil the purposes for which they are designed.

Mr. RICHES: For repairs to Solomontown embankment, Port Pirie, £27,500 is provided. I express my appreciation for the inclusion of this line. In the last couple of years we have had discussions with the Minister, and a satisfactory arrangement has been arrived at. The Minister asked the people of Port Pirie to allow him to judge the best time to submit this proposal to Cabinet, and his efforts were greatly appreciated. The reinstatement of this wall will mean as much to Port Pirie as any work done in recent years, and will act to the benefit of the city for many years to come. The local people have agreed to meet £12,000 of the cost. The Minister will remember that we approached the Broken Hill Associated Smelters Ltd., which agreed to contribute £6,000 and the Port Pirie Corporation accepted responsibility for £6,000, making a total of £12,000 of the £27,500. The Government has agreed that the £12,000 from the local people may be spent over a period of six years. We should like to see this work undertaken as soon as possible, but it does not seem likely to be done until March. It would be appreciated if the work could be put in hand so that the area could be available this summer.

Will the Minister be good enough to call for a report from the Harbors Board on the desirability and possibility of establishing a boat haven at Port Augusta? The number of boats being registered there for fishing and other purposes is increasing every year and there is no provision for mooring the boats or securing them, and severe damage has resulted. The Harbors Board has not had to incur any expense at Port Augusta for a number of years and therefore I believe there is a case for the establishment of a boat haven there.

Line passed.

MINISTER OF RAILWAYS.

Railways Department, £14,735,397.

Mr. COUMBE: I want to refer to the unsatisfactory position of car parking by employees at the Islington workshops. At present many of them park their cars at right angles on the western side of Churchill Road.

On the eastern side parking is completely prohibited and this is policed by the Enfield and Prospect Corporations. The majority of the adjacent side streets are also prohibited areas for parking in the day-time and this is also enforced by the councils. The position is bad enough in the morning when employees park their cars, because they have to back into the parking lots and thus cause confusion to oncoming traffic; but it is infinitely worse when the men cease work at a time when Churchill Road is heavily loaded with other traffic. The position at the intersection of Islington and Churchill Roads at the Reephams corner is chaotic and there have been accidents there. For a number of years efforts have been made to have this position remedied. The Enfield Corporation has approached the Railways Commissioner and when I was a member of the Prospect Corporation it also made approaches and this has also been done by the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings); and I am pleased that last week the Leader of the Opposition brought up this question again. All these approaches have got us nowhere, the Railways Commissioner refusing to accede to any of these requests and also the repeated requests of the Industrial and Welfare Committee of the Islington workshops for off-street parking. The Prospect Corporation was even prepared to meet the cost of providing gravel and grading part of the road to make the position easier, provided that fences could be set back a certain distance from the road.

The Northern Suburbs Weekly of September 27 stated that the matter had been discussed by the Enfield Corporation, which had written once again to the Railways Commissioner, who again replied that it was not the policy of his department to provide parking space for day workers for whom public transport was available and that it was regretted that he was unable to assist in the matter.

For many of these workers public transport is not available. I admit that there are special trains running from Adelaide to Islington to take workers from the city area, and that also a bus service passes the gates of the works, but there are no cross connections by bus or rail. To say that many of these workers could get to their work on public transport is not stating the true position. It has been suggested that portion of the railway property itself could with advantage be used. It has also been suggested that land adjacent to the railway workshop land could be used. In addition, there is plenty of vacant land to the west

of the workshop occupied by the sewage farm, and I have suggested that that land could be used. I also suggested that a small cross-over of the railway line could be provided for the railway employees, but that request was turned down also.

Here is an instance where our Railways Commissioner, who is the highest paid public servant in the State, is repeatedly refusing reasonable requests by members of this House and by responsible local government bodies. None of the requests has been unreasonable. I pay a tribute to the Commissioner for his ability as an administrator, but I maintain that he has been most unreasonable in refusing these repeated requests. I was pleased that I received some support in this matter last week from the Leader of the Opposition. A regulation recently passed in this House provided that in future the owners of large city buildings could be compelled in certain circumstances to provide a certain amount of space for off-street parking, yet here we have a Government department that is not prepared to co-operate with councils in providing some off-street parking for its employees.

