

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, August 28, 1962.

The SPEAKER (Hon. T. C. Stott) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITION: ADELAIDE CENTRAL MARKET.

Mr. LAWN presented a petition signed by 98 shopkeepers in and around the Adelaide Central Market respectfully praying that the market be retained on the ground floor in any future plan considered when amending the legislation concerning leases in that area.

Received and read.

QUESTIONS.**HACKNEY BRIDGE.**

Mr. COUMBE: On several occasions I have sought information regarding the rebuilding of the Hackney bridge, which adjoins the council areas of Walkerville, St. Peters and the City of Adelaide. In view of yesterday's newspaper report of the Minister of Road's statement regarding the rebuilding of this bridge, and the publicity the matter received on television, is the Minister of Works now able to reply to my earlier question?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have not received a report from the Minister concerned.

TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOLS.

Mr. CLARK: I understand that on April 27, 1962, the definition of "metropolitan area" in the Progress Allowance Regulations, Part XXI, Division 1, paragraph 1, was amended to include the area within the District Council of Salisbury. Children who enrol at the Salisbury High School will now be regarded as living in the metropolitan area and will not in future be eligible for travelling allowances. I fear that this amended regulation will be instrumental in many children from Salisbury who would have attended technical schools in Elizabeth next year now going to the Salisbury High School. This could mean two things: that children who would be better suited at technical schools would be attending the Salisbury High School and that the consequent increased enrolment at the Salisbury High School would necessitate the erection of additional buildings at the high school earlier than expected. There are about 260 in grade 7 in Salisbury primary schools this year and it is considered that

most of these children will now be attending Salisbury High School next year instead of the 175 who were expected before the alteration of the regulation. It could well be that the cost of providing extra rooms at the high school would be considerably more to the department than the cost of fares to Elizabeth technical schools. I understand that the Salisbury High School Council has communicated with the Minister of Education on this matter. Will the Minister consider amending these regulations so that they do not operate next year or, failing that, will he arrange for the early provision of additional accommodation at the Salisbury High School?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall be pleased to give this specific matter my personal attention because I think it is a real problem in that locality. I am also interested in the general nature of the remark that many scholars attending the high school there may well be better suited to attending technical high schools. That is a matter of general application throughout the State. Many prominent headmasters and principals of high schools have informed me over a period, and even as late as last week, that they consider many boys and girls attending our high schools are not suited to academic studies, are not making a success of their work there, and are probably filling the places in those high schools unnecessarily when their talents lie in the direction of more practical work, and that they would make a success of their study in technical high schools. In some quarters there seems to be some prejudice against technical high schools. Some people seem to labour under the misconception that technical high schools are in some way inferior to high schools, whereas that is not so. In my opinion a technical high school is on an equal footing with a high school; they do not compete with each other, but each is complementary to the other. I strongly recommend parents to consider carefully the great advantages their children can gain from a thorough education in any one of our technical high schools. I believe they are adequately equipped from every point of view. They have fine headmasters and teachers, and I am personally anxious that all the advantages of a sound technical high school education should be available for the hundreds of boys and girls who would profit by it. I have taken the opportunity to elaborate on the remarks of the member for Gawler. I will certainly consider the position in relation to his problem and generally.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I agree entirely with the Minister when he says that there is a strange belief that the technical high schools are somewhat inferior. I think that years ago a pamphlet was issued setting out the virtues of these schools and giving parents a guide as to where they could best find accommodation for their children. I do not know whether this pamphlet is still being produced. If it is not, will the Minister consider having a satisfactory type of literature prepared for distribution to parents of scholars at primary schools so that they may make the widest possible choice in the interests of the State and of the children who are to have secondary education?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: One booklet has been prepared. It is on a more informative scale than it has been in the past, and will be delivered to about 20,000 children in grade 7 at primary schools. I am sure it will give in precis form a good cover of the advantages of both systems of education according to the various aptitudes and abilities of the children.

FREE LIBRARY SERVICES.

Mr. LAUCKE: My question concerns the widest possible spread of libraries under the Libraries (Subsidies) Act, particularly in providing libraries economically to meet the requirements of small rural communities. Many of these communities have an institute with a subscription library that provides a comprehensive range of periodicals and fiction. It would be uneconomic and, indeed, prohibitive in many instances for these communities to have to provide, for library purposes, the premises, establishment and staff beyond that now existent. At many institutes a room could be set aside where people could refer to educational books and where a reasonable supply of books of the type available at public libraries could be provided. The institute's librarian could also act as librarian of the public library section. By this means outlay would be minimized and the given community would be enabled to have access to the benefits of the free libraries system. To facilitate this desirable condition without wishing to infringe on the Libraries Board's established policy in respect of establishing libraries in the larger country towns or in the metropolitan area, can the Minister of Education say whether it would be competent, under the Libraries (Subsidies) Act, for an institute committee to set up a free lending library in the building that houses an institute library in conjunction with the local

government authority as the financially responsible body?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I doubt very much whether under the existing legislation it would be possible to go as far as the honourable member has suggested. However, I commend him for his valuable and constructive suggestion. I shall be only too pleased to investigate it and, if necessary, to discuss it with the Treasurer and later to refer it to Cabinet for discussion. I think there is much merit in it, but I know that opinions are divided on this. Those who favour free libraries as such do not want them to be part of the institute. However, I think the suggestion merits serious discussion to determine how far we can go along that path.

SCHOOL SPORTS GROUNDS.

Mr. LANGLEY: I understand that the Minister of Education has a reply to my recent question about the control and maintenance of school sporting grounds.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The policy of the Education Department on the establishment and maintenance of school sporting grounds on school sites is as follows: first, the Government provides the land and meets the full costs of initial ground formation and grading. The Government also meets half the cost of water reticulation and grassing; secondly, the school and parent bodies meet the cost of maintenance, but the cost of water (which is substantial) is met by the department. The cost of sporting equipment used by schoolchildren is subsidized by the Education Department on a pound-for-pound basis. School sporting grounds are made available as far as possible to local outside sporting bodies. The Government is anxious, wherever possible, to extend the scheme, but the cost of purchasing and establishing school grounds is becoming almost prohibitive.

A high school in the Plympton area has about 16 acres of land and the committee is anxious for the Government to purchase a further nine acres. The owners have set a value well over £100,000 on this land. I do not criticize the owners for setting that value on the land because were they able to carry their own proposals to fruition that land would be worth about £150,000. However, it is a prohibitive—and, indeed, fantastic—price for the Education Department to pay for land for recreation, sporting and physical education and therefore we cannot do as much as we would desire in providing facilities for our children unaided. That is why I am anxious

to have the support of outside bodies in determining whether we can join forces in the joint use of these grounds.

I recently held a conference of all interested bodies including the Teachers Institute, Public Schools Committees' Association, High School Councils Association, School Welfare Clubs and the principal officers of the Education Department. It was generally agreed that many of these grounds, particularly in secondary schools, were being used to the full capacity by scholars and that many of the grounds in primary schools were unsuitable for adolescent use. Concern was also expressed about possible damage to grass ovals, in particular by over-use, and to acts of carelessness or vandalism to school grounds generally. However, it was unanimously agreed that in the first instance the Director of Education should write to the heads of all departmental schools suggesting that, in conjunction with their respective parental bodies, they should give sympathetic consideration to making available school grounds including ovals, basketball courts and tennis courts (subject to proper terms and conditions) to youth clubs affiliated with the National Fitness Council and the South Australian Youth Clubs Incorporated, churches and other responsible youth organizations where these grounds are not being fully used for school purposes. It was the general desire of the conference that the control of school grounds should remain in the hands of the heads of schools and the local school authorities as at present. The circular mentioned was forwarded to heads of schools on May 17.

Encouragement is thus being given to the fullest possible use by youth clubs of the department's sporting facilities, bearing in mind the need to keep in good order the grounds which have required a considerable expenditure of money by the Government and school organizations. Honourable members will see that the Government, through the Education Department, bears a heavy burden in providing for the sporting and physical education needs of the schoolchildren and members of youth clubs. It is considered that the already generous contribution to the establishment of these facilities cannot be extended at the moment to cover the cost of maintenance of school sporting grounds.

KANGAROO MEAT.

Mrs. STEELE: During the weekend the view was expressed by Dr. Donald Dowie, the Senior Medical Officer in the Commonwealth

Department of Social Services, that the public was being exposed to a health risk in the present method of marketing and retailing kangaroo meat both for export overseas and for consumption as pet food within Australia. He said that it was well known that kangaroo meat was a host to hydatid, carried Q fever and salmonella, and caused dysentery. In view of this reported statement, and also because the risks involved are known to the Fisheries and Game Department and are to be discussed at the bi-ennial conference in Hobart next month (which I understand the Director of the Fisheries and Game Department will attend), will the Premier say whether this matter is being considered by the public health authorities and whether any steps are contemplated to more rigidly control the killing of kangaroos and the marketing and retailing of kangaroo meat?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member's remarks could probably apply to any animal—certainly to rabbits. I sometimes wonder whether statements of this kind do not frighten the public unnecessarily. However, the position has been observed and the Health Department has under consideration some regulations. I understand they are fairly far advanced and, for what they are worth, will be promulgated. Personally, I doubt very much whether it is possible to police them in such a way as to make them effective.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT.

Mr. HUGHES: Can the Minister of Education comment on a statement that appeared recently in the press, under the name of Mr. Haines (President of the South Australian Institute of Teachers), about whether it was necessary or advisable to retain the Education Department as part of the Public Service and so perpetuate a system of remote control by people who are not educationists?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: No. That involves a question of Government policy. In due course, I will discuss the matter with my colleagues in Cabinet.

BELAIR PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have received a copy of a letter written by the Chairman of the Belair Primary School Committee to the Assistant Superintendent of Primary Schools asking that two additional classrooms be provided at that school at the commencement of the 1963 school year. I have also received a covering letter from the Chairman of the committee embodying much other information, from which

it certainly seems that the two extra classrooms are abundantly justified and, in fact, needed. Will the Minister of Education be kind enough, if I supply him with this letter, to look into the matter?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall be pleased to do so.

TEAL FLAT.

Mr. JENKINS: Last week, the Premier, in reply to a question I asked about progress on the Chowilla dam, indicated that there was a delay because of the inability of the Government of New South Wales to meet its financial commitments. Has the Premier any ideas on developing the alternative impounding of water at Teal Flat?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Many months ago the Government made a statement of policy on this matter. Personally, I do not believe the time has yet arrived for South Australia to announce that it is going to submit to the Public Works Committee an alternative scheme. The negotiations have not yet reached that stage. The fact that, the negotiations on water rights have been discontinued at this juncture does not, I believe, mean the time has arrived when South Australia can consider going ahead with an alternative scheme. The time that South Australia has to consider this matter is limited because, at the present rate of development, it is necessary that something be concluded in the way of assistance to our present supplies by 1970, when our present water resources will be inadequate to cover us in the event of a drought year. So that by that time an alternative plan must actually operate. The answer to the honourable member's question is that the Government does not intend at this stage to make any announcement of the sort that he has requested.

The Government, however, cannot allow the position to drift on indefinitely. Using the best means of construction, a dam of the type we are discussing would probably take from four to five years to construct, so obviously, in view of the plans, specifications, Parliamentary approval and examination by the Public Works Committee that are required, there is not much time to be wasted. The answer is, at present, no.

RETURN TICKETS.

Mr. HALL: A letter, sent to me by a constituent at Blyth, states:

In the past railway regulations, etc., have permitted ticket holders to use the return section of a ticket on an adjoining line, provided the distance is similar or where

there is a slight difference in distance a small additional fee (calculated on the extra distance) is payable. The local stationmaster has intimated that recent amendments to railway regulations have been introduced with the result that the return section of a ticket from Adelaide to Blyth can no longer be utilized by joining the train at Clare or Snowtown. This would appear to be an anomaly, especially in view of the fact that no Sunday service operates between Blyth and Adelaide. Under the previous arrangement it was possible for passengers to travel from Adelaide to Blyth per Friday evening train and return to Adelaide on the return section on Sunday by joining the Sunday train from either Clare or Snowtown to Adelaide . . . Apart from the angle of Sunday travel, the interchangeability of tickets was advantageous inasmuch as it provided opportunity for both earlier arrival in Adelaide when proceeding thereto and also later departure from Adelaide when returning therefrom, because of more frequent service on the other two lines.

Will the Minister of Works ascertain the reason for this alteration of regulations and inquire whether the previous convenient method of inter-changeability can be restored?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I shall obtain a report for the honourable member.

SUGAR COMMITTEE.

Mr. BYWATERS: The Fruit Industry Sugar Concession Committee has a stipulation that the committee may refuse payment of domestic sugar rebate or special export assistance to a manufacturer who has not made full payment to the grower within 60 days after delivery of the last consignment by that grower of each variety of each type of fruit purchased by the manufacturer for processing. I understand that this was included in the agreement for the protection of growers. I have been told that this year some canners who have not made their payments within this prescribed time have already acquired the sugar concession, but are now being asked to refund that money to the committee or to the Commonwealth Government. Has the Premier any knowledge of this, and has he been approached by any fruit canner with a request that the Commonwealth authorities be asked to waive this repayment? If so, can he say what action is likely to be taken?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I know for a fact that some South Australian canners have found it very difficult to place their canned fruit this year quickly enough to enable them to get sufficient turnover to pay the growers the whole amount, but I have

not actually been approached by any canner regarding the specific matter the honourable member has mentioned. However, I have an appointment for a canning firm to come to see me, and it may be that that is the matter the firm desires to raise. For some years the position regarding the sugar concession committee has been very unsatisfactory for South Australia as South Australian cannerymen, in my opinion, have not received proper consideration from it. The committee operates almost entirely in Victoria, and I have sometimes thought that the interests of the Victorian cannerymen are adequately safeguarded whereas cannerymen in this State may not have had the same consideration. However, I will see what the problem is and inform the honourable member whether it is necessary to take any action. The fruit industry in South Australia is in a precarious position. As the honourable member knows, we only have a limited number of outlets for canned fruit, and anything that would put our canning industry out of operation would have grave effects upon the fruitgrowing industry next season. The Government would be most anxious to give the canning industry every assistance to carry on in the interests not only of the cannerymen and of the State but also particularly in the interests of many people who obtain their livelihood from growing fruit for the canning industry.

BANK CHARGES.

Mr. FRED WALSH: Last night's *News* stated that the Australian Bankers' Association had arrived at decisions in respect of alterations in cheque account and certain other charges. This was not denied in this morning's *Advertiser* by the Chairman of the Australian Bankers' Association, who stated:

It is true that decisions are at present being taken on certain aspects of bank charges. Details of these will be announced at the end of this week after we have fulfilled our other obligations and responsibilities in the matter. The editor's sub-note said:

It is understood that the other obligations referred to reaching agreement with the Commonwealth Trading Bank, the State Banks and the Savings Banks about the new charges. Can the Premier say whether the State Bank or the Savings Bank has negotiated with private banks on alterations to existing bank charges, and, if either bank has, whether it is committed in any way to any decisions of the private banks?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: About five weeks ago the Chairman of the

State Bank Board informed me that the Australian Bankers' Association had under consideration a proposal for the elimination of inland exchange, and that instead of inland exchange it intended to charge persons who had cheque accounts cleared a certain amount for that clearing. At that stage consideration had not proceeded far, and I do not know whether the State Bank even had a definite proposition before it: I doubt whether it had. Moreover, the State Bank had only a limited interest in this matter, inasmuch as until recently I do not think it was actually a member of the exchange committee. I think it is only a partial member even now. I doubt whether the Savings Bank has any interest in the matter whatsoever. I will inquire of the Chairman of the State Bank Board and see whether I can obtain a report for the honourable member.

SOUTH-EAST SLEEPERS.

Mr. CORCORAN: I understand that the Minister of Works now has a reply to my recent question regarding sleeper accommodation.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Railways, informs me that the second sleeping car is only attached to the "up" train from Mount Gambier if the number of passengers offering for same is six or more. The out-of-pocket costs of working a sleeping car on a return trip between Mount Gambier and Adelaide are approximately £40 provided a sleeping car conductor is not rostered to work the car. It will be seen, therefore, that the Railways Department would suffer a heavy loss if, as suggested by the honourable member, the second sleeping car were attached for one or two passengers.

SEACOMBE HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Will the Minister of Education ask the General Manager of the Housing Trust for a report on the valuation of building blocks owned by the trust on the south-western side of the Seacombe High School, the cost to the Education Department if it purchased the land on today's valuation, the type of house the trust intends to erect on this land, and the cost of these houses, including land, to purchasers? Will he also ask for an estimate of the cost of making this area reasonably level for use as an oval, including the cost of excavation and filling to about 12ft.?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall be pleased to do so. Since the Leader asked me a question a week or so ago about this

matter, I received a preliminary report on Friday that tended to confirm what he said. This report stated:

This matter has been investigated by the Engineer for Sites and Surveys of the Public Buildings Department, who has advised that extensive earthworks would be required to obtain the minimum which is considered suitable for the establishment of an oval of one in 40. . . . An approach has been made to the South Australian Housing Trust to ascertain whether it is prepared to make the land available.

As far as I can see, no definite inquiries have been made on the lines suggested by the Leader as to the cost of land if it were purchased from the trust or the cost of replacement if it were obliged to transfer a suitable area to compensate the trust for this land. I think this is a further illustration of what I told the member for Unley—that, however desirable it is to endeavour to secure additional land for our schools, particularly secondary schools, the cost is becoming prohibitive, not only as regards the purchase but also as regards the high cost of earthworks. However, I shall be pleased to make the two specific inquiries required by the Leader.

CRAYFISH INDUSTRY.

Mr. TAPPING: This morning's *Advertiser* contained the following report:

The \$600,000 United States market for South Australian crayfish tails was being jeopardized by the poor quality and marketing of Western Australian tails, the general manager of SAFCOL (Mr. R. F. Ware) said yesterday. Mr. Ware has just returned from a three-month visit to the United States, Britain, Europe and Hong Kong. Weaknesses in the U.S. crayfish market had been brought about by Western Australian exporters going outside recognized channels of distribution, he said. The poor quality of Western Australian crayfish tails had lessened confidence in Australian crayfish generally.

Like other members, I would be alarmed if this were the position being faced by the crayfish industry of South Australia; we all know its value to this State. Will the Minister of Agriculture comment on Mr. Ware's statement and will he refer this matter to a meeting of State Ministers for agreement on uniform standards for crayfish tails for export?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I am not prepared to comment on the statement today but I shall probably be able to do so tomorrow. Should I wish to make some approach to the other States, I would do so at a conference which has already been arranged to discuss fisheries matters in September. That conference will be in place of a Fisheries Council

meeting, and it will give me every opportunity to put the views I require to put. By that time I shall have a full considered statement on the matter raised by the honourable member.

ORE TRAFFIC.

Mr. RICHES: As I was unable to watch ADS-7 last Thursday night, my information is only secondhand, but I have been told that the Premier announced that the transport of ore by road from Broken Hill to Port Pirie was being considered. If that is so, will he say whether, before anything of this nature takes place, it will be necessary for consultations to take place with the Transport Control Board or whether, as Broken Hill is over the border, such movement is not subject to control by the Transport Control Board? I believe that the Premier made a statement about this State's financial commitment in carrying out this work on its own. Could this House be given the benefit of that information, and will the Premier say how the money is to be raised?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The proposal which the Railways Commissioner is considering and which will be referred to the Public Works Committee provides for a re-grading of the Broken Hill to Port Pirie line so that there will be a prevailing grade east to west of one in 120. I believe the prevailing grade is one in 80, so there would be a material benefit to the locomotives hauling ore from Broken Hill to Port Pirie as it would give a much better grade. This involves re-laying and diverting about 62 miles of the line. Full plans and specifications for the work have not yet been prepared and will not be ready to go to the Public Works Committee for about a fortnight. They were approved in general principle by Cabinet so that the Commissioner would realize that he was submitting a programme of the nature contemplated by Cabinet. When I last saw the estimates, the cost of the work was about £2,700,000. I sympathize with the honourable member for being unable to see the telecast, and I hope Port Augusta will soon have a television service. Leaving that aside, however, the position is that in a recent report to me the Railways Commissioner said that he understood one of the companies in Broken Hill was considering experimenting with road transport. Indeed, shortly afterwards in an interview with me, the Managing Director of one of the companies stated that his company was seriously examining the

possibility of using road transport to cut down costs. This House could not place any limitation upon the interstate transport of ore. It would be possible to place a ton-mile tax on it to a limited extent, provided we imposed the same tax upon all other transports on South Australian roads. Members will realize that that would have far-reaching effects upon our economy, and would be something that we would not desire. Cabinet has approved my placing a submission before the Broken Hill companies that will afford them some relief, although not as much as they have asked for. It may make it possible for them to carry on pending standardization becoming effective. It will be a small measure of relief compared with what they believe to be necessary for the successful undertaking of their enterprises.

FORRESTON SCHOOL.

Mr. LAUCKE: Can the Minister of Education say when the proposed septic tank system at the Forreston Primary School will be installed?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The Director of Public Buildings has stated that, as part of the programme for the installation of country septic tank systems by departmental labour, Forreston school is listed for on-site work to commence in November this year. The work will be completed for the opening of the first school term in 1963.

DEEP CREEK RESERVE.

Mr. BYWATERS: Last Sunday's *Mail* stated that reserves were becoming fewer as more land was cleared. The *Mail* was outspoken in its support of having the Deep Creek area reserved as it was in danger of being lost when cleared. It strongly advocated, as I have done in the past, that this area should be reserved for the future. Has the Acting Minister of Lands any knowledge of the progress being made in this area and can he say whether the Government intends to acquire it in its natural condition so that it will not be lost to the State?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I cannot take the matter further than it was taken a few weeks ago when it was first mentioned. When I am able to make a further statement I will do so.

PORT PARHAM WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. HALL: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about a water supply for Port Parham?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I examined this matter at the honourable member's request. Some difficulties are associated with improving the supply at Port Parham because the supply in that large area is provided from small mains which, with the passage of time, have become inefficient and do not carry the normal quantity of water. I doubt whether they would have been large enough for the area in the first place. However, we did improve the position by cleaning and cement-lining the mains and this has resulted in a substantial improvement to the area generally, but the department believes that it has not sufficient water available in the area at present to supply Port Parham. A thought that I would pass on to the honourable member, and which may be of some value, is that a number of beach shacks at Port Parham are seeking a water supply primarily for septic tank systems. Where the sea is available for bathing and when shacks are occupied only intermittently, the normal catchment from the roof to a rain-water tank would suffice for the most part for essential domestic requirements. This matter has given me much concern and I have given thought to it, because there are many places along our coastline where a similar problem arises are regards septic tank systems. Seawater will work satisfactorily in a septic system and it can also be used by emergency fire-fighting services when necessary. I suggest that the local district council might examine the possibility of installing small pumps to pump seawater into tanks at strategic points to be used for septic tank purposes and, in the event of an emergency, for combating fires that may break out. That may solve the problem. It could be carried out at small cost and at short notice.

ENTERTAINMENT TAX.

Mr. RICHES: On August 9 I asked the Premier a question regarding the admission charges at cinemas in country areas. I referred particularly to the charges applying at Port Augusta in connection with the film *The Sundowners*. As this is a growing practice with other films, and causes concern in areas where television does not play the part that it does in the city and where picture-going is the chief entertainment of the ordinary citizen, the Premier said that he would get a report from Sir Edgar Bean. Has he received that report?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Not yet.

BARLEY MARKETS.

Mr. HALL: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about possible barley markets for the coming crop?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: As I said I would, I have asked the Chairman of the Barley Board for a statement on this, which I have before me. He says that it is too early to give a reliable estimate of the crop but, assuming that receipts of barley amount to 30,000,000 bushels of good quality, the marketing prospects appear to be good also. There is a possibility of sales in both Europe and Asia. As this report is a little too long to read, I ask permission to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

BARLEY MARKET PROSPECTS FOR THE COMING SEASON, 1962-63.

It is still a little early to give a good assessment of marketing prospects, but from information available at this stage, the position is as follows:—Receipts of barley by the board in South Australia are estimated at 25,000,000-30,000,000 bushels in South Australia and approximately 3,000,000 bushels in Victoria. Of this overall receipt of about 30,500,000 bushels, the usual requirements for home consumption are in the vicinity of 7,500,000 bushels. This leaves 23,000,000 bushels for export and, provided that the crops finish favourably, approximately 75 per cent of the receipts should be of better quality barley, *viz.* malting and No. 3 grade.

Reports from United Kingdom indicate that barley crops are two to three weeks late, due to heavy rainfall during the later stages of the growing period. Whilst the quantity of barley is not likely to be affected, the quality is expected to be somewhat lower. This situation also applies to Denmark and parts of Germany, Belgium, etc., and does indicate a favourable outlook for selling a considerable quantity of our No. 3 grade barley to these countries for malting purposes. On the other hand, as the yields are not likely to be affected, availability of feed barley crops will be increased. Nevertheless, the United Kingdom and continental countries would still require to import a large quantity of feeding barley to meet their requirements, such imports being mainly from Canada, U.S.A., Australia. This would suggest a potential outlet for our lower grades.

The matter of price will be largely influenced by the decision of the European Economic Community as to the amount of Community preference for cereals. We are presently endeavouring to gather some information on the contemplated price structure. In addition to the United Kingdom and Continent, China has evidenced further interest in our barley, but the effect of this will depend on whether we can supply on terms suitable to them. Generally speaking, it is considered that prospects are good for the disposal of our coming crop.

SCHOOL DESKS.

Mr. FRED WALSH: Has the Minister of Education a reply to a question I asked three weeks ago about the supply of school desks?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Tenders for the supply of the secondary school desk frames mentioned by the honourable member were received by the Supply and Tender Board in the usual way and were forwarded to the Public Buildings Department for recommendation. The tender from Tubular Steel Industries was not the lowest received, but was recommended because on previous occasions it was found that two lower tenderers, including the business mentioned by the honourable member, had not delivered equipment as promised. It had also been found that equipment manufactured by them had to be returned owing to defects. For these reasons and because of the superior workmanship in desks previously supplied by Tubular Steel Industries Limited, the additional expenditure was considered justified. This firm has delivered the initial supply of frames of the present contract and all have been passed by the stores inspector as being in accordance with the specification.

GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (on notice):

1. How much was spent in acquiring the building for Government offices on the corner of Rundle and Pulteney Streets, which prior to purchase was known as Foy & Gibson's building?

2. How much has been spent on alterations since purchase?

3. Which departments are housed in the building at the present time?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The replies are:

1. Purchase price was £452,500.

2. £220,270.

3. Highways and Local Government, Hospitals, Woods and Forests, Mines, Public Health, Children's Welfare and Public Relief, and Prices.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (on notice):

1. How much was spent in acquiring the building for Government offices in Gawler Place which, prior to purchase, was known as Simpson Building?

2. How much has been spent on alterations since purchase?

3. Which departments are housed in the building at the present time?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The replies are:

1. The Government offices in Gawler Place were not purchased, but have been rented since October 1, 1946.

2. £67,937.

3. Agriculture, Fisheries and Game, and Public Stores and Supply and Tender Board.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION.

Mr. McKEE: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to make a statement.

The SPEAKER: Can the honourable member give me some indication of the nature of the proposed statement?

Mr. McKEE: It concerns the resolution passed in this House last week on gauge standardization.

Leave granted.

Mr. McKEE: Yesterday I was handed a letter by the Mayor of Port Pirie in appreciation of the action of members of this House in passing a resolution on gauge standardization. The letter reads:

It is the desire of the aldermen and councillors whose signatures appear below that you should ask Mr. McKee, member of Parliament, to express appreciation to the members of the House of Assembly in the Parliament of South Australia for the attempts being made to secure the rail standardization which has been promised for so long. We are grateful to note that the members of the House of Assembly of South Australia appreciate the grave threat to the exports from South Australia from competition in other places.

The citizens of the city of Port Pirie have accepted increase in rates, thus demonstrating their own faith in the future of the city and a belief in the important part it plays in the economy of Australia, and of South Australia in particular. Therefore, we are thankful that the members of the House of Assembly are keeping faith by pressing vigorously for the standardization of rail which has been promised for many years. We need the standardization to meet the competition.

HOSPITALS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

REGISTRATION OF DEEDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

SALE OF HUMAN BLOOD BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

LOAN ESTIMATES.

In Committee.

(Continued from August 23. Page 692.)

Engineering and Water Supply, £11,460,000.

Mr. JENKINS: My question is concerned not with a line but rather with the omission of one. I refer to Parliamentary Paper No. 24, on which appears an interim report of the Public Works Committee recommending the expenditure of £379,500 on a water scheme for Strathalbyn and rural areas. This report, I understand, was not to hand before the Loan Estimates went to print. This was through no fault of the Public Works Committee but was mainly due to the fact that further attention was needed before the interim report could be submitted to Cabinet, as a group of farmers who desired to be included in the scheme was not listed or planned for in the original plan before the Public Works Committee. However, the Minister has informed me that the Engineering and Water Supply Department will shortly apply to Cabinet for funds to carry out planning, designing, survey work and like steps, and to acquire land, if necessary. Having in mind the fact that when this scheme was first applied for it was the opinion of the Engineering and Water Supply Department that this supply should come from the proposed Murray-Kanmantoo-Onkaparinga mains, expected to come into operation in about 1970, the Treasurer said this would be too late and something would have to be done before that to relieve the problem of water in this area. Can the Treasurer assure me that funds will be available, as indicated by the Minister, for the preliminaries mentioned and that the scheme will be proceeded with forthwith?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): Money is available for the preliminary examination but I cannot say that money is available to start the scheme because it is not, at present. The scheme will have to wait until some present commitments have been dealt with. Cabinet has approved the preliminary investigations proceeding so that, when we have the money, the scheme can go ahead.

Mr. BYWATERS: I refer to the item "Tailm Bend—£10,000". The Treasurer in his statement referred to the Tailm Bend amount as being to continue work on the installation of additional pumping plant to improve supplies. He will know that Tailm Bend water supply is under two departments: the Railways Department and the Engineering and

Water Supply Department. It has been requested from time to time that it be brought under one department only, the Engineering and Water Supply Department, because of the unsatisfactory service. Is this a move towards that end and what is the situation relating to the pumping plant already at Tailem Bend? I refer to the one between the hospital and the hotel. Is that to be enlarged because the hospital is adjacent to it? Is it intended to have the Tailem Bend to Keith pumping station in that vicinity or has the site been selected for it in some other area?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will give the honourable member a report on those matters.

Line passed.

Public Buildings, £8,600,000.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): Can the Treasurer say when the major additions to the Port Lincoln Hospital are to be commenced?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Tenders will be called on September 7.

Mr. HARDING: What major additions are being made to the Penola High School?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have not the details with me, but I will obtain the information for the honourable member.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I rise to ask the Minister of Education about some buildings which were anticipated in my district but which unfortunately do not appear in these Estimates. Last year I raised my voice in considerable lament over the fact that for a very long time indeed we had been asking for a new infant school at Marryatville. The Minister had originally said that he intended to place this school on the Estimates in 1955; it has been on the Estimates for the last three years, but now it is off the Estimates. The site, which I inspected yesterday, has many weeds on it and a mouldy cricket pitch in the middle, but there is no sign of anything happening out there, although the Minister promised me and the people of the district that the school would be opened at the beginning of this year. Not only is it not open but it does not look as if it will be opened for a long time, because there is no provision for it here. Some years ago I presented to the Minister a petition signed by more than 500 parents asking for the new infant school because of the crowded nature of the buildings in the present primary school, which is shared by the infant department. Those people are disappointed at this turn of events, and wish to know what is to happen.

I should also like to know what is happening about the design of new buildings for the Norwood Girls Technical High School. At the beginning of this session I asked the Minister about the position. Apart from the new major block and the new library there is a great jumble of ancient buildings, including some that were part of the original vineyard establishment when the area was Clark's vineyard. Until recently, the girls in a typing class were occupying a basement in one of these buildings. As it is, the buildings are insufficient for the school. This year the Baptist Church hall on the other side of Norwood Parade, some distance from the school property, has had to be hired to accommodate certain classes, and the enrolments there are growing. This means that soon the school will be badly overcrowded, and there does not seem to be any provision under the appendix of "Major works to be commenced or designed during 1962-63" for a design for major additional buildings.

The third matter I should like to raise concerns the prospect for the new Kensington Girls Technical High School which was to have taken over the present Norwood High School, which I understand is to move entirely to its new site some time in September. This was to leave vacant the old Norwood High School buildings in Lossie Street, and I have been informed by the Minister that those buildings were to house a new girls' technical high school for the eastern districts, not to replace the present Norwood Girls Technical High School but to cope with the greatly increased demand for girls' technical high school education in the eastern districts. However, rumour now reaches me that because of pressure by the University of Adelaide to take over the Exhibition Building completely and proceed with its demolition—a project long overdue—it is proposed that the School of Art may for a period take over the old Norwood High School buildings instead of moving directly from the Exhibition Building into its new buildings which are in the course of construction, and this will delay the development of the new girls' technical high school in the Norwood area. I am not at all happy about that proposal, and I shall be very glad to have some information from the Minister on what is proposed about the future of the present Norwood High School buildings when the school moves in September to the new buildings at Magill.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will obtain a full report on these matters and let the honourable member have it later this week.

Mr. McKEE: Last year's Estimates provided for the Airdale Primary School as well as a technical high school at Port Pirie, but I see no line on this year's Estimates for either of these schools. I do not think I need mention the unsatisfactory position at the Risdon Park Primary School; I think the Minister is fully aware of the problems at that school as a result of overcrowding. I understand that that school is at present using an all-purpose room because of the lack of accommodation, and it is continually asking for extra rooms to be built. Can the Minister advise me of the department's future plans for the proposed Airdale Primary School and the technical high school?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I point out that the Director of Education has to arrange priorities according to the demand that arises from time to time. It is not always possible to give a priority and stick to it, because other factors, such as excessive numbers in some other district, may arise. However, I will obtain from the Director the priorities of these two projects, and will let the honourable member have that information as soon as possible.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Additions to the Edwardstown Primary School were to have been ready for next year, but the additions are not mentioned on the Estimates. This work was promised at least two years ago. Members of Parliament have to attend various functions and explain to gatherings of several hundred parents the plans that have been made and the progress that has taken place with these various projects. We make these announcements, with the approval of the Minister, and then we often find that work has not proceeded. This is hardly good enough. It is no answer to say that these projects must be postponed because of increased demand elsewhere, because the department should have some reasonable idea of the growth of different areas and should know what is expected of it. No provision is made in these Estimates for the Forbes School. I realize the importance of providing new schools, but the state of this school is aggravating to people in the district whose children have spent year after year in portable buildings.