Some cars park on the railway property at the moment but apparently these are staff cars. Many of the workshop employees travel by car and either have to park out in the street in a dangerous position or walk about three-quarters of a mile or more. Surely the department could co-operate and make some provision in this matter, for sufficient land is there for this to be done. Must the people of Prospect and Enfield wait for a fatality to occur before something is done? With the increased traffic on that road, especially in the evening, I believe that before very long there will be a fatality in the area. The workmen cannot park their cars on the angle and they cannot rank them, so they have to park at right angles to the stream of traffic and the result is a chaotic situation at that spot. I make a plea for something to be done. The newspaper to which I previously referred goes on to state that the Mayor had asked what the reaction would be if the council prohibited the parking of vehicles on the western side of Churchill Road.

Mr. Riches: The Subordinate Legislation Committee would rub them out.

Mr. CUMBE: I do not think it would have to come to the Subordinate Legislation Committee, for the council already has a by-law and the prohibition could be imposed by resolution and gazettal. In reply to the Mayor's

question, according to the report, Councillor Hawes said that it would cause the greatest upset imaginable. If the council prohibited parking of cars on that side of the road—and it would be justified in doing that—the position would be chaotic, and a hardship would definitely be imposed on the workers concerned. The report concludes:

Councillor Ivey moved a subsequent motion that the attention of the Premier be drawn to the problem, and ask that the matter be placed before the Minister of Railways, seeking his assistance in the matter of parking employees' vehicles within the workshops property.

I now appeal to the Treasurer and the Minister representing the Minister of Railways to take heed of what I have said and to do something before we have fatalities in the area.

Mr. RICHES: I draw the attention of the Minister representing the Minister of Railways to the item "Refreshment Services" at the bottom of page 111. There may be an explanation of this matter, but an anomalous position seems to have arisen. The only soft drinks available in the refreshment rooms at Port Pirie are manufactured in Adelaide, although there are soft drink manufacturers in Port Pirie. All the drinks are brought from Adelaide, and this seems a needless expense when quite good drinks are manufactured in Port Pirie and should be available. Ironically, drinks made in Port Pirie are available at Bowmans. Where transport is involved it seems to make some sort of appeal to the railways. I should like these remarks brought to the notice of the Railways Commissioner so that an explanation could be given of why the Railways Department cannot patronize local industry. In these days of keen competition from American bottling companies, local industries should be supported.

Mr. JENKINS: I draw the attention of the Minister representing the Minister of Railways to a matter that concerns the people of Victor Harbour. The service to Victor Harbour and to stations along the line has improved considerably over the past few years, for the diesel-electric locomotives have reduced the time taken by passenger trains by about half an hour. In between Hindmarsh Road, Eyre Terrace and Flinders Parade there is an old smoky galvanized iron shed in which the steam trains used to be accommodated overnight. This is an unsightly structure. The council expends much of the ratepayers' money for the sake of the tourist trade, on which many of the town's residents depend to a great extent for their living. The bowling greens are within about 30 yards of this building, and for many

years when the wind was in the north or the north-west the trains would emit black smoke, soot and steam to the discomfort of visitors and the local people alike. That disability is no longer there, but the old building is still an eyesore. Can the structure be removed, or, if one is needed, could it be one to fit in more with the locality and the scenery?

Mr. McKEE: During the Address in Reply debate I asked the Treasurer whether he would obtain a report from the Railways Commissioner regarding the unsatisfactory Bluebird service between Adelaide and Port Pirie. He obtained a report, which contained the following:

However, it can be maintained that, in general, the railcar service to Port Pirie is operating as originally instituted.

In the last three weeks the only Bluebird service was on last Friday. On Tuesday and again today there has not been such a service.

Mr. Hall: It was not well patronized.

Mr. McKEE: It would be if people knew definitely that there would be a Bluebird service. At Port Pirie there is a connection with Port Augusta and Whyalla transport, and if people in those towns knew that there was a daily Bluebird service to Adelaide they would use it rather than their own means of transport. People in those towns would be pleased if the matter could again be taken up with the Railways Commissioner, because the report that the gave to the Treasurer recently was incorrect.

Mr. HALL: There is much concern in country areas during the burning off season at the possibility of serious outbreaks of fire on railway property. The permanent way men have a difficult task in attending to this matter. Last year at a local conference it was understood that the local emergency fire-fighting service would attend burning off operations on railway property. The Railways Department engineer promised to put several gangs on the work, which meant that 12 or more men would be doing it. This means that more burning off can be done and enough to warrant the attendance of the emergency fire-fighting service. I am sure that other areas would welcome an arrangement like this.