Provision is made for an expenditure of £348,000 for building in precast concrete the Mitcham (Daw Park) High School. Will a technical high school be needed in this area, which was formerly occupied by temporary houses, and will the school be for both sexes? Land values in the area have greatly increased.

A football club was interested in purchasing or leasing about 21 acres for use as an oval, but funds would not permit either. Is this the land that will be used for the school building?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The amount of school accommodation we are building each year is twice as much as is necessary to accommodate children entering our schools. I doubt whether, if we had the money, it would be wise to go beyond that, as there would ultimately be a most serious repercussion in the building industry if we suddenly stopped the rate of building. One of the problems the Director of Education and the Minister of Education have run up against is that the demand for school accommodation in any locality can change rapidly. Once an industry is announced and a big building programme takes place the school-building programme must be completely changed to meet the exigencies. If the Minister were to put out a priority list for any one area, it could only be issued subject to alteration if circumstances rendered something more urgent for which a higher priority should be given. By and large, the money being provided is building twice the accommodation required for the number of children entering our schools.

Coming to the specific inquiry, the Government has not negotiated for the establishment of an oval in the area. Any plans considered by the Government have not materialized, and at present it is negotiating in a more serious way for the sale of the land to the Housing Trust. The trust has offered a price that is higher than the Land Board's valuation. There is no doubt that the Government will accept the offer with regard to a large portion of the land. There is some question about whether the Government should accept the offer with regard to the whole of the land, excluding some 20 acres which has not been offered to the Housing Trust and which has been reserved—this is the area closest to Mitcham facing Daw Road—as it has been selected by the Education Department. That portion is not under negotiation with the Housing Trust for sale. The Government has had many representations from the area for it to make the land available to the trust, as many businesses, such as chemists, etc., that were supplying goods to people in the temporary houses have been seriously embarrassed because of their removal. These people want the land occupied by people who will use their services. Although I have no objection to the issue of a priority list, it could only be issued subject to the right of the

Director of Education to make alterations that might be necessary from time to time. About 20 acres of land at Daw Road is being reserved for a secondary school (I think it is a high school). I believe the rest of the land is subject to an agreement with the Housing Trust, and this will be considered by Cabinet soon.

Mr. LOVEDAY: On several occasions I have had occasion to go to the Psychology Branch of the Education Department and to the Aborigines Department, both of which are cramped in regard to staff quarters and accommodation for people who have to go there and wait, but no provision is made in these Estimates for them. Will the Treasurer say what the Government has in mind for these departments, which both need better and more commodious quarters?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will endeavour to obtain a report for the honourable member this week.

Mr. CORCORAN: No provision has been made for a new primary school at Millicent South although provision was made in the Estimates for 1961 and 1962. The existing primary school is over-crowded; about 630 students attend. A fairly steep increase in the number of students will probably occur within the next 12 months because of the expansion of Cellulose Australia Limited. The present high school is to be vacated shortly and a new high school will be occupied. The local district council has been negotiating with the Education Department for some time regarding this building, because it is interested in it as a civic centre. I do not think any decision has been reached on that matter. As no provision is made for the Millicent South Primary School the intention may be to use the old high school buildings for primary school purposes. Will the Treasurer give me some information on this question?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member knows that a new high school for Millicent has been completed or almost completed. The local council wishes to take over the old high school for municipal offices because the council's buildings are inadequate and not capable of being altered. The Education Department, however, cannot at present hand over to the Millicent District Council. I have received some deputations from the district on this matter, and I believe we will be able to notify the council in due course giving it some time limit in which to negotiate on a suitable price basis, but we are not able to do that yet. I will supply the honourable

member with more details when they have been worked out.

Mr. FRED WALSH: When the Minister of Education replied to my question on school desks I assumed that the reply was from the Education Department. However, whether the reply was from that department or from the Public Buildings Department, it is not in accordance with my information. My interest in this matter resulted from a dispute at Tubular Steel Industries Ltd. involving wage reductions in respect of certain classes of workmen who suffered a reduction from the first class welder's rate to a second class welder's rate. The men were told that they need not be too particular about the work. The sole responsibility for this rests on the works manager of the establishment, a Czechoslovakian who has not been there long, but who seems bent on considerably reducing production costs in his own interests and in the interests of the firm.

I do not raise the question of the wages dispute because that is before Conciliation Commissioner Portus and a decision is pending. However, since this matter was raised here some desks have been returned to the company, and it could be assumed that they did not conform to the specifications laid down by the Education Department or the Public Buildings Department. I accept the word of the Minister of Education, but the reply that this company is supplying the frames and that they have all been passed by the stores inspector as complying with specifications is not correct. I do not know whether that comment applies to the contract I referred to or whether the company has another contract, but I know that certain desks were returned for reasons best known to the department. Will the Treasurer have special inquiries made into this aspect of the supply of desks from this company and ascertain whether any have been returned to the company in the last three or four weeks?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have no knowledge of this matter but I do know that the ordinary procedure in such a case is that the desks would probably be supplied to the Supply and Tender Board. I believe that the Director of the Public Buildings Department would ask the Supply and Tender Board to supply this item. No doubt the Director of Public Buildings would report, but the contract would be arranged by the board. If the honourable member examines the Public Supply and Tender Act he will see that the

Government must purchase its requirements through the Supply and Tender Board. However, I will obtain a full report on the matter from the appropriate authority—either the Chairman of the Supply and Tender Board or the Director of the Public Buildings Department—and I will let the honourable member have it as soon as possible.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Provision is made in the Estimates for the building of the Coonalpyn Police Station and this is the third time that this has appeared in the Loan Estimates. Although this is a difficult site to plan for I hope that we will see something specific before the end of the financial year because of the importance of this station to the district. Will the Treasurer see how far the planning of this new police station has gone and whether its completion is expected this financial year?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes, I shall be pleased to do that.

Mr. RICHES: I refer to police buildings at Port Augusta and ask what provision has been made for that item in the current year. Some £5,000 has been allocated for the Port Augusta gaol but, as the cost of this project exceeded £100,000, it was referred to the Public Works Committee and favourably reported on by that committee. What is proposed for that building during the current financial year? I am glad that the Government is making some provision for the Wilpena chalet because that will be money well invested. Will the allocation provide for campers as well as for people staying at the chalet? There is a need for an ablution block for campers.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will have to obtain a report from Mr. Pollnitz about the work being undertaken at Wilpena, but some work has been completed with a view to meeting the heavy spring rush of tourists. Work on the Port Augusta gaol has been approved by Cabinet and the £5,000 is for the preparation of preliminary estimates preparatory to calling for tenders.

Mrs. STEELE: I commend the Government for providing £10,000 towards the construction of a new herbarium in the Botanic Garden. I have spoken on the need for this in previous years. The old herbarium contains a valuable collection of this State's flora, but it is inadequate for the purpose for which it was planned. The new herbarium will ultimately cost about £80,000. Recently I visited the area in which the Stradbroke Primary School is being erected and was pleased to note the progress being

made. This is a rapidly growing part of the metropolitan area and, as young families are establishing in the area, the number of school-going children is increasing. I share Mr. Dunstan's disappointment about the Marrayville Infant School, but I accept the Minister's explanation that the children at Marrayville have a school building and that the need is much greater in many other areas where no schools exist. I am pleased that provision is made for a combined police station and courthouse to serve the Burnside area. The existing building definitely needs replacing, particularly as this will be the centre for a large police district.

Line passed.

Miscellaneous, £3,147,000.

Mr. DUNSTAN: An amount of £1,000 is provided under the line "Public Parks Act". Apart from the playing fields of St. Peters College there are no recreation areas in the East Adelaide district suitable for the playing of games like football and cricket. The only means whereby sporting clubs can find playing fields is to approach the authorities of St. Peters College who have been most generous in making their ovals available. The East Adelaide Primary School has no playing field. I am concerned about the proposal to establish an oval where the Torrens River bends around the old rubbish dump on the Walkerville side of the river. The natural amphitheatre to be formed in such a project would be of inestimable benefit not only to the people of my district but to the people of the State as a whole, because it would be another major oval close to the city. It could be a means of our one day attracting to Adelaide a major event like the Commonwealth Games. The press has mentioned this project from time to time, but nothing seems to have been done. I understand that the Walkerville council is prepared to transfer the area to the St. Peters council and that the St. Peters council is interested in taking over the area for oval purposes. I believe that negotiations have been held regarding the purchase of the old rubbish dump site, but every time I inquire I am merely told that the proceedings are going nicely. I have been inquiring about the project for seven years and some of the young people originally interested in playing on that land are now getting long in the tooth, and by the time the oval is established they will be in their dotage. Can the Treasurer say whether the Government is concerned in these negotiations at present; what has gone on so far; and what we can expect in the future?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Government has given local councils considerable assistance for recreation areas. On approved projects we subsidize the local authority by 50 per cent of the Land Board's valuation of the land. The honourable member will recall that the Government has frequently assisted projects of that description in his district. This particular project would involve a major expenditure, due to the fact that it is extremely profitable for people to dump rubbish on this land. It has a high acquisition value simply because people at present use it for dumping rubbish. The Government does not believe it should be obliged to spend large sums of public money on the acquisition of such land. A problem did exist because the land was on the boundary of two council areas, but I believe that problem has been solved. The Government would be prepared to assist in this project, but would not be prepared to grant a large sum for the acquisition of a rubbish dump. I understand that the council has not been prepared to pass a regulation prohibiting the dumping of rubbish on that land. At present this matter is not making rapid progress. The Government would be prepared to make a major contribution, but it believes its duty is to get value for public money expended. The Government should not have to meet heavy acquisition costs in this instance, because the land is being used for the disposal of rubbish from other parts of the metropolitan area.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Some time ago the Treasurer told me that the Housing Trust would build no more double unit houses after the present contract had expired. Now reference is made to progress work on the building of more double unit houses. It would appear from the information supplied that all the houses will not be completed this year, because of the reference to progress work. It seems that the contract has been let for a long way ahead, if the Treasurer's statement that no more contracts are to be let for these houses was correct. Has consideration been given to making single unit houses available for rental as well as purchase on the same lines as has been adopted in Western Australia with good results?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have had general discussions with Mr. Cartledge and I assume that the contract for the double unit houses will be completed this year, depending on the progress made by the contractor. Trust policy is not to let additional

contracts for this work. Mr. Cartledge said that there would be an overlapping this year, which conveyed to me that, normally speaking, the double unit houses now being constructed would be completed this year.

I cannot give the honourable member an answer to his second query, but the trust hopes to substitute the present rental houses with purchase houses on low weekly repayments. That would not involve the purchaser in anything more than the rent, because it would work out at about the same amount, except that the purchaser would have to find the deposit of £50. At the end of the period he would own the house. We are using low interest money in this matter and will make it available to people already occupying rental houses. From the number of applications made and the inquiries received it appears that many people in rental houses would prefer to change over to the new scheme. That would leave rental houses available for suitable tenants. I am sure there will be a transfer of tenants of rental houses to the new purchase houses.

Mr. RICHES: I refer to the proposed expenditure of £330,000 on a power station on Torrens Island. At present I do not feel disposed to vote for the line, but the Treasurer may satisfy me with information later. From time to time in this place I have urged that the trust or some authority such as the Public Works Committee should have power to fully investigate the effect on the State of building a power station on Torrens Island as against building a country station. Whenever there has been a discussion on this matter here we have received a different line of reasoning as to why it should be on Torrens Island. The ground has changed considerably since the first references were made.

It was hoped that by this time atomic energy would be the basis of power in South Australia. It was mentioned in the Governor's Opening Speech years ago. It is recognized now that progress in this matter has not been as rapid as was hoped and that a conventional power station must be built. The trust was asked to set out its requirements for such a station, and it said that it needed area of land, water and proximity to harbour facilities, transmission lines and points of consumption. It has been explained that all these requirements could be found as easily at Port Pirie as on Torrens Island, with the exception of proximity to points of consumption. Each time the matter has been raised we have had a different excuse given why the Port Pirie

site should not be used, but we were told that it would cost an additional £1,000,000 to build a station anywhere else than on Torrens Island. We would be interested to know what factors determine this additional expenditure. My second point is that, if the total sum is £151,000,000 and if this industry could be decentralized, a full examination would prove that it would be worth £1,000,000 to put it into the country. It would be difficult to estimate the value to South Australia if this power station were established in the country.

Mr. Hall: Do you know how much the powerlines would cost from Adelaide to Port Augusta?

Mr. RICHES: About £10,000,000, I have been told. The Commonwealth Government did not consider it bad business to spend £1,000,000 or more to subsidize the building of one petrol tanker at Whyalla. It thought it was worth while to do that work there. It subsidized the cost of that Ampol petrol tanker although it did not own a single rivet in the ship when it was finished. The same principle could be applied to the establishing of this new power station.

Mr. Jenkins: There was nowhere else that that tanker could be built.

Mr. RICHES: The Commonwealth Government considered it worth while to subsidize the building of that one tanker to the extent of £1,000,000. I give it credit for that. It is good business and is paying dividends for Australia and South Australia. Nobody who knows what it has done for Whyalla would criticize that expenditure.

The same thing can be done in other directions. When I asked last week if we could be told how this £1,000,000 was to be made up, the discussion immediately went off at a tangent and we were told that the big advantage of Torrens Island was that water could be taken in on one side and distributed on the other with no interference. The Treasurer referred to the exhaustive inquiries that had to be made before the Port Augusta power station was built on that site. We know that, and I agree that there are sites on Spencer Gulf or in other parts of the State where difficulties may arise, but at Port Pirie it would be just as easy to arrange for the distribution of water, after cooling, as it would at Torrens Island.

I do not hold myself out as an expert on these things but the answers we have been given lead me to the firm conviction that this position has never been seriously inquired into. I am not prepared to take the opinion

of Sir Fred Drew as the final word on this. I admire his ability but he is not always tolerant of representations made, particularly when he has preconceived ideas. For that reason, I say that all the evidence so far substantiates my belief that the claim for decentralization in this matter has never been thoroughly investigated; otherwise, these statements would not be made. It would be valuable to the State, even if it did ultimately cost £1,000,000 out of a total expenditure of £150,000,000, to place this power station in a part of South Australia that could be built up and developed around it and made a permanent asset. Of course, that could happen at Torrens Island but the advantage there to the city would be infinitesimal and hardly noticed by Adelaide whereas in the country a work of this magnitude could mean the difference between progress and stagnation.

The Treasurer may be able to satisfy me that the matter has been thoroughly investigated by people able to take into account the other side of the balance sheet—the value of a decentralized community. How has it been accounted for and assessed? It is the function more of a body capable of determining overall policy than of the engineers of the Electricity Trust. We shall doubtless be reminded of what led to the establishment of the Sir Thomas Playford Power Station at Port Augusta. From the point of view of sheer economics and convenience of operation, the Adelaide Electric Supply Company considered it would be much better to have all its operations centred and situated where it could exercise convenient control, and there was no decision to decentralize that station until the Treasurer referred the matter to a Royal Commission specifically charged to inquire whether it was desirable to establish a regional power station at Port Augusta. The engineers of the Adelaide Electric Supply Company were competent and, from the point of view of the company, which was efficient, their recommendations were probably correct. But experience has shown that, from the point of view of the development of the State, it was worth something to have that power station established at Port Augusta. I feel the same way about this matter. I do not criticize the Electricity Trust's engineers, but other considerations have to be taken into account and they should be given full credence before a final decision is reached. Unless I am satisfied on that, I shall vote against this line at this stage.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I hope the former part of the honourable member's statement was more in line than the latter part, because he wandered a good way from actuality in the latter part. The Royal Commission appointed by Parliament was to inquire into the question whether there should be a public ownership of electricity in South Australia.

Mr. Riches: What year was that?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Commission had three members, who reached the decision that it would be advisable for the State to take over the production and distribution of electricity, and it was taken over by a Bill. The decision to put the power station at Port Augusta was made by the Electricity Trust whereas the decision to hand over the Leigh Creek coalfield to the Electricity Trust was made by the Government. The second decision was also a decision of the trust and the fact that 80 per cent of the electricity generated for the metropolitan area comes from outside the metropolitan area was a decision of the trust. It is true that this will be a major power station and also true that the trust has not gone into it without the most thorough investigation of every aspect. It has taken into account the evidence of the most highly technical overseas people it could get. It was not a light decision. Ultimately the project will cost about £150,000,000.

The fact that the honourable member is not prepared to accept the view of Sir Fred Drew is doing that gentleman a grave injustice, because it is a matter that has been investigated for four years. It was not a snap decision. I remind Mr. Riches that a Bill will be introduced when the Notice Paper is sufficiently clear, and the whole reason for it will be explained to members. It is necessary for a Bill to be presented. Mr. Riches mentioned that there were already transmission lines from Port Augusta to Port Pirie, but I remind him that the lines at Port Pirie are already loaded to their capacity. The Government desires to place industries away from the metropolitan area and it has made heavy contributions to industry in that connection. The whole success of our secondary industries depends upon having electricity at the lowest possible rate; anything that would result in increasing costs would have a deleterious effect upon consumers. That is the reason why it is necessary to study fully the position as to power costs.