At Condowie there is a privately owned weighbridge on railway property. Condowie has no bulk handling facilities and therefore the quantity of wheat handled is small, but some barley is delivered to the siding. The Railways Department charges £12 a year rental for the bridge that has been installed by a non-profit making company. Last year I

approached the Railways Department for the company after it had made several unsuccessful approaches, but although the department is sympathetic it says it cannot reduce the rental, because if it did a precedent would be created. Nothing could be done last year and I do not think anything can be done in the immediate future. If the weighbridge is removed, as it will be if the rental is not reduced, the barley will go to Snowtown by road, which will mean a loss of about 3s. a ton in freight receipts for the department, although it will mean extra expense in road maintenance. In a normal year the loss in this way to the Railways could be about £100 in freight charges.

Mr. RALSTON: I draw the attention of the Minister to the condition of the sleeper carriages on which conductors and other railway men have to work on the South-East line. Other South-Eastern members know the position and I hope that at least one of them will support me tonight. In 1960 the Railways Commissioner instituted a trial period for two months in the use of modern sleepers to learn whether their use would result in greater patronage. That test showed that compared with the previous year the number of passengers using the service had decreased slightly. That fact was used by the Railways Commissioner who, when answering a question put in Parliament, said that, because of this decrease, the provision of modern equipment was not justified. Later in the session, further questions comparing railway patronage during the same period (July and August, 1960) with that during the year 1959 revealed that patronage of the Melbourne express decreased by about 400 passengers. Apparently, that was the worst time of the year for conducting a test. The slight decrease in passengers carried from the South-East to Adelaide compared favourably with the decrease on the Melbourne express. Later, I again asked if the Railways Commissioner would institute another test, this time at a more favourable period of the year. Also, I asked that it be conducted on the service operating from the South-East to Adelaide and back, and not (as in the first trial period) from Adelaide to the South-East and back to Adelaide. Anyone from the South-East wishing to use that service to return to the South-East had to wait till the following week to do so. Most people in the South-East felt it was a cute way of trying to fob off a reasonable request.

How much longer will this position continue? The only two sleeping cars owned by the South

Australian Railways Department are 53 years old, having originally been purchased from the Victorian and South Australian joint railways stock. The staff has done everything possible on the service between the South-East and Adelaide to ensure that the people using this service are looked after in the best possible way. It deserves all credit. But for the service given by these officers, I doubt whether any people would use this service. Why should equipment of this age be used on this service when Ansett-A.N.A. use a jet air service? Why does the Railways Department complain of lack of patronage when its equipment is over 50 years old?

Mr. HARDING: With the Bluebird service, we are more fortunate than is Port Pirie. We have no complaints. It is a beautiful service running to a tight schedule. It is sometimes behind time but we are not complaining. Any test so far on the sleepers has been made at the most unsuitable time of the year, and it has not proved a thing. Although the roads there are good, many people in the South-East would travel by the night train if the service could be improved. I ask that another trial be made at a more suitable time of the year, and I am sure that a better service will achieve better results.

Mr. LAUCKE: I note that a sum of £154,000 is provided for refreshment services. Turning to the Auditor-General's report, I notice that in the last financial year a deficit of £35,000 was incurred in the running of the Adelaide railway station cafeteria and dining room, and that deficit was £5,000 higher than the previous year's deficit. Could not these rising deficits be overcome by letting out these services to private enterprise? They are, of course, peculiar in their nature, in that they have to be provided at certain hours. It is a service to the community. This increasing deficit can become an embarrassment. In this case it is about 20 per cent of the total vote for this service. Will the Minister consider letting the catering service at the railway station to individuals?

Mr. QUIRKE: The Auditor-General's report for the year ended June 30, 1961, states that the Railways Department had a deficit of £3,604,000. Contributions from the State Treasury amounted to £3,500,000 and a further £800,000 on account of debt charges made the total contribution £4,300,000. The revenue surplus for the year was £696,000 after the State had paid in over £4,300,000. Those figures are fantastically funny. The railway system is now completely outmoded by other

forms of transport. The motor car has beaten the railway system and will continue to beat it. Even with Bluebird services and good rollingstock the system is not patronized by the people.

Until recently Clare had two services which ran from Adelaide through to Clare and on to Jamestown. One of those services now runs only as far as Clare. Spalding has a night service from Adelaide, the return service to Adelaide operating next morning. Jamestown has a morning service to Adelaide with the return service to Adelaide operating at night. In the old coach and horse days from Saddleworth, Clare had much the same postal services that it now has. We are not advancing in this direction. When are we going to do something about South Australian transport? The railway system is costing our taxpayers £4,500,000 to keep it on the rails. No passenger service at all is provided for Riverton to Spalding, but the department runs a road bus service alongside the rail line because the rail track will not accommodate a railcar. The department would be afraid of a railcar jumping the rails. The lines will take a slow-moving goods trains, but much money has to be spent on that line and thousands of new sleepers have been put into it: it still will not carry a passenger service. If a new track were laid and a Bluebird were operated on it I would still not say that it would pay because of the bitumen road running alongside the line to Adelaide.