We should remember that since 1953 there have been no increases in electricity charges in South Australia, but four decreases. On

the other hand in every other State there have been substantial increases. On that score alone, the trust's policy is exemplary. It has managed its affairs well and kept costs down to consumers and has been instrumental in enabling a larger number of industries to be supplied. In Mr. Riches' district I believe that the trust has invested about £38,000,000 in capital costs. No other district has had anything of that description, and that was by decision of the trust.

Mr. RICHES: I cannot let go unanswered the inference that my remarks were designed as a reflection on the trust's operations. I think that members have heard me express from time to time the view that the trust's operations had been to the advantage of the State and that it had had my support right through. What has been done at Port Augusta I should like to be done at Port Pirie and I am not convinced that that cannot be done. The Treasurer also said that I was wrong in stating that a Royal Commission had been appointed charged with deciding whether it was in the interests of the State that a regional power station should be erected at Port Augusta. I know that a Royal Commission was set up on the question of taking over the Adelaide Electric Supply Company. The other Royal Commission was a separate one. Apparently the Treasurer has forgotten it. The records will show that this Royal Commission was set up to inquire into whether it was in the interests of the State that a regional power station should be erected at Port Augusta. I know that, because after the Commission reported there was some talk of shifting the site, despite the fact that Port Augusta had been recommended. Representations were made to Canberra at the time and other places had been listed for the site. This resulted in much anxiety at Port Augusta.

In reply to a question by me last week the Treasurer said that legislation would be introduced on the question of the new power station and members would then have the opportunity to discuss the matter fully. He repeated that again just now. If that is the case, are we justified in voting £330,000 on this line at this juncture? If I vote for this expenditure now, I am committed to the project and that applies to all other members. I believe that the trust will inquire into the type of power station required, because I have confidence in its engineers. At no time have we known that any evaluation has been taken into account as to the worthwhileness of decentralization for decentralization's sake. I am firmly convinced

that decentralization is worth while even if it has to be subsidized in some respects. I know that there is a limit to that, but I consider it is a claim that should be investigated.

I am not satisfied that the claims for a site at Port Pirie have been fully investigated. I am not suggesting that the Torrens Island site has not been fully investigated, because I think it has. In the interests of the State I ask that the other claims be examined as well, and if possible by someone who will consider the value of decentralization. I know what happened at Quorn and I still think that it could have been saved if someone had had the responsibility of considering the value of the community there. If this matter is to be the subject of legislation later this session, is there any need for this line to be placed on the Loan Estimates at this stage, in view of the Treasurer's statement that we can fully discuss the matter when the legislation is presented?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member will see that the Electricity Trust's Loan programme this year amounts to £8,962,000, and of these moneys the State is providing only £2,300,000. If it is any consolation to the honourable member, I can tell him that none of that £2,300,000 will be provided for the Torrens Island activity: care will be taken to see that the money is not provided for that purpose. In fact, the money provided by the State Government will be spent entirely on country transmission lines. The trust is providing the bulk of its own money from its own resources and from semi-governmental borrowings. However, for the sake of showing honourable members what the trust's total programme is we have shown the total amount of £8,962,000, although in fact we are providing only £2,300,000 of it. Therefore, I assure the honourable member that if he votes for the expenditure of this latter amount it cannot be said later on that he has already approved of the project. Actually, the Government is providing only about one quarter of the money that the trust is using. I assure the honourable member that he is not being put into the position of having voted money for this project when in fact ultimately he may wish to oppose it. The reason for showing the total programme is to let members see the type of work on which part of the trust's money is to be spent.

Mr. HARDING: I refer to the line "Rural extensions", for which £1,250,000 is provided. In the South-East powerlines come back from

Snuggery to Furner, Hatherleigh, and Callendale, which is entirely a rural settlement. We also find the 33,000-volt line coming back from Mount Gambier through Mil Lel, Mingbool and Tarpeena, coupling up with the supply at Nangwarry and proceeding on to Kalangadoo. Will the Treasurer obtain for me a report of the immediate districts which these 33,000-volt lines are to serve, and will he also obtain details of the inquiries that have been made to further extend those powerlines into rural districts in the South-East?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The expansion in the South-East is contingent upon the completion of the main transmission line from Adelaide. This transmission line, for which the Government made a contribution of £1,000,000, will not be completed for, I think, another six or eight months. Recently I obtained information for the member for Millicent (Mr. Corcoran) on this matter, and if I remember the detail correctly the information was that it would be about two years before the areas mentioned by the honourable member could be connected. I shall obtain further information on this matter.

Mr. JENKINS: Some months ago I took up with the Electricity Trust the question of extensions to Currency Creek and Hindmarsh Island, and I was told that these extensions would probably be undertaken this financial year if money was provided for them on the Estimates. Can the Treasurer say whether those extensions are included in the line "Rural extensions"?

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

Mr. McKEE: If we pass this line we will be giving our sanction to the Torrens Island power station because, on page 10, £330,000 is set aside for preliminary earthworks, sheet piling and access works. I consider that this amounts to approval for the expenditure of moneys, and that if this line is passed, as the member for Stuart (Mr. Riches) has pointed out, it means that we have sanctioned the project, and I do not think there would be much to prevent the Bill from going through because we would have indirectly approved of the scheme. Like the member for Stuart, I am concerned about the Port Pirie site. I do not know whether the Government has adequately investigated the matter, but I maintain that the site across the river at Port Pirie is ideal because it has been reclaimed and is practically surrounded by water, and the excess water can be pumped

into the river. It has all the facilities that are available at Torrens Island, and I doubt whether it would cost as much to put a bridge across the river at Port Pirie as it would to put one across the river at Torrens Island. The reconstructed wharves at Port Pirie will have modern facilities for loading and bulk handling, and soon that city will have a labour problem. The Government should consider the people living in the country. These people at Port Pirie should not be expected to uproot themselves when this modernization takes place there. Can the Treasurer say whether the Port Pirie site has been considered?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I should be happy to obtain a report for the honourable member. However, I point out that when we established an industry at Port Pirie the land and the establishment of the industry was most expensive. The cost of the 40 acres of land and the preparation of the site was excessive. Some seven feet of soil had to be carted on to the area to get it above tide level. As a matter of interest, the proposed power station requires 200 acres, and without knowing the locality the honourable member has in mind at Port Pirie I doubt whether there is 200 acres adjacent to the port that is available and suitable. However, I will get a full report on investigations in relation to Port Pirie and let members have it in due course.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: For south-western suburbs drainage, in 1960-61 the sum of £150,000 was proposed and actual payments were £44,907, and in 1961-62 the sum of £250,000 was proposed and expenditure was £127,372. Each year we have voted substantial sums to carry out this most necessary scheme, but in the last two years the Government has achieved only 43 per cent of the programme forecast and for which Parliament provided the funds. This year an expenditure of £300,000 is proposed, including £50,000 for a flood control dam on the River Sturt. This matter is causing a great deal of concern, particularly in the substantial area from Goodwood Road to the River Sturt that has been developed for both residential and industrial purposes. Every roof erected there for either house or factory has made the drainage problem more difficult because there is no natural drainage. My sympathies are extended to the people in the district, particularly on Marion Road, whether they are in business or reside there. Last Saturday week I went along Marion Road at about seven o'clock after

there had been a fall of about 45 points (not a heavy downpour), and people could not cross the road. After heavy rain shopkeepers have to sandbag the fronts of their premises.

I am not satisfied with the information I have received about this matter. I have been informed that the university is working on a project to discover whether water could get away if another drain were constructed along Adelaide Road from Marion Road to the River Sturt. If water from the Westbourne Park Primary School has to be drained into Goodwood Road via Cross Road to get to the River Sturt, that drain will have to work overtime. I believe that not only should operations promised on the dam in the hills be commenced but the drain from Goodwood Road to the River Sturt (acknowledged as being important) should also be commenced. If this work were done it would greatly assist in our unemployment problem. The drain along Edwards Street, Brighton, which goes from Brighton Road to the sea-front, is not part of the drainage work. Undoubtedly a great volume of water goes down Sturt Road and to the sea-front via Edwards Street, but that water is not due to the River Sturt's overflowing its embankment at any place. I am doubtful whether the Treasurer intends to do the amount of work set out and, if that is so, let us have a show-down. Will he give an assurance that vital work on this project will be proceeded with? The member for Mitcham is confronted with difficulties in his district and the Garden Suburb Commissioner has a problem in relation to his area. People in the Marion Corporation area also are vitally concerned in this matter. The Housing Trust, too, will be concerned about it if there is a heavy rain. Will the Treasurer give an assurance that he will go ahead with the work provided for in these Estimates? If the Treasurer has not the information will he see whether a drain could be constructed from Goodwood Road via Avenue Road to South Terrace at Plympton to link up with another drain to relieve flooding from the Morphettville racecourse? The Minister of Education has had representations from the South Australian Jockey Club Incorporated on flood damage. Could that drain be built in addition to the Sturt drain to provide some relief in the area?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Drainage generally is a local government responsibility and local schemes are usually carried out by the district concerned, which is responsible for payment. This scheme received assistance from Parliament because it involved

several districts. The Government agreed to make £2,000,000 available over eight years subject to the local councils' repaying the capital and interest on half that amount.

Mr. Frank Walsh: After the first £1,000,000.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: They are responsible for the total amount which may be £2,200,000. The features of the scheme were worked out by the local councils. I believe that the constructing authority nominated by the Government is Mr. Jackman, but he works under the direction of a committee including council representatives. The £300,000 is available for the construction work and if the money is spent it will be provided. The priority of the work is decided by the local councils and the Public Works Committee has reported on it.

Mr. Quirke: They all agreed on it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes, and they all agreed on the timing. I cannot carry the position further than to say that the £300,000 is available and more cannot be provided this year, because the Loan programme already overspends the Loan Account and will require financing, by about £1,000,000, outside Loan Council approvals. I am not able to say that the local councils can proceed as far as they wish but, if the sum were exceeded by £10,000 or £20,000, provision might be made for that. However, the £300,000 is available and I hope that it will be well spent this year.

Mr. SHANNON: I have noticed the tremendous impetus at Port Augusta following on the construction of the power station and it is heartening to observe industries springing up in that manner. However, instead of advocating decentralization to towns such as Port Augusta, Port Pirie or Wallaroo it might prove advantageous if members opposite were to consider towns such as Murray Bridge, Taillem Bend or even Eight Mile Creek which have an abundant supply of fresh water. I believe that members opposite are a little parochial in their attitude. The water on which we mainly depend flows down the Murray River and members opposite should examine Murray Bridge or Taillem Bend where no trouble is experienced to obtain an adequate fresh water supply.

If industry is taken to Port Pirie we are faced with the problem of pumping water from Morgan at a capital cost of £9,000,000 to £10,000,000. Is it the policy of the Labor Party that we should spend money pumping water when we have it running past certain towns? Members opposite should have a

Party meeting to determine the best site for the establishment of a power station and I do not believe that Port Pirie would have a leg to stand on.

Mr. Ryan: Have your schemes been investigated?

Mr. SHANNON: I am not suggesting any scheme: I am trying to assist Caucus in its deliberations. Certain statements have been made on areas in which people have vested interests but, if they desire to be really constructive, they should decide which town is the best site for a power station. Members opposite cry decentralization for decentralization's sake. They know that industry will never survive unless it is economically based. They are as mindful of that fact as are other members in this Chamber, and to talk of constructing a huge power station in a spot where it will be more costly to produce power and to sustain the work force in industry does not make sense at all.

Mr. HUGHES: I was disappointed that the member for Onkaparinga did not mention Wallaroo because, as Chairman of the Public Works Committee, he has visited that area frequently and must know that land can be obtained without reclamation works. South of Wallaroo is a 150-acre block that would be eminently suitable for a power station site. The Treasurer has said that although £330,000 has been shown on the Estimates for Torrens Island, it does not necessarily follow that all of that money will be spent there. I cannot understand that reasoning. When the Treasurer calls for a report on Port Pirie, will he also call for a report on Wallaroo as a possible site for a power station?

My RYAN: The proposed Torrens Island power station will be in my electorate. It is one part of my district to which I have not ready means of access. Whilst I know in whom the ownership of Torrens Island is vested (and I think it is the Harbors Board)—

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: No.

Mr. Shannon: I thought you said you knew.

Mr. RYAN: Perhaps the honourable member, as the brains trust of the Government, may be able to supply the information.

Mr. Shannon: You told us you knew, and I am waiting to hear.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. RYAN: I understand that the Commonwealth Government has a lease over some, if not all, of the land on the island.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: A small part only.

Mr. RYAN: Will the proposed scheme encroach upon the Commonwealth land? I understand that negotiations are proceeding between the State Government and the Commonwealth Government with a view to terminating the present lease of Torrens Island as a quarantine station when it expires.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: No, the negotiations are for entirely different reasons.

Mr. RYAN: If the Commonwealth is granted an extended lease, will it interfere with the proposed project?

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: No, not with the power station.

Mr. RYAN: Last weekend I read that the Electricity Trust was calling tenders for the building of a bridge to provide access to the island. I am glad that the calling of tenders is being left to the trust, because if it were in the hands of the Public Works Committee—and it delayed its decision as long as it has delayed its decision on the Jervois bridge—the £150,000,000 project would not be seen during our lifetime.

Mr. CORCORAN: Although I should like the power station to be sited in the Millicent district, I am concerned more particularly with the line relating to fishing havens. A scheme for Lake Butler was recently approved and £14,000 was allocated: £4,000 for the purchase of land and £10,000 to commence work on that project. The speed with which the money has been provided indicates the need for the work. The existing slipway is dangerous and risk is involved when using it. Can the Minister indicate when work will commence on this project and can he say to what extent it is likely to progress this year? An amount of £3,000 has been provided for "Minor Works and Services". Many of the South-Eastern fishing ports need improvements to fishing facilities. The Kingston jetty needs repairing; the entrance to the bay at Carpenter Rocks needs improvement (and, if possible, a breakwater should be established); the Southend jetty needs resiting and a change of direction; and the Cape Jaffa jetty needs lengthening. Can the Minister say whether these works would normally be included under the line for minor works and services, because, if so, obviously not much work can be done this financial year?

Mr. RICHES: I understand that the Treasurer has given an assurance that he will have Port Pirie investigated as a possible site for a power station. I hope that any such report will be made as a result of an

investigation into the possibility of decentralizing the station and that it will not merely consist of reasons why the station cannot be sited there. I understand that not only will a report be brought down but that if we vote £330,000 for earthworks at Torrens Island it will not necessarily mean £330,000 for Torrens Island but could mean a distribution in rural areas, for which I am all in favour. I could name some suitable areas.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: I think you have made up your mind about it.

Mr. RICHES: I remind members of the farcical position into which this Committee is getting when we are told that the proposed expenditure of £330,000 on earth works on Torrens Island does not mean that it will be spent that way. The Treasurer has given a categorical assurance that it will not be spent on that line.

Mr. Quirke: It does not say that, because £2,000,000 will be supplied by the Government and the rest will come from internal funds.

Mr. RICHES: Yes, but the Treasurer assured me that if it would make me happy none of the money voted on this line would be spent on Torrens Island. I listened carefully and *Hansard* will show that is almost word for word what he said. I wonder, under these circumstances, whether any member can know what he is voting for. This pre-supposes that you, Mr. Chairman, will take a vote on the total amount and not on the individual lines under "Miscellaneous". I have always understood that if the Committee desired it a vote could be taken on the individual lines. I would thank you for your assurance on this matter.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member would be in order to move that the particular line be reduced, if he wishes to do that.

Mr. RICHES: Yes, and the line would be voted on separately. I was under the impression that that was the situation.

The CHAIRMAN: Assuming that the honourable member moved for a reduction.

Mr. RICHES: Yes, but then where do we get? How does that measure up with the statement that the line need not be there at all, because the money will not be spent in that way? I suggest that it was not an answer to the case put up. The Treasurer is a master of that kind of reply. He knows that when he gives it it does not satisfy anyone. I was not amused by the funny story from the member for Onkaparinga. He tried to be

humorous, but he forgot that he opposed the setting up of the Electricity Trust.

Mr. McKee: He was opposed to the steelworks at Whyalla.

Mr. RICHES: Yes. I would expect him to be opposed to anything of this nature because it is characteristic of the attitude he has adopted ever since being in Parliament.

Mr. Hall: What were the Opposition's views on the steelworks?

Mr. RICHES: If the honourable member peruses *Hansard* he will see that three motions were submitted by me asking the Government to proceed with the negotiations for the steelworks, ever since it was recommended by a former Director of Mines in the first place. The Opposition has voted for that consistently over the years and I leave it to the honourable member to see who opposed it.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: You moved for the acquisition of the plant and leases of the Broken Hill Proprietary Company at Whyalla.

Mr. RICHES: Yes. We are proud of our association with the negotiations for the steelworks at Whyalla, as well as the movement in this place that led to successful negotiations. It was done not as a first recourse, but after the early negotiations had broken down and there was an impassioned statement by the Treasurer in this place, about the failure of the negotiations.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: It shows what the Opposition would do to private enterprise if it were the Government.