Most people now have motor cars and the railways cannot keep up with its passenger service. We have to reconcile ourselves to running services that do not pay the taxpayer or to allowing reasonable competition from road services. People are no longer going to put up with a four-hour rail trip when they can cover the same distance in an hour and a half by car. I am not arguing about the economics of this matter, but the maintenance of rollingstock must be terrific. The public desires modern comfortable transport. Even if we cannot put much expensive passenger equipment on the rails and complete the terrific amount of maintenance work required, we can put passenger vehicles on the roads and we may get somewhere. That is a line of thought that I have had for some years but people well versed in transport costs would have to work out the economics involved.

Railway finances have become a reproach because the system is completely outmoded. The department is attempting to do an

impossible job and the State demands that it should do an impossible job. I would like to hear the Minister on this subject. Is the position going to be taken in hand? Is there any large overall proposal for the reconstruction of the railways in relation to modern transport needs? The railways are not supplying modern passenger transport and furthermore the system cannot do it profitably. Possibly the department could make a profit by putting the service on the roads in the shape of really good road vehicles and by taking the traffic off the rails. That would be cheaper because the cost of running the rail vehicles is terrific.

The amount of passenger goods traffic that could be carried on the roads is astonishing. That difficulty could be overcome. There must be a way in which this burden of transport costs could be lifted, if not in whole, then in part from the State because it is becoming an increasing burden. I should not mind so much if we had a service to compensate for the responsibility assumed. Country members are not concerned with decrying our railway system, which is essential for the carriage of heavy goods, but our entire transport system needs overhauling. I would not object to the huge expense on this line if commensurate services were provided, but people will not patronize the obsolete services on many of our lines.

Mr. LOVEDAY: One of the troubles with our railway system is its failure to meet modern requirements. The Adelaide railway station restaurant could be made more attractive. Its prices are reasonable. Recently I travelled on the "Sunlander" to Cairns and the three-course meal provided at a small country station was consumed in comfort by the passengers without rush in a 21-minute break in the journey. It was remarkable when compared with the services provided on our trains that cater for tourists. The East-West train pays handsomely, and there is no doubt that for long-distance travel people prefer modern trains to motor cars. Train travel is certainly the safest means of transport. If our restaurant services were modernized we would attract more of the travelling public.

I notice that last year there was an improvement in passenger takings, although the number of country passenger journeys continued to decline. Considerable economies were effected in working expenses due to modernization, particularly the introduction of diesel-electric power. The member for Gouger referred to the

burning-off operations carried out by the department between the railway lines and the boundary fences. Has the Minister considered using modern earth-moving equipment to grade and level that land? If that were done the burning-off operations could be undertaken by mechanical means instead of by hand, possibly saving time and money.

Mr. CASEY: The member for Burra was harsh when he suggested that road transport should take over many of our railway passenger services. I travel from Peterborough to Adelaide every week by train and the Bluebird is one of the most comfortable cars I have travelled in, and I have travelled extensively throughout Australia. However, the service connecting Broken Hill and Adelaide could be considerably improved by air conditioning the cars. The Commonwealth Railways Department converted the old rollingstock from the trans-continental line to air conditioning and put it on the Marree to Alice Springs line. Earlier this year I travelled as far as Oodnadatta on that line and experienced a comfortable ride because of the air conditioning. The country between Terowie and Broken Hill has similar temperatures and frequency of dust hazards. In fact, a traveller on arrival at Broken Hill in the summer can clearly see where he has been sitting because the rest of the seat is covered in dust. Most travellers will agree with Mr. Quirke that the safest means of transport is by rail and people use the Bluebird service from Terowie to Adelaide rather than their own motor vehicles.

The biggest problem of the Railways Department is competition from tourist buses, which have monopolized passenger traffic between Broken Hill and Adelaide. The Railways Department can compete only by providing more amenities, such as air-conditioning and a buffet car. People who travel north on Thursday nights sometimes cannot obtain refreshments in the 15 minutes allowed at Riverton, but must wait until they get to Terowie. The time now wasted at Riverton could be saved if a buffet car were on the train, which regular passengers have suggested as a reasonable amenity.

Line passed.

Transport Control Board, £19,237—passed.

MINISTER OF ROADS AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

Office of Minister, £6,720—passed.