Mr. RICHES: Yes. If taken as a whole, that is precisely the programme a Labor Government would follow. It would be negotiations in the first place, and then both parties would have to stand up to the agreement entered into.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: The company has stood up to the agreement.

Mr. RICHES: I suggest that the company has not stood up to it yet. No-one can say that the company has honoured the agreement in the Indenture Act.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: That is not so.

Mr. RICHES: The Minister is wrong, and no-one knows it better than he does. As the Treasurer has said that he will call for a report on the matter of the power station, and although the money voted for earth works on Torrens Island will not be spent in that way and as we shall have a full opportunity to discuss the matter when legislation is introduced, I do not propose to ask that members vote on this line on its own. It would be

competent for the Committee to deal with the line on its own. The Treasurer's statement that moneys voted under the Loan Estimates can be juggled around will not stand investigation.

Mr. HALL: The sum of £132,000 is to be spent on the purchase of school buses. What increase in bus services can we expect from this expenditure? I take it that some money will be spent on the replacement of buses, but I am interested in the increase in bus routes. Regarding the establishment of a power station on Torrens Island, I draw attention to the fact that about £4,000,000 has been spent on providing powerlines from Port Augusta to Adelaide. If a country station is built at a cost four or five times that of the proposed station, we shall have a powerlines cost three, four or five times the £4,000,000 mentioned. Many more millions of pounds will be needed for a power station at Port Pirie than at Torrens Island. We could have an expenditure of £10,000,000 to £20,000,000 more for a station outside the metropolitan area.

Mr. McKee: Do you think a station could be developed in the country without the expenditure of money?

Mr. HALL: The Port Augusta station can meet the needs of the north for many years to come. Much of its present production comes to Adelaide. The metropolitan area needs a station at Adelaide. Therefore, the only reason for putting this station at Port Pirie would be political; it would not be economical. It would burden all citizens of the State because the consumer tariffs would have to be loaded if this station were sited uneconomically.

Mr. QUIRKE: If all things were equal, I think this power station should not be built on Torrens Island—but I do not know all the facts of this project. For strategic reasons alone, it is bad to clutter up a city with major power stations, but, as I say, I do not know the full implications of the facts of this case. I incline to the belief that possibly Port Pirie has been investigated. I want this point cleared up. The member for Stuart (Mr. Riches) has said that the Treasurer has promised to obtain a report on Port Pirie, but I did not understand the Treasurer to say that. I gathered from what he said that it had been investigated and that a report existed. I do not know whether or not that is correct.

The figure for the total Loan programme under this section is nearly £9,000,000, of which only £2,300,000 comes from State Loan funds. The other expenditure is listed as coming from the Electricity Trust's internal funds and

from "loans to be raised by the trust from financial institutions and the public", the total amount from both sources being £6,662,000. The unfortunate position here is that these figures are inextricably linked. The total expenditure is £8,900,000, of which these lines are applying only £2,300,000; but there are two lines—"General extensions to distribution system, £1,195,000" and "Rural extensions, £1,250,000"—that work out at more than the total amount being put up by the Government. So the greater portion of the money, this £6,600,000, is coming from the trust's internal funds and loans to be raised. When honourable members say they would "vote it out", they do not know where the money, either the £2,300,000 or the £6,600,000, is coming from. It is all in one lump. I take it the other lines are given to show the general expenditure of the Electricity Trust.

I would favour putting an electricity installation of this size somewhere other than in the middle of the metropolitan area, if it were possible to do that without jeopardizing the costs to the consumers. I have sufficient confidence in the officers of the Electricity Trust to know that what they have done in their investigations shows that it is to the benefit of South Australia to have the power station where it is proposed to be put. I would accept that. The Electricity Trust goes closely into this matter and gathers all the information, and the final result accruing from that information is that it is better to put the power station on Torrens Island. But at least we should know why. That is absent from this discussion.

What is the trust's report? What has it got that shows that Torrens Island is better than Port Pirie for this purpose? I do not care if the trust has its reasons but I should like to have them here, a report tabled in Parliament showing why the Electricity Trust favours Torrens Island. That would obviate all this discussion. Will the Treasurer say whether I have interpreted him correctly or not in what he said when the member for Stuart assumed that the report that the Treasurer said he would obtain on Port Pirie would be entirely new, whereas my interpretation of his remarks led me to believe that information had been gained on Port Pirie and that a report was available?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I thank the honourable member for pointing out to me the different constructions placed on my remarks. I told the member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee) that I would obtain a report for him upon Port Pirie. I would assume

that a report from the trust is in existence but, if one is not in existence, the reason will be some factor known to the trust that it cannot report upon. For instance, the honourable member can say, "Give me a report on Norton Summit", where I live. Obviously, the answer is that there is no specific report on Norton Summit, but the trust knows that the factors at Norton Summit are so utterly impossible that they do not come within the scope of consideration.

The facts of this case are that this is a major project, the biggest the State has ever undertaken. The Electricity Trust has been examining it for a long time and has sent people abroad to inquire into what is necessary. It has satisfied me that it is a good thing to make the land available to it. This matter will come before Parliament. One feature will require to be placed before Parliament and, when it is, all the relevant information necessary to enable honourable members to make up their minds will be supplied. There is no mystery or secrecy about it. I think that three years ago it was publicly stated that the trust was examining the possibilities. It looked, first of all, for a site close to its present power stations. Because of certain features already there, it wanted to go close to its present stations, but that idea had to be ruled out as there was no room there. Also, there was the difficulty of water.

A station of this type can function efficiently only if it has the coldest possible water. If there is any contamination of cold water by hot water, for every degree rise in temperature I believe it loses one per cent of efficiency. So water temperature is of the greatest importance. The best brains have looked at this. However, when the Bill is introduced, honourable members will be fully informed why it is desirable that this station be placed on this site. Any inland site has the problem that water gets heated. Enormous quantities of water passing through mean that hot water is being poured into a confined space. We had trouble at Port Augusta. There was much investigation by representatives from the University of Adelaide to obviate it, because this inland water is subject to temperature "contamination", if I may put it that way. The amount voted is £2,300,000 and the total expenditure is nearly £9,000,000. The trust itself could find the £330,000 out of its own funds without asking Parliament; but for the purpose of letting Parliament know the programme, it has included all items in the

Estimates, showing particulars of how the money is being spent.

Mr. MCKEE: Can the Treasurer explain the line of expenditure of £634,000 (estimated repayments) on uranium production capital?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: We have terminated production, but subsidiary items are still being made and under those circumstances this small amount has been provided. It will not be possible to continue this activity, because we have been unable to sell the quantities, and at present we are stockpiling.

Mr. LOVEDAY: How would the quantity of power generated at the new station compare with the present total produced? Would it be double what is now being generated?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It is not possible to give a comparison in the form the honourable member desires. At present we have four power stations, including one in the South-East. Osborne A station, which was taken over from the Adelaide Electric Supply Company, is serviceable but completely uneconomic to work, because its efficiency is now so low that the cost of this power would be exorbitant if it were used as a base-load station. The position is that we have at all times a capacity for generation very much greater than effective production would be. At present Osborne B station is beginning to get less efficient than the stations at Port Augusta, which are more efficient than Osborne B; the second one at Port Augusta is very much more efficient, and the proposed Torrens Island station will probably be twice as efficient as any of them. The practice overseas, and I believe here, has always been to make your base-load your modern station and to use your less modern station to generate for peak requirements. As fast as we can build the Torrens Island station it will be advantageous to scrap existing units, purely on the question of efficiency.

At present the trust has a considerable margin of capacity, but if we use it consumers would find that their accounts would have to be increased very rapidly. I do not want honourable members to take this as being factual, although in general terms it would be right—the Osborne B station electricity costs about ½d. per unit less than that produced at Osborne A. Members can see what effect that would have on generation capacity. I believe that the rated capacity of all the power stations is approaching 500,000 units. The ultimate for Torrens Island will be 2,000,000 units. It will take care of all rising costs of production and I

believe will enable a stable price for electricity in future. It is the result of using highly efficient units in place of less efficient units. When the Bill is introduced, I will bring down information on the lines honourable members desire.

Mr. HALL: Returning to the question of school buses, does the Treasurer know whether the figure in this regard relates to an increase in the number of bus routes, or is it to be used to replace existing obsolete buses? I should like to know more about the system of providing Loan moneys for school buses.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: There would be only a small amount for increases in the total numbers. Every year on the revenue budget of the Education Department is an amount providing for amortization and running expenses, so that the buses are amortized over a short period. The reason they come under different lines is that otherwise there would be some years when there was a large sum on the lines, and in others only a small sum. The Government found from experience that it was much better to finance the buses from Loan, because otherwise there was less tendency to run them for the proper mileage they should run. By putting the amount through the Estimates, frequently the buses were not changed when they should have been. The system adopted provided for the buses to be withdrawn periodically. The department pays a regular amount for buses in the form of depreciation and running expenses. This is provided for in the Revenue Estimates. The buses are amortized over a short period, according to mileage, and that means that the buses are in a better state of repair and this system is more businesslike in the general set-up.

Mr. LOVEDAY: I thank the Treasurer for his remarks concerning the power generated by the new station, and I appreciate how important that is. However, it seems that most of these big projects are considered by engineers mainly from a point of view of isolation from other matters. By that, I mean that we seldom see the planning having regard to the heavy cost entailed because a project is in a certain place. The member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) airily talked about an additional cost of £10,000,000 or £20,000,000 for a country power station. That cost figure is just a guess, because no-one has investigated that. I have pointed out on a number of occasions that industries in the city are subsidized by virtue of the fact that public facilities of many kinds have to be provided

to permit workers to get to work at a reasonable cost so that wages can be kept on a stable basis, and that is not denied. What that total subsidy is, nobody knows; it must be tremendous.

The expenditure of £150,000,000 must mean a considerable addition to the power available in South Australia, and it will undoubtedly mean that many additional industries will be centred on the one spot, namely, Adelaide. The city will expand, and tremendous expenditure along the lines I have indicated by way of other Government facilities will be needed. People will have to take more time going to and returning from work because of the size of the city. These are all difficult things to estimate, but I question whether all these great additional expenditures are considered when these sorts of project are being examined. I think they are examined by engineers more in isolation, as the member for Stuart (Mr. Riches) has pointed out, and probably from their point of view they are rightly so examined; but from the point of view of the State, I am certain that the whole effect of these things is not estimated in terms of expenditure in the long run. I know that would be difficult. However, I notice that the Town Planner in today's *Advertiser* points out that a person should not have to spend more than half an hour going to work and half an hour returning home. Obviously, as the city expands that will become impossible. I would think that from the point of view of expenditure there is an optimum size for a city.

Those are things we never appear to take into account when considering projects of this character. When I was a lad I worked in London, and I had to spend one hour getting to work there and one hour getting home at night. People travel from Gawler to Adelaide every day. A friend of mine once told me that he never saw the daylight in winter-time. These things may be said to be of no consequence at all, but they are of consequence in terms of human values. I am sure that industry is subsidized to a tremendous extent by the fact that we run many public facilities either at cost or below cost in order that people can work at a wage that industry can pay. It is not true to say that when we take an industry out to the country we have to subsidize it to a greater extent that we would if it were in the city. I put that point of view to the Treasurer, because although he has said we will have all the relevant facts, I question whether we will have many of these facts.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Honourable members are inclined to look at the Torrens Island power station as a project to be built forthwith, whereas the programme probably will extend over 20 years. I point out that the construction of the Port Augusta power station has been continuing since 1946, with each year planned ahead on the number of units necessary to meet the expanding demand. The member for Whyalla would be correct in his general statement, if the Government itself had not seen the desirability of adequately providing for the matter. As I pointed out, the Government out of its revenue provided £1,000,000 to take electricity to the South-East. It provided that money at no cost to the trust, simply to enable electricity to be available in the South-East at rates comparable with those in the metropolitan area. I deprecate the criticism of the trust that we have had here today.

Mr. Loveday: We have not criticized the trust.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Members have every right to criticize the trust if there is some basis for criticism.

Mr. Loveday: We have not done that.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Let us have a look at the trust's history. The member for Whyalla shakes his head, without stopping to think of what is involved. How many power stations have been built by the trust since its inception? It completed the power station at Osborne which had been half built by the Adelaide Electric Supply Company; it has built two power stations at Port Augusta, one at Port Lincoln, and one at Mount Gambier; and it was instrumental in having another small power station established at Nangwarry.

Mr. Loveday: We are not denying that it has done a good job.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I doubt whether any other authority in South Australia has done more than the trust has for decentralization. All the activities it has commenced since its inception have been in the country. It also built a power station at Leigh Creek, but that station is now being superseded by a powerline from Port Augusta, purely from an economy point of view. If there is one authority that has done its utmost to decentralize, it is the Electricity Trust.

Mr. Loveday: Hasn't the trust done that mainly from the economic point of view?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I think the honourable member for Stuart (Mr. Riches) is looking for the report of a non-existent Royal Commission that recommended Port Augusta. The facts are that the trust has looked at its obligations fairly and squarely, and its main obligation is to supply electricity to the people of this State at the best possible rates.

Mr. Loveday: No-one denies that.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It could just as sensibly be said, "Well, we could pay some extra money for a power station; we could have even better decentralization if we built it at Ceduna." The moment we take it away from the effective areas, however, we raise the cost to the consumer. The trust's job is to provide electricity to the consumer at the best possible price.

Mr. BYWATERS: The Treasurer referred to the powerline to the South-East, and the £1,000,000 given by the Government. I notice at the top of page 11 a sum of £610,000 for this project. I was under the impression that the £1,000,000 was sufficient to cover the whole scheme. However, the Treasurer is shaking his head, so I accept the fact that that is not so.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The trust at the time estimated that the cost would be £1,500,000, and I said we would put up the £1,000,000.

Mr. BYWATERS: Provision is made for a new head office of the Electricity Trust (£600,000) and new depots, district headquarters and suburban sites (£292,000). I have discussed with the trust the question of some improvements for the Murray Bridge depot where little dog boxes are provided. During the summer the staff has a hose running over the roofs to keep the huts cool. I was there once when the outside temperature was 104deg. but inside it was 110deg. even with the hose running. That is not a suitable condition under which men should work and the trust cannot get efficient service under such circumstances. Will the Treasurer say what the programme is for improved conditions at Murray Bridge for employees?

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

Mr. CORCORAN: The Treasurer was absent when I asked a question relating to fishing havens, and the Minister of Works did not reply to the question. An amount of £14,000 has been allocated for the Lake Butler scheme

at Robe, £4,000 being for the purchase of land and £10,000 to enable work to commence. Is the Treasurer able to say when this work is likely to commence and what expenditure is likely to be incurred this year? If the allocation has been spent, will the work be stopped until further money is made available, or will the work continue and more money be made available later?

Dealing with minor works and services, for which only £3,000 has been allocated, many facilities (particularly jetties), are required in South-Eastern fishing ports, and I am sure £3,000 will not be sufficient to cover all or even some of them. If any of this work is approved during the current year will more money be made available?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The land at Lake Butler has been acquired and £10,000 has been allocated for the commencement of the work at Robe. That means that the work will go on progressively. I cannot assure the honourable member of more than £10,000 this year because of the general state of the Loan programme. However, the work having started, more money will be provided next year. I do not know what the ultimate cost will be but, probably, the work will be completed within 18 months. However, the honourable member should not take that as a foregone conclusion. Dealing with the second part of his question, considerable amounts have been made available in different ways in the South-East, and I doubt whether we can increase the amount provided this year.

Mr. RICHES: The Treasurer was correct when he said that I was looking for a report of a non-existent Royal Commission. The report I had in mind was from a Committee of Inquiry into Electricity Supply for South Australia and its members were His Honor Judge Herbert Kingsley Paine (Chairman) and Messrs. Henry Percival Moss and Balfour Staines Woodfull. The terms of reference of that committee were:

To inquire into and report on the following questions:

1. Whether it is desirable in the public interest to establish an electric power station at Port Augusta or elsewhere outside the metropolitan area for the generation and transmission of electricity to the metropolitan area and country districts;
2. If so, what additional generating sets, if any, should be installed at Osborne B power station, in addition to the 30,000 K.W. generating set already being constructed for installation at that station;
3. What measures can be taken to meet the present necessity for an immediate increased electricity supply in the metropolitan area.