Highways and Local Government Department, £566,978.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Will the Minister of Works say whether arrangements for the Highways Department to take over from the Engineering and Water Supply Department certain parts of my electoral district have yet been completed and what areas will be taken over?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Works): The new arrangement became effective as from July 1 last and the Highways Department had plant operating on the Eyre Highway when I came through early in July. I am not sure whether, even if I had a map, I could indicate the precise areas, but, generally speaking, the area south of the transcontinental line is included in the area taken over. It is a matter of operation and connections—in what way certain lateral roads leading from main highways can best be served. The precise areas of administration have also been decided.

Mr. FRED WALSH: There are two bridges crossing the Sturt River—one at Tapley Hill Road and another at Golflands. The former, which was badly designed and about which a lack of foresight was shown by the designers, who did not envisage the future development and volume of traffic, is getting more dangerous each year. Also, no provision was made for pedestrian crossings. This bridge is adjacent to the migrant hostel, many children from which must cross it twice daily to go to and from school and to go to the beaches in the summer. The Graymore bus pulls up on the southern side and pedestrians alight before the bus swings around to go to Graymore and St. Leonards. About 12 months ago the Town Clerks of Glenelg and West Torrens and the manager of the migrant hostel approached me to ask for assistance to obtain a pedestrian crossing. It was suggested that a cantilever bridge be constructed or that there be separate crossings for pedestrians.

I took up the matter with the Commissioner of Highways about 12 months ago. He disregarded the idea of having a cantilever bridge and said that a pedestrian crossing would cost too much; he had in mind reconstructing the bridge and providing proper footways for pedestrians at a cost of £3,000. The department was prepared to pay two-thirds if the two councils agreed to pay the balance. The councils were advised and I think they were prepared to agree to this. I have not yet learnt whether the department intends to proceed along the lines suggested by the Commissioner, but something must be done to avoid any further tragedies. Will the Minister

obtain information on this matter from his colleague?

The crossing at Golflands was constructed in the days of horse traffic and is not sufficient for the requirements of modern traffic. It is a wooden bridge and is not wide enough for two vehicles to cross at the same time. Many protests have been made in the last few months about this bridge. If it is used by people on the northern side of the river, they must go around the Tapley Hill Road, at least three-quarters of a mile, and it is even further if they travel along through streets. I know that this bridge is the responsibility of the corporations concerned, but I believe that with some assistance by the department a satisfactory bridge could be provided to meet the requirements, and it would not be very costly. Will the Minister take up the matter with his colleague?

Line passed.

Miscellaneous, £49,682—passed.

APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Estimates were adopted by the House and an Appropriation Bill for £66,654,000 was founded in Committee of Ways and Means, introduced by the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford and read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is for the appropriation of £66,654,000, details of which are set out in the Estimates, which have just been dealt with by the House. Clause 2 provides for the further issue of £48,654,000, being the difference between the amount authorized by Supply Act (No. 1)—£18,000,000—and the total of the appropriation required in this Bill. Clause 3 sets out the amount to be appropriated and the details of the appropriation to the various departments and functions. This clause also provides that increases of salaries or wages which become payable pursuant to any return made by a properly constituted authority may be paid, and that the amount available in the Governor's Appropriation Fund shall be increased by the amount necessary to pay the increases. It further provides that if the cost of electricity for pumping water through the Mannum-Adelaide main and from bores in the Adelaide water district, and through the Morgan-Whyalla main should be greater than the amounts set down in the Estimates, the Governor may authorize the additional expenditure, and the

amount available in the Governor's Appropriation Fund shall be increased by the amount of such additional expenditure.

Clause 4 authorizes the Treasurer to pay moneys from time to time authorized by warrants issued by the Governor and provides that the receipts obtained from the payees shall be the discharge to the Treasurer for the moneys paid. Clause 5 authorizes the use of Loan funds or other public funds if the moneys received from the Commonwealth and the general revenue of the State are insufficient to make the payments authorized by this Bill. Clause 6 gives authority to make payments in respect of a period prior to July, 1961, or at a rate in excess of the rate in force under any return made by the Public Service Board or any regulation of the South Australian Railways Commissioner. Clause 7 provides that amounts appropriated by this Bill are in

addition to other amounts properly appropriated. I commend the Bill for consideration of members.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): Few lines in the Estimates have escaped the notice of honourable members and if they have not received all the information they require, they may still ask questions. I hope that provision will not be necessary to cover the cost of pumping water through the Mannum-Adelaide main, but one must realize that the weather has been against us and that there has not been sufficient intake into our reservoirs to meet requirements. I support the second reading.

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

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.03 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, October 5, at 2 p.m.