I have also read some of the 1943 Parliamentary debates and members interested enough to read them will be amazed at the similarity of some of the items discussed and the views taken. The Treasurer was then querying the reports of engineers who were reporting in the best interests of the trust, which had set out to build another power station at Osborne after the Treasurer had entered into negotiation with the Commonwealth for the decentralization of electricity supplies. Following on discussions in this Parliament, I expressed the opinion that the company was trying to steal a march on Parliament by proceeding with its plans for Osborne. The committee of inquiry was charged with the duty of inquiring into the electricity supply position and was to report back to Parliament as to whether it was in the best interests of the State. My point is that there can be a difference between the interests of the company and its engineers, and the interests of the State or somebody else, and that was the case in 1943. The people conducting the inquiry were not engineers. Advantages that could accrue in the policy of decentralization should be measured against the economics of establishing a power station in the metropolitan area. If the economics of one outweigh those of the other we have to accept the position. All I have tried to obtain this afternoon is an assurance that the full effect of decentralizing supplies has been taken into reckoning and, if so, can we have the results of the investigations? I understood the Treasurer to say, in reply to the member for Port Pirie, that he would bring down such a report, and if he does that I shall be content to let the matter rest. The Treasurer has not pulled the wool over anybody's eyes by saying that none of this £330,000 would be spent on Torrens Island. I believe I said that earlier when the Chairman ruled that we could vote on this particular item.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Vastly different circumstances existed in 1943. The power station at Port Augusta and the Leigh Creek coalfield were first mentioned as possibilities in one of those evening broadcasts the honourable member for Port Augusta always likes to listen to. On that occasion he applauded the decision with considerable zeal. I will tell the Electricity Trust that it is not to assume that the member's vote on the £330,000 in a programme of £9,000,000 is to be taken as indicating honourable member's support on this project at this stage. I will

give the honourable member the complete report when I introduce the Bill later this session. That should clear up the matter.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: When is some provision likely to be made for the new Government printing works that has been spoken of for some years?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The problem associated with this work is mainly one of site, and Cabinet discussed the question about a fortnight ago. The Minister of Roads and the Minister of Works are to confer on the plans and, generally, I believe that a suitable site can be arranged on Engineering and Water Supply Department land opposite the Thebarton police barracks. It is necessary to have the printing works close to Parliament and to have the heavy machinery on the ground floor. A site of about four acres is needed. I think the proposal will materialize sufficiently to be placed before the Public Works Committee in about six months' time.

Mr. FRED WALSH: The progressive association in the Kidman Park area has approached the Tramways Trust seeking a bus service for children in that area who attend the primary and infant schools at Seaton Park. I have written to the trust pointing out the situation and requesting that sympathetic consideration be given to the requests of the people, but to no avail. Some of the children are of tender age and have to walk almost 1½ miles in some instances. About 152 children from Kidman Park attend the Seaton Park schools and at least 50 per cent would use a bus service were one provided by the trust. Since the inception of the bus route along Grange Road (Kirkcaldy) to Port Adelaide, parents have suggested that, by diverting one or two buses that may be going to Port Adelaide in the morning along Kingbourne Avenue to the school, it would provide an almost direct route and that if similar arrangements applied in the afternoon it would not dislocate the trust's organization and would be economic. Will the Treasurer take this up with the Tramways Trust?

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

Grand total, £30,647,000, passed and Committee's resolution adopted by the House.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL.

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

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of

the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to authorize the Treasurer to borrow and expend moneys for public works and purposes and to enact other provisions incidental thereto.

Motion carried.

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

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

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It appropriates the moneys required for the works and purposes provided for by the Loan Estimates that the House has considered. Clause 3 defines the Loan Fund. Clause 4 provides for borrowing by the Treasurer of £27,000,000. The allocation to South Australia out of the borrowing programme approved by Loan Council in June last is £25,529,000 for works other than under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. However, depending on the state of the economy, there could be a further meeting of Loan Council early in 1963, with the possibility of a supplementary loan allocation for State works. With this in mind the borrowing authority in clause 4 has been set down at £27,000,000 to avoid having to call Parliament together again should it be possible to arrange an increased borrowing programme.

Clause 5 provides for the expenditure of £30,647,000 on the undertakings set out in the first schedule. Clause 6 deals with expenditures on three Loan undertakings for which appropriation was given by warrant by the Governor under powers conferred on him by the Public Finance Act. The financing of Student Hostels was a new activity introduced during the year, while Waterworks and Sewers and Government Buildings and Land each required appropriation additional to that included in the Public Purposes Loan Bill of 1961. Clause 7 provides for borrowing and payment of an amount to cover any discounts, charges and expenses incurred in connection with borrowing for the purposes of this Bill. Clause 8 makes provision for temporary finance if the moneys in the Loan Fund are insufficient for the purposes of the Bill. Clause 9 authorizes the borrowing of £10,000,000 for the purpose of carrying on Loan works at the commencement of next financial year and until the Public Purposes Loan Bill for 1963 is considered by Parliament.

Clause 10 gives the Treasurer power to borrow against the issue of Treasury Bills or by bank overdraft. The Treasurer possesses and may exercise this authority under other legislation, but it is desirable to make the authority specific year by year in the Public Purposes Loan Bill as is done with other borrowing authority. Clause 11 deals with the duration of certain provisions in the Bill. Clause 12 directs that all money received by the State under the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act shall be credited to a special account to be paid out as required for the purposes of that Act. Clause 13 provides for the Bill to operate from July 1, 1962. I commend it for the consideration of members.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): In Committee members carefully considered the Loan Estimates. However, when expenditure under the Loan Estimates is approved for certain lines and the money is not used for the purposes set out there is need for explanation. The Bill will enable the works programme for the year to be commenced and it will now go to another place. I understand that next week members will have the Budget placed before them. I support the Bill.

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

MARINE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Marine) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Marine Act, 1936-1957. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It makes several amendments to the Marine Act, designed mainly to bring certain of its provisions into line with practice and provisions elsewhere in Australia. The first amendment is made by clauses 3, 4 and 5 of the Bill. Sections 19 and 20 of the Act prescribe the number and class of masters, mates, engineers and other officers to be carried on intrastate ships, section 20 stipulating the qualifications which engineers must have. The Government agrees with the view of the Australian Port Authorities' Association that uniform regulations for marine enginedrivers' certificates should be adopted, in order to avoid the necessity for re-examination where drivers move from State to State. The provisions of the Act can be altered only by way of statutory amendment, and the adoption of uniform provisions from time to time by way of regulation rather

than statutory amendment would enable agreed modifications to be made as and when necessary. Clauses 4 and 5 will, accordingly, amend sections 19 and 20 by removing the scales therein set out and substituting scales to be prescribed. The first part of clause 3 will enable the making of the necessary regulations from time to time. In connection with these amendments, I mention that Queensland and Tasmania have adopted uniform regulations, New South Wales is seeking the necessary legislative amendment and Victoria has not yet taken action; no action is necessary in Western Australia.

Clause 7 will repeal the present section 26 of the principal Act which enables the Harbors Board to cancel certificates of masters, mates or engineers on conviction of felony or misdemeanour, but only where the certificates are granted by the board. The new section 26 will extend these provisions by enabling the board to cancel or suspend certificates of competency issued by other British Commonwealth authorities as well as the board and, further, in cases where the holder has been convicted of an offence in another Commonwealth country or where the board, having regard to the findings of another court in Australia, is satisfied that the holder is incompetent or has been guilty of misconduct. It is considered desirable that there should be full reciprocity within the British Commonwealth on this matter and the new section follows the lines of the corresponding section of the Commonwealth Navigation Act.

Clause 8 inserts a new section in the principal Act, to require the furnishing of stability information before the issue of a certificate of survey, the information to be based on a stability test. The second portion of clause 3 enables the making of regulations for matters affecting stability. The Court of Marine Inquiry recently referred to the fact that there is no power to compel shipowners to have stability tests conducted when a vessel is being built or extensive alterations are being made to it. The court expressed the view, in which the Government concurs, that such a power was necessary. In the interests of safety, the proposed new section 85A is inserted into the principal Act. It follows the lines of the provisions of the Commonwealth Navigation Act.

Clauses 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 concern the constitution of courts of marine inquiry. In this State, a court of marine inquiry is constituted by a magistrate and assessors who have equal authority with the presiding magistrate. The position is similar in Victoria, but in the other four States and under the Commonwealth legislation assessors do not

adjudicate or fix penalties. The clauses which I have mentioned will bring the position in this State into line with that in the Commonwealth and the other States (except Victoria) by providing that assessors shall advise the court but not adjudicate. The qualifications of assessors will also be specified by regulation rather than by the Act as at present. This will enable uniformity in the matter of qualifications and procedure to be achieved by way of regulation from time to time.

Clause 14 amends section 127 of the principal Act. The effect of the amendments is to adopt and adapt to intrastate ships the provisions of the Commonwealth Navigation Act regarding the employment of seamen. Division 7A of that Act, which deals with the engagement of seamen, provides that seamen shall be engaged only with the approval of a superintendent appointed under that Act. Engagement may, however, be refused a seaman with three "bad" discharges. These Commonwealth provisions do not, of course, apply to seamen on purely intrastate ships and this means that men with "bad" discharges can obtain employment on South Australian vessels and this could lead to seamen engaged in this State being mainly those who could not obtain employment elsewhere. Clause 14 accordingly imports into South Australian law the provisions of the Commonwealth legislation with the necessary modification that a seaman who is refused engagement may appeal to the State Industrial Court: under the Commonwealth Act the right of appeal is to the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. Desirable as it may be in theory to have all appeals to the one tribunal, jurisdiction cannot be conferred upon a Commonwealth body by State law. The Bill accordingly provides for the appeal to be to the State Industrial Court, thus giving to seamen a right of appeal from a refusal of engagement. On this matter I understand that Queensland and Western Australia have passed amending legislation, New South Wales is awaiting legislation and Tasmania has deferred action. Victoria has no intrastate seamen under its control. The amendments made by clause 14 of the Bill will, accordingly, bring this State into line with others on this matter.

Clause 15, which is to be read with clause 7, is of a formal character. The Act contains, in its first schedule, a code of rules for the prevention of collisions at sea. These rules are now out of date, having been superseded by a set of international rules that have been

adopted by the Commonwealth and are, I understand, in fact observed in our own waters, although not formally enacted in this State. The need for uniformity in matters affecting collisions is obvious and I need not dwell upon it. Although the rules in the schedule to our Act can be amended or varied by the Governor, there is clear advantage from a practical point of view in incorporating the new set of rules in the schedule when there is a Bill dealing with other amendments. The ordinary person looking at the Marine Act would normally assume that the first schedule was reasonably up-to-date. Clause 15 substitutes the new set of rules for those in the present schedule, thus enabling persons interested to find the latest set of rules at the end of the statute.

The amendment to section 59 made by clause 6 is in the nature of a consequential amendment: the new rules refer to and apply to seaplanes and, if we are to adopt the whole code, it is desirable to adopt them in their entirety rather than amend them to omit those which might have no practical application. There was some doubt in my mind about the necessity of including this clause as seaplanes appear now to be obsolete, but the proposals do in fact follow those universally adopted and, although they may have little force or effect in our present conditions, yet for the purposes of uniformity in this legislation they have been allowed to remain in the Bill. Clause 6, accordingly, strikes out the restrictive words of section 59, leaving the international and Commonwealth rules applicable in their entirety to all intrastate vessels. I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr. TAPPING secured the adjournment of the debate.

EXPLOSIVES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The object of this short Bill is to add to the present regulation-making power under the principal Act three additional subjects, namely:—First, the regulation and control of the sale of explosives, the licensing of sellers, the conditions on which explosives may be sold and the persons to whom they may be sold; secondly, the control of the storage and display of explosives; thirdly, regulation and control of the import of explosives into the State. Legislation regulating the sale and import of explosives exists in other Australian States and in New Zealand. The Explosives Act in this

State does not contain provisions on these matters and the power to make regulations does not appear to be wide enough to cover such matters as the prevention of the obtaining of explosives for unlawful purposes, the licensing of sellers, the display and storage of explosives or any control over the importation of explosives.

One matter, apart from the more serious aspect of the holding of explosives for unlawful purposes, concerns the control of the storage and handling of fireworks. There is at present no restriction on the sale of fireworks to young children nor does there appear to be power to regulate the handling, or, more particularly, the display, of fireworks in shop windows where, I understand, there is a serious fire risk. The amendments proposed in the Bill will permit regulations to be made controlling these matters and the new powers proposed will I believe be welcomed by members of this Chamber in the interests of public safety.

It is not proposed to widely control and restrict the use of fireworks, but some fireworks are dangerous. I have seen a collection of fireworks any of which could be obtained in Adelaide, and the use of which could easily prove fatal—for instance, if one were struck by one of the heavy type rockets that are easily available. The only reason more are not sold is that they are expensive. They could have a fatal effect if misdirected. Although I do not know of any fatal accidents in South Australia from their use, this has happened in other places. It is therefore considered that there should be power to control fireworks generally, if thought necessary. Frequently explosives imported from other countries have no directions in English as to their use, although some have lettering in a foreign language. In such cases there may be need for regulation-making power. I commend the Bill.

Mr. LOVEDAY secured the adjournment of the debate.

BULK HANDLING OF GRAIN ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 15. Page 551.)

Mr. HUGHES (Walleroo): His Excellency the Governor in his Speech when opening Parliament said that a Bill would be introduced this session to authorize the Treasurer to guarantee repayment up to a further £200,000 by South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited as an additional loan to the £400,000 made by the Commonwealth

Trading Bank. This Bill is similar to one introduced last session, when it was necessary to amend section 4 of the principal Act by inserting a new section to enable the Treasurer to execute a further guarantee to that bank for the repayment of £500,000. To refresh members' minds, I will read section 4 of the principal Act, which states:—

(1) The Treasurer may execute a guarantee in favour of the Commonwealth Trading Bank of Australia for the repayment of any sum, not exceeding £500,000, being the whole or part of a loan made by that bank to the company on the security of a mortgage or charge over the assets of the company.

(2) The guarantee shall contain such terms and conditions as are agreed upon between the Treasurer and the said bank.

(3) If any sum becomes payable to the said bank by the Treasurer under a guarantee given pursuant to this section, the Treasurer may pay that sum out of the general revenue of the State.

Last session, when section 4a was added to the principal Act, it was necessary to include additional wording, although the substance of the section was the same as was contained in the original legislation. Section 3 (1) in the Act passed last year was as follows:—

(1) In addition to any guarantee executed by the Treasurer pursuant to section 4 of this Act, the Treasurer may execute a guarantee in favour of the Commonwealth Trading Bank of Australia for the repayment of any sum not exceeding £500,000 being the whole or any part of any loan (other than a loan made prior to the commencement of the Bulk Handling of Grain Act Amendment Act, 1961) by that bank to the company on the security of a mortgage or charge over the assets of the company.

I take it that the additional wording was necessary as a safeguard to the Treasurer, as he was acting as a guarantor for the bulk handling company to the Commonwealth Trading Bank on a current loan works programme. The Bill is a simple one and contains only one substantive clause, but a very important one, and it is clause 3 (1), which reads:

The following section is inserted in the principal Act, after section 4a thereof:

4b (1) In addition to any guarantee executed by the Treasurer pursuant to sections 4 and 4a of this Act, the Treasurer may execute a guarantee in favour of the Commonwealth Trading Bank of Australia for the repayment of any sum not exceeding £200,000 being the whole or any part of any loan (other than a loan made in pursuance of the provisions of either of the said sections) by that bank to the company on the security of a mortgage or charge over the assets of the company.

Again it will be noticed that the provision has been included to safeguard the Treasurer, and rightly so. I believe it is right for the Government to accept certain responsibilities and also rights not only in the establishment of such a large undertaking, but in seeing that the effect is to the best advantage of the State. The fact that the Government is standing as guarantor to the undertaking creates confidence in the minds of interested parties. I was pleased to hear the Treasurer refer, in his explanation of the Bill, to the assistance received from the Leader of the Opposition, who pledged his support to enable the preliminary work to be proceeded with. I had hoped that immediately following the Treasurer's statement the press would have given some prominence to his statement regarding the Leader's co-operation, but if there was any such report in the press it escaped my notice. I do not think any such report appeared.

The problems of the primary producer are the problems of this Parliament and not entirely the problems of a section of Parliament, as some people would have us believe. I have studied the *Hansard* report of the debate that took place when the original Bill was introduced in this House. One speaker on that occasion was the member for Flinders (Mr. Pearson), who is now Minister of Works. In my opinion the honourable member on that occasion made a thought-provoking and searching speech, the preparation of which must have entailed much thought. The honourable member's remarks concerning clause 33 of the original Bill tie in with the Premier's second reading explanation of this Bill, which states:

The present Bill is the outcome of discussions between the company and the Australian Barley Board. In the light of the experience of the economies and facilities of bulk handling, the board desired to secure port bulk handling facilities as soon as possible and, in view of its own position and the undesirability of two authorities providing separate facilities, one for wheat and one for barley, decided to secure the co-operation of South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. Agreement in principle was accordingly reached some months ago between the two authorities that the South Australian company should provide the initial funds, construct the facilities and continue to own and operate them, the Barley Board meeting reasonable operation and maintenance costs and payments to amortize the full cost of the structures over 20 years and of the machinery over 10 years.

The member for Flinders at that time was seeking clarification of the charges to which

the company would be entitled in the handling of grain other than wheat in bulk through its system, and, being a primary producer, the honourable member foresaw that within a few years other types of grain would be handled in bulk. Another point made by the honourable member was that it appeared that the company would have a monopoly for the handling of grain, and in his opinion that monopoly should be controlled in some way. The late Mr. Christian, who was then Minister of Agriculture, tried to assure the honourable member that the Bill gave the company not the monopoly to handle grain but only wheat. However, the member for Flinders was not to be side-tracked and said that, although the company was not being granted an absolute monopoly for the handling of grain, in actual practice it would become a monopoly. It is good to know at this juncture that two such authorities as the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited and the Australian Barley Board are negotiating in the best interests of one of our principal industries. If the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited is looked upon as being in any way a monopoly, then I consider that that monopoly is necessary in the best interests of all graingrowers and of our export trade.

The people who will be affected by this arrangement are the men who have handled the grain over the years and the business people who have relied on the pay cheques of those men to keep country towns stable. According to the explanation of the Bill, the cost of construction of the additional facilities will be about £730,000, of which £400,000 is to be spent at Port Adelaide and £165,000 at each of the ports of Wallaroo and Port Lincoln. When bulk handling was first introduced at Wallaroo it was reliably stated that it would affect about 200 men, and I assure the House that that has been the case. Whereas 350 men were employed on handling wheat, I understand that today only about 160 men are so employed. About 200 families were forced to leave Wallaroo where they had lived for many years. Honourable members can see that in the march of progress many people have been affected. With bulk handling of barley, further families will be forced to leave that area. Recently I was accused in this House by the North Terrace primary producer, the honourable member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip)—

Mr. HEASLIP: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I take exception to the remark that I am a North Terrace primary producer.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Rocky River has taken exception to the remark that he is a North Terrace primary producer, and therefore I ask the member for Wallaroo to withdraw it.

Mr. HUGHES: Mr. Speaker, as you have asked me to withdraw that remark, I will do so. The member for Rocky River accused me of being opposed to bulk handling, but his statement was unfounded because never at any time have I opposed bulk handling or the quicker turn-around of ships at any seaport. However, like a predecessor of mine—Mr. McAlees—I maintain that where the Government is assisting in the progress of one section of people it should provide for the other section of people who are adversely affected. I also rise to the defence of Mr. McAlees against the charge by the member for Rocky River, and again I maintain that the accusation was without foundation. In fact, the member for Rocky River defeated his own argument by quoting the last paragraph of a speech made by Mr. McAlees on the original Bulk Handling of Grain Bill. Mr. McAlees did not oppose bulk handling but, like me, was deeply concerned about the future of those people who would be affected by its introduction.

The capabilities of the Wallaroo bulk facilities have been proven by their use. The conveyor belt system can load 400 tons of wheat an hour, and, as you, Mr. Speaker, know, it has done that most successfully on numerous occasions. However, I was interested to read a report in the August 18 issue of *Waterfront* that Geelong sets the world's loading record. That report states:

Waterfront workers in Geelong now hold the world's record for loading wheat. The record was set last month when 14,850 tons of wheat were poured into the bulk wheat carrier *Bjorjheim* in 10½ hours. The old record was held by the port of Vancouver bulk terminal. Wheat poured into the *Bjorjheim* at a rate of 1,440 tons an hour, compared with 1,290 tons an hour for the Vancouver record.

That demonstrates that Geelong has more modern methods than has South Australia, although I was interested to read that the Port Adelaide installation is to handle about 800 tons an hour, or about double the quantity handled by Wallaroo and Port Lincoln. That illustrates that South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited, with assistance from the Government in the installation of its conveyor belt systems, is improving its methods.

The co-operative is to be congratulated on the improvements that have been referred to in this House. It was stated that, because Wallaroo and Port Lincoln were early terminals, improvements would be made as time went on and I am delighted to know that the improvements are being effected.

Wheat shipments at the Wallaroo bulk silos in 1959 from the excellent 1958 harvest totalled only about 150,000 tons or about 5,500,000 bushels. Undoubtedly four times this quantity of wheat could have been handled if the grain had been available. More than 42,000,000 bushels of wheat has been handled by Wallaroo silos in the last 20 months. Members must bear in mind that the grain must be handled when it is received at the silos and again on being shipped over the belt system. In 1960-61, 11,361,519 bushels was received at the silos and in 1961-62, 9,860,169 bushels was received. For the latter season hard wheat comprised 3,201,798 bushels and f.a.q. wheat comprised 6,658,371 bushels. The method of cartage to the silos was as follows—2,071,534 bushels by road, 7,563,620 bushels by rail and 225,015 bushels by road agencies. Thus 21,221,688 bushels of wheat was brought to the silos and was shipped out again in 20 months.

Much credit for this achievement must go to the terminal manager (Mr. Chittleborough) and his staff for the excellent way they work as a team, especially at peak periods. Mr. Chittleborough and his men have a considerable reputation and they have achieved this reputation amongst primary producers because of the efficient manner in which they adapt themselves to handling huge tonnages of grain. It is a well-established fact that the Wallaroo silos have greatly helped to bring maximum returns to the producers for their grain.

I imagine that all honourable members have, within the last week, been supplied with a copy of the booklet entitled *Grain is Better in Bulk* written by Mr. Max Lamshed. I believe this booklet is a valuable contribution to the story of the bulk handling of grain. The Bill before the House is to give a guarantee of £200,000 to S.A. Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited for the building of additional storages to include barley. I wish to refer to a paragraph in the booklet dealing with barley, but point out that just prior to this Mr. Lamshed has been dealing with different strains of wheat. Regarding barley, he states:

Its first recorded harvest, too, was in 1841-42, when 10,000 bushels were reaped from 500 acres. Five years later the yield passed

100,000 bushels for the first time, but it was not until after the turn of the century that a half million bushel harvest was reached. The "running out" of the land affected barley growers, also, and unrelieved cropping brought the average yield from high in the twenties—once or twice it exceeded 30—to 18 or 19. There, with the application of superphosphate and better cultivation practices, it remained until the 'forties, when it began to creep up to, and then well into, the twenties, and remain there.

It was not until 1912-13 that South Australia had its first million bushel barley crop, but from then on the advance was rapid—2,500,000 in 1918-19; nearly 4,000,000 in 1920-21, 6,000,000 in 1932-33, 10,000,000 in 1941-42, 15,000,000 in 1947-48 and 25,000,000 in 1952-53. Thence onward, barley became a real rival of wheat as South Australia's main cereal, and for four years from 1956 the barley harvest exceeded that of wheat.

That speaks well for barleygrowers in South Australia. Mr. Lamshed referred to the introduction of the original Bill in this House and, Mr. Speaker, with your permission I wish to quote one or two paragraphs, because I believe every honourable member is interested. At the same time I think the paragraphs I read should be inserted in *Hansard* for future generations to read.

The SPEAKER: As long as the honourable member is quoting it is in order.

Mr. HUGHES: Mr. Lamshed continues:

... the introduction into the House of Assembly in June, 1955, of the Bulk Handling of Grain to give S.A. Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. an exclusive right to handle wheat and other grain in bulk (while still preserving the rights of the Railways Department, the Harbors Board and the Wheat Board) and to guarantee £500,000 of the loan from the Commonwealth Trading Bank.

"Whereas it is desirable," said the preamble, "to confer certain rights and powers on the company and to regulate and control the bulk handling of wheat and other grain in order to ensure that proper service is given to growers, millers, merchants and other persons concerned in the marketing, handling and disposal of wheat and other grain . . ." It was provided that there should be a directorate of nine—two being Government nominees for as long as the Government guarantee of £500,000 remained, and seven elected, three of the latter being State directors holding office for six years and four zone directors elected by members within the respective zones and holding office for three years for the first term, and six years thereafter.

It was fitting that the Bill, which was parallel in many respects to the bulk handling legislation of Western Australia, was introduced by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Christian) who, as Chairman of the Public Works Standing Committee, had heard much of the earlier evidence about bulk handling, and who was a wheat grower. As such, he told the House, he was in favour of bulk handling. Features of

the Bill, he explained, were that the provision and maintenance of loading equipment and facilities at the shipping terminal ports would remain the function of the Government. In return for sole rights to handle bulk grain, the company would have to accept all the wheat offered to it at its storages, whether by members or non-members. The terminal ports for shipping, initially, would be Ardrossan, Wallaroo, Port Lincoln, Thevenard, Port Pirie and Port Adelaide, although others might be proclaimed later. Mr. Christian paid tribute to the S.A. Wheat and Woolgrowers' Association for the "vast amount of organizational work done in obtaining the support of wheatgrowers for the measure". The Bill was supported by both sides of the House, although one or two Labor members were apprehensive that bulk handling would displace considerable wharf labour at ports.

I think that is where Mr. McAlees (former member for Wallaroo) came into the picture. He was not against bulk handling, but wanted an assurance before he voted on the Bill that something would be done at Wallaroo to use the labour that would be displaced by bulk handling. The booklet continued:

The Leader of the Opposition, the late Mr. M. R. O'Halloran, M.P. (Lab.), in one of his best speeches, gave the Bill his blessing, saying, in respect of the apprehension voiced, that Labor "believed man was intended for a better destiny than carrying bags of wheat on his back and that if any better method can be devised that will confer a benefit on the primary producer in the first instance and take the load of wheat off the lumper's back in the second instance, it should be encouraged". In a lively speech, the secretary of the S.A. Wheat and Woolgrowers' Association, Mr. T. C. Stott, M.P. (Ind.), explained the structure and plans of the co-operative, saying he believed it offered so many attractions that growers would not be able to stay outside it. The debate in the Legislative Council followed similar lines, although there were hints that the company would fall through and the Government might have to come to the rescue. The Bill was signed by the Lieutenant-Governor on July 7, 1955. With its operation, the sponsoring body, the Wheat and Woolgrowers' Association, had no further say.

I was pleased that Mr. Lamshed included a reference to the late Mr. Cecil Chapman, who laboured so hard and died in harness. This man stuck out for a complete conveyor belt system in preference to the truck jetty-tip plan. I have been told that had it not been for Mr. Chapman's insistence at the time perhaps we would not be enjoying such good loading facilities at Wallaroo. The following is what Mr. Lamshed had to say about Mr. Chapman:

Cecil Thomas Chapman was of similar calibre and attainment in the Moonta district, where he had lived all his life. He, too, had been President of the Wheat and Woolgrowers'

Association, and at the time of his appointment to the co-operative board was a South Australian member of the Australian Wheat Board—his total service there was 14 years—as well as a member of the Wheat Industry Research Committee. The development of new types of wheat suited to South Australian conditions was one of his prime interests. In public life, he was described by a colleague as a "man of fighting qualities, and sincerity of purpose, a guiding light at the many conferences he attended over the years". He, too, was to die before he completed his six-year term.

Also, I feel that the following remarks by Mr. Lamshed regarding Mr. Lloyd Heaslip were true indeed:

Lloyd Howard Heaslip was appointed first chairman of the co-operative and, as such, has presided over its remarkable development since. He, too, is of a family long associated with wheat and woolgrowing. A vice-president of the Wheat and Woolgrowers' Association and for many years a power in its affairs, he was one of the leaders in the campaign for formation and recognition of the co-operative. Both then, and subsequently, he showed qualities of heart and head, particularly in capacity to deal with fellow producers and in administrative ability and foresight. His selection was a happy and auspicious one.

I entirely agree with that, because Mr. Heaslip at a meeting of angry Yorke Peninsula farmers held at Kadina showed his great qualities. In a few minutes after commencing his remarks he had fully proved to many primary producers that they were barking up the wrong tree in regard to the co-operative. Mr. Lamshed also said:

There were sound capabilities among the zone directors. The first secretary was Mr. Stott, in many respects an architect and builder of the concern. Later, he became liaison officer between the co-operative and his first love, the Wheat and Woolgrowers' Association.

Many paragraphs could be quoted. It is a pity that the book in full cannot be printed in *Hansard*. Mr. Lamshed also said:

Wallaroo was chosen for the company's first terminal to be erected under its own control. Its jetty could take vessels of up to 10,000 tons; it was the logical outlet for the centre and upper part of Yorke Peninsula as well as hundreds of square miles of the lower north—in the sum probably the richest grain-growing area in the State (and already partly served by silos); road haulage from the Peninsula was fairly short and over good roads; by rail, the grain could come in from Brinkworth, Snowtown, Balaklava and so on as well as stations in the Port Pirie and Port Adelaide divisions until terminal silos were operating in those ports; ketches could bring parcels from Spencer Gulf ports.

Mr. Nankivell: Ardrossan was the first bulk terminal port.

Mr. HUGHES: I will not enter into an argument at this stage; I was merely quoting from Mr. Lamshed's book. The co-operative has proved beyond doubt that it can adequately handle in bulk all the grain grown in South Australia. Another portion of the book stated:—

The near record harvest of 1960-61 put the company to a test. With only part of its programme completed, it had to deal with a yield nearly four times that of the preceding season. Inevitably its machinery creaked, but it did not break down, and a record volume of grain was bulk handled, even if the handling dragged on for months. Several divisions were badly affected. On Eyre Peninsula, still with only the elements of its planned silo pattern, the proportion of the State yield jumped from a sixth to nearly a third. In some counties the advance was spectacular—from 1,200,000 to 4,600,000 bushels in Jervois, from 300,000 to 1,500,000 in Flinders and from 70,000 to 1,800,000 in Robinson. The Adelaide division was hit, too. Its yield rose to 14,000,000 bushels, more than a third of the State total—and as yet it lacked a terminal to ease the pressure on country silos. Some relief was gained by railing grain to ships at Wallaroo, but that was only a palliative.

All over the State the company and its staff planned and worked. At some storages staff worked up to 16 hours a day for seven days a week; co-operation with the railways gained for extra wheat trains all the rolling stock the department could put on rails; co-operation with the Australian Wheat Board and port officials got more ships to load wheat and faster loading of them; emergency storages such as hangars at the disused Mallala airfield were stuffed with wheat. The controversial sale by the Wheat Board of a million tons to China opened a valuable and hitherto virtually unexplored outlet for Australian cereals.

But still the grain cascaded in. There just was not enough space for all of it. So from all over the State came the story—full silos and terminals—

and I remember only too well when that was taking place—

receivals suspended for days at a time, chagrined farmers placed on delivery quotas and compelled to stop harvesting or hold the grain on their farms. Many found they could tip it on cleared spots in their paddocks and safely leave it there for weeks until the pressure eased, and then reload it for delivery at small cost. Special plant was invented and made to deal with the heaped grain. Not unnaturally the company came under fire. It was accused of "lack of foresight, bad planning and poor management". Actually, it did pretty nearly all that could have been expected of it. The seemingly endless river of grain was an act of God!

Its silo capacity was 15,000,000 bushels. It received over 25,000,000, 23,400,000 of it in bulk. Many of the silos were filled and emptied twice. At Wallaroo, 37 ships were loaded with

10,300,000 bushels; Port Lincoln loaded over 9,000,000 bushels in 27 cargoes and Ardrossan nearly 4,000,000 in 26. By June the position had eased. By July the crisis was over and the company was looking to the Wheat Board for charterings to clear all storages for the coming season.

Without going any further I think I have quoted enough from this book—

Mr. Millhouse: Hear, hear!

Mr. HUGHES: I am glad to have got a "Hear, hear!" from the member for Mitcham.

The SPEAKER: I hope the honourable member will link up his remarks with clause 3.

Mr. HUGHES: I shall do that now. I was under the impression that I had been linking them up with clause 3. I think I have read enough from this book to convince the House of my point. I know that honourable members have this book in their possession and are keen to get on their feet to quote from it. One reason for my quoting from it so extensively was that I hated to think that the member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) would come up behind me and say that I had left something unsaid. I support the Bill, and particularly clause 3.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River): Briefly and to the point, without quoting from something that is in the possession of all of us and is no doubt valuable information, but still is available to all of us without our having to listen to it here—

Mr. Hughes: I explained the reason for my reading it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HEASLIP: I give this Bill my blessing. Clause 3 provides for the guaranteeing by the Government of £200,000 to the Commonwealth Trading Bank, upon conditions, and the bank will then advance £400,000 to the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited. This £400,000 is not sufficient for the job in hand—the building of extra works to handle barley as well as wheat. It will take another £330,000, which is money supplied by the wheat-growers. I will return to that later.

Everybody in this House will agree that South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd., has done a magnificent job, despite the criticism and doubts expressed here when we passed the original Bill. There were many doubting Thomases, many who predicted failure. Many criticized the Government for making even the first guarantee, but now I hear no criticism and I do not think there will be any when this Government increases that guarantee and comes forward with another £200,000 to extend the works completed. The

Co-operative Bulk Handling is naturally very up-to-date, with the latest installations in Australia, and also it has the name and record of having the cleanest silos and the best out-turn of wheat in Australia.

Weevils have caused much difficulty and waste but, since the Co-operative Bulk Handling has taken over in South Australia, the wastage through weevils has been greatly reduced. With the modern type of silos, this wastage or loss through insects will be further reduced, and this will play an important part in the handling of barley, which today is only in transit; it is not being put into silos and stored, as wheat is. The difficulties of holding barley have not yet been overcome, but I am sure that it is only a matter of time before barley will be held not only for months but for years.

I do not think the grading of barley will raise a great problem, although we have far too many grades in barley today, altogether about six. There are malting barley, milling barley and feed barley. They are the only three that matter, really. The difficulties in the grading of barley can be overcome. Possibly malting barley, which is that mostly used in Australia, should be segregated altogether. Another point is that the segregation of our wheats under bulk handling was not done or attempted until the bulk handling system was introduced. It has proved a tremendous help in the sale of our semi-hard and hard grades of wheat. The buyer who wants semi-hard can now buy semi-hard without getting a mixture; the buyer who wants hard can now get hard without having semi-hard mixed in with it and not knowing what quantity of semi-hard is in it. If we are to sell barley overseas to best advantage, it is demanded in bulk and so far we are shipping only from bags and transporting overseas in bulk, whereas the time will come when barley will go into silos and be held in bulk like wheat.

Moisture has been a problem in the past and we have already reached the time when that can be overcome. The aeration that is now being introduced into the silos has a great effect in keeping the moisture down. Mr. Hughes had much to say about the men working on the wharves and mentioned that whereas 350 men had been employed at Wallaroo before bulk handling was introduced there were now only 160. I am sorry that they had to leave that job because possibly they had their homes there.

Mr. Ryan: The same position has developed in other places where bulk handling has been introduced.

Mr. HEASLIP: These people are possibly now doing far more useful and easier work. I agree with the former Leader of the Opposition (Mr. O'Halloran) that man was not made for lumping wheat on his back. I think there are better ways in which men can earn money.

Mr. Loveday: They have had to stand the expense of the change.

Mr. HEASLIP: I would say that these men are now possibly employed in more remunerative work.

Mr. Ryan: You cannot substantiate that by fact today.

Mr. HEASLIP: Although there is a certain skill in lumping wheat, it is not a highly skilled job.

Mr. Jenkins: It is only irregular work.

Mr. HEASLIP: Exactly. I have already said that I am sorry that they had to leave their homes and go elsewhere for work, but I still think that they would be happier and better off doing some other job than lumping wheat at Wallaroo or elsewhere. Mr. Hughes did not mention that although about 190 men had to lose their jobs and undertake other work, bulk handling had been a huge benefit to producers in his district. Lumping wheat in a paddock in the heat of the day is not a gentleman's job. Not only is the handling of wheat in bulk easier, but also cleaner. Primary producers have received no end of benefit from bulk handling. As I said in the Address in Reply debate, primary producers today are not in an enviable position in making a living. Their position is so different from what it was. They must keep down every cost possible if they are to compete on world markets, as they have done in the past. They are the only markets on which they can sell their product, and it is one of the few means by which we can get overseas credits. If the day arrives when our primary producers cannot compete on world markets, it will be a sorry day for Australia. It is all-important that every cost should be reduced if possible. Bulk handling has resulted in cutting down tremendously the cost of importing jute, and has made it easier for wheatgrowers to compete.

Mr. Ryan: What is the difference in costs between the bulk and bag methods?

Mr. HEASLIP: It is difficult to say. When I was wheatgrowing I worked it out, but when my neighbours also did so they got another answer. Although official figures have been

given, I cannot say what the supposed saving is, but I know it is considerable.

Mr. Ryan: Who gets the greater benefit—the buyer or the seller—from the difference in the f.o.b. price?

Mr. HEASLIP: I understand that the difference is 6d. a bushel. I know it is a big difference between bulk and bagged wheat.

Mr. Bywaters: That is the suggested figure.

Mr. HEASLIP: I do not think we could get an exact figure.

Mr. Clark: Are there many countries that require wheat in bags?

Mr. HEASLIP: They are very few.

Mr. Ryan: Eastern countries take small parcels in bags.

Mr. HEASLIP: All the wheat we are exporting to Japan and China is in bulk and when it comes to bags it is only in small parcels. In many Asian countries it is received in bags, emptied out, put in cane baskets, and carried away.

Mr. Ryan: Is it not a fact that in some countries the wheat is imported in bulk, placed in bags, and shipped elsewhere?

Mr. HEASLIP: If that is done, I have not heard of it, but I have heard of countries importing in bags, emptying it on the wharf, and placing it in cane baskets so that it can be taken away. An amount of £730,000 is required to complete the job by the bulk handling co-operative and £400,000 of that is under this guarantee to the bank. That leaves £330,000, which is money contributed by the wheatgrowers, by way of tolls. This further equipment is to be used for barley. When farmers agreed to pay the 6d. a bushel, the co-operative had the use of that money interest free for 12 years, and that enabled it to erect silos all over the country. If this £330,000 is to be used for the expansion of existing silos and terminals for the handling of barley, it will mean that wheatgrowers will have to wait longer for more silos. People all over the country still want silos and despite the rapidity of the erection of silos by the co-operative, many more are still required. As far as I can see, if this £330,000 is spent on equipment for handling barley in bulk, it cannot be spent on silos for wheat. It is money that has been contributed by wheatgrowers free of interest. I know that there is a saving clause or an understanding, and I hope it works out. Reference to it is contained in the Minister's second reading explanation, as follows:

Agreement in principle was accordingly reached some months ago between the two

authorities that the South Australian company should provide the initial funds, construct the facilities and continue to own and operate them, the Barley Board meeting reasonable operation and maintenance costs and payments to amortize the full cost of the structures over 20 years and of the machinery over 10 years.

In other words at the end of 20 years the silos will become the property of the wheatgrowers and if the machinery is not worn out it will also become the property of the growers in 10 years. That is only right and proper. In my opinion that is the saving clause. As the co-operative is using the wheatgrowers' money to provide facilities for handling barley, it is only right that the money should be returned to them.

Mr. Bywaters: The barleygrowers will probably pay a toll.

Mr. HEASLIP: I don't know. They will probably pay for the handling charges and the maintenance of the machinery. Therefore, there will have to be a toll or some charge on barleygrowers.

Mr. Bywaters: Why didn't the co-operative consider that?

Mr. HEASLIP: There are no barleygrowers in that co-operative, only wheatgrowers. The wheatgrowers still will not have the facilities that the wheatgrowers have; they still will not be able to handle entirely in bulk as do the wheatgrowers. No doubt they will have full bulk handling facilities in time, but at present they have not. I support the Bill. I think the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited is doing a good job, and I am pleased that the barleygrowers will have the same opportunity to make their work easier and their costs lower.

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa): Some splendid instances of co-operation are associated with this legislation. First of all, we have the continued co-operation of this Government and, indeed, this Parliament with the Commonwealth Banking Corporation in expediting bulk handling in South Australia by way of cash guarantees executed through the bank's backing of the company. Last year we had a measure similar to this Bill, when £500,000 was guaranteed by this Parliament and the Commonwealth Banking Corporation in respect of the advance made to the company, and the fillip then given to the building of silos throughout South Australia was soon evident.

The second point of co-operation which I note very happily is the commonsense and laudable working together of the Australian Barley Board with the co-operative in this

matter. Through this co-operation there will be avoided undue duplication of installations and harbour out-loading facilities, and so on. I pay a tribute to a fine spirit being evinced by the Barley Board, barleygrowers generally, and the co-operative, because, after all, cereal growers in South Australia have a common interest, and if they can use the same facilities then it is to the advantage of both barley and wheatgrowers. The co-operative in this instance will supply the initial funds, construct silos, own and operate them, and charge a reasonable fee for handling barley through the silos, and thereby the full cost of structures will be amortized over 20 years and the cost of machinery over 10 years. We have there a situation of good commonsense business practice.

It is pleasing to note that of the total cost of £730,000 required to facilitate certain extensions in respect of the ability to handle bulk barley, £330,000 can be provided by the co-operative from its own funds. That is really good, bearing in mind that this authority has been operating for only five or six years. The £440,000 remaining is coming from the Commonwealth Banking Corporation, and half of that amount is being guaranteed by this Parliament. The third reference is in respect to the co-operation the Leader showed when in March he was approached by the Premier and his views sought in respect to giving certain assurances to the bank that this Parliament ultimately would back the State Government's guarantee. Mr. Speaker, I commend the co-operative action of the Leader at that time in not holding up a necessary and progressive movement.

Mr. Frank Walsh: But I did not know at that time that this matter had gone before the Industries Development Committee.

Mr. LAUCKE: I referred to the Leader's preparedness to say that this Parliament as a whole would back the guarantee sought by the co-operative. I commend the Leader for what he did.

Mr. Frank Walsh: That is only one aspect of it: the Industries Development Committee also had a say in it, and its recommendation was different from the provision in this Bill.

Mr. LAUCKE: The Industries Development Committee, or whichever body it is to which these matters are from time to time referred, has been of great assistance in giving effect to a purposeful and constructive approach to more efficient industry in this State. When one views the installations for bulk handling and notes how rapidly the capacity has increased

in this State and how the overseas demand for receiving grain in bulk is growing more and more, then the wisdom of those who fought hard for the introduction of bulk handling in South Australia is worthy of praise. I pay a tribute to you, Mr. Speaker, for the real part that you played in espousing the cause of modern approaches to handling grain.

The report which the Hon. Sir Cecil Hincks made on his return from Europe last year is relevant to this evening's debate. That comprehensive report concerns the marketing of grain in Europe, with particular reference to barley. One of the questions he was asked, at the request of the South Australian Wheat and Woolgrowers' Association, to inquire into was whether the importation of barley was preferred in bulk as against bags by the maltsters and grain merchants and the trade generally in France, Germany, Belgium, Denmark and any other countries he might visit. On his return it was apparent that without exception every overseas market preferred to receive grain in bulk. Again, it vindicates the judgment of those who, in about 1955, pressed for bulk handling in South Australia.

I should like to refer briefly to the ability to store barley, particularly in bulk, about which major doubts have been expressed. South Australia is fortunate in having a climate that produces a healthy grain. Our conditions climatically are such that our grain finishes off normally in extreme heat. It is a healthy grain of low moisture content, with no inherent infestation or moulds associated with the harvested grain, as is so often evident in European countries, where the finishing of the harvest is not blessed with the same brilliant sunshine as we enjoy. I was interested to read in Sir Cecil's report that in Ireland the barley is reaped at a moisture figure of 24 per cent; that is reduced to 12 per cent through aeration, and the barley can then be stored for two years without deterioration. Sir Cecil was told in Dublin that if barley was stored at 14 per cent moisture content there would be infestation in six or eight weeks; down to 12 per cent it was safe, even in the moist conditions of Ireland.

Sir Cecil reported that in Germany barley is brought back to 13.5 per cent with no show of weevil infestation for 12 months. In Canada barley can be stored, he stated, almost indefinitely at a moisture content of 12 per cent. In South Australia we reap much of our wheat at 10 per cent moisture content and

barley at 12 to 13 per cent, and it is a healthy 12 to 13 per cent that can be reduced to 12 per cent quite easily under normal summer conditions or through aeration systems. Therefore, on world viewing of the ability to hold our grain under healthy conditions for 12 months, if we insist on not receiving bulk barley in at a higher figure than 12 per cent moisture, we should have no trouble in storing barley free from weevil and other pests and free from mould and any movement towards malting.

This type of legislation affords me great pleasure to support because it is of assistance to individual growers and, collectively, it is of major assistance to the whole economy of the State and through the State to the nation. I hope that should the co-operative seek further finance to enable it to extend its facilities more rapidly than it otherwise could from its own earnings, this Parliament will be prepared to back such application for assistance. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray): I support the second reading of this Bill. Something seems to be wrong with the second reading speeches on this occasion. I think all members will agree with me that your absence from the floor of the House, Mr. Speaker, leaves the speeches on this Bill somewhat lacking because, on all past occasions, we have had you, as the honourable member for Ridley, speaking vociferously on these questions. I was interested to read the *Hansard* report of the debate of 12 months ago when this question was last before the House, particularly the speech of the honourable member for Ridley, and to recall that he was not agreed with by at least one other member and that the then Speaker (Hon. B. H. Teusner) had some difficulty in keeping him to the relevant clauses in the Bill. The same thing has happened this evening and this Bill is similar to the previous one.

All members on both sides of the House are fully appreciative of the work of the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited. The co-operative is doing a good job in its field. I know, too, that the point raised by some speakers in relation to the cutting down on work is appreciated by farmers and by every man who has had a bag of wheat across his shoulders. Anyone who has lumped wheat for any time knows it is not an easy job. In every instance where progress has taken place something should replace it and in this regard I appreciate the position of the member for Wallaroo. I was pleased to hear the member

for Rocky River refer to this point, saying that he was sorry, because that means that at least members on the other side share a mutual understanding of the position.

I know that farmers, particularly, have appreciated the modern facilities available to them. Perhaps one difficulty associated with this is the rapid growth of the industry. One of the disadvantages is that farmers have to hold their grain for some time waiting for available facilities. The facilities will eventually catch up but, in a season of heavy yield, the problem of holding the grain is very real. On more than one occasion I have been told that farmers would like to have disposed of their grain but the silos have been full and, instead of trucking it on the railways, they have had to hold it. That has caused them some concern. More silos are to be built and that will take up some of the slack but, until that stage is reached, this difficulty will be experienced with heavy yields.

Problems are associated with barley and this House is indebted to Sir Cecil Hincks for his extensive survey of the position overseas. This problem still remains to be overcome and we still have some difficulty with the bulk handling of barley. Local experience, coupled with the experience overseas, will probably overcome many of the difficulties and it is to be hoped that some advantages will accrue because barleygrowers are at a disadvantage. In fact, some barleygrowers are going out of barleygrowing into wheatgrowing because of the disadvantages associated with the barley industry. If these facilities can be provided for barley that will prove to be an advantage.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): I wish to briefly support the Bill because the terminal at Port Adelaide will be the first terminal for the Adelaide Division, which has been at a tremendous disadvantage regarding the disposal of surpluses. The handling of surplus holdings, over and above the silo capacity, at the respective sidings has been limited to millers and consequently, once the silos have been filled, deliveries to the sidings have been held up through lack of space. A commendable effort on the part of the Wheat Board over the last two seasons has been to make trucking available and to carry the cost of freight of trucking wheat from the South-East to Wallaroo for shipping.

This money is to be guaranteed to assist in the construction of the Adelaide terminal and that will prove to be of tremendous advantage to the Mallee and the South-East districts where I live and which I represent. Barley, as the

member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) said, has many problems associated with it. Although those problems are not insurmountable we must find a quick method of assessing the quality of barley to determine it without sending samples to the board for classification. Until we can do that we will have some difficulty in delivering and storing barley for shipment in bulk. The provision of a 1,100,000-bushel storage at Port Adelaide, in addition to the storage available for wheat, will make the in transit and shipping of bulk barley much more rapid than in the past and will do away with bag slitting into holds. I have much pleasure in supporting the guaranteeing of this money for this purpose.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Enactment of principal Act."

Mr. HALL: Can the Minister say whether this will be the last time that Parliament will be asked to consider a guarantee to the co-operative? Later in the session we shall be considering an amendment to the Loans to Producers Act and I believe that will remove from Parliament supervisory power in this matter and vest it in the Treasurer.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Agriculture): I think that matter could be more appropriately raised when we are considering the other measure. I am not definite on the matter, but I do not know that this legislation has any bearing on the Loans to Producers Act. I understand that this is merely an amendment to the Bulk Handling of Grain Act and that it would be necessary to have another Bill of this type if similar action were to be taken in future.

Mr. RICHES: I did not speak in the second reading debate because of the degree of co-operation mentioned by the member for Barossa, and the fact that some of the work has already been authorized by arrangement between the Government and the Leader of the Opposition. However, I am still of the opinion that expenditure of this kind should be examined by the Public Works Committee. I am fortified in that opinion by other inquiries that have been made. The Public Works Committee investigated and reported on the possibilities of bulk handling of grain. This expenditure by the company will not come directly under the control of the Minister, but it is expenditure under an Act of Parliament. The amount involved is about twice the amount needed for an investigation by the Public Works Committee into a project.

There is a feeling that some of the storage of grain should be done as was originally proposed, and that there should be intermediate sidings rather than have the storage at outports. I do not know that that suggestion has been completely answered, and the Railways Department and the Highways Department have given strong evidence on the matter. The storage at intermediate sidings, with the Railways Department moving the wheat to outports, getting back-loading with superphosphate, and the farmers carting their wheat from the farms to the sidings, is an economic factor that should be considered by someone. The Bill circumvents any inquiry. I question the need for a Government guarantee of this nature. If the banking institutions can find a proposition more sound than this one I should like to hear of it. The company is efficient and it is supported by the tolls collected from farmers engaged in wheat handling. The company has assets far in excess of the amount of the loan. Again I am fortified by the opinions of others. They have investigated the matter and say that there is adequate security available to the Commonwealth Bank to merit the advance without any guarantee from the Government. It is a perfectly sound proposition.

Mr. Hall: We shall not be running any risk.

Mr. RICHES: I do not suggest that there will be a risk, but there should be an upper limit for Government guarantees. The giving of this guarantee could affect the giving of guarantees in other directions. An agreement has been entered into and cannot be altered here, but that does not prevent me from giving my opinion, in support of which there is much evidence. The Commonwealth Bank could finance the business without any State guarantee. The farmers will appreciate that it is to the credit of both sides of this Parliament that the guarantee is being supported because the bank is not prepared to come to the party. The bank has been remiss in that it has not come to the party before. We take a dim view of its refusal to make an advance two years ago. There is no alternative at this stage but to give the guarantee, and I do not oppose the clause. The Minister knows that the Bill has our full support. I am not yet satisfied that the Chairman of the Public Works Committee is not on fairly sound grounds when he claims that this additional expenditure should have been referred back to the committee for inquiry.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Works): The honourable member said that this matter should have been investigated by the Public Works Committee, but this is not a work within the terms of that committee's Act. The Government is not doing any work, and, in fact, it is not providing any money. It is backing the operations of the company with the good name of the State by standing behind the loan being provided by the bank. This is a continuity of the policy laid down and subscribed to by Parliament when the original Bulk Handling of Grain Act was passed. The finances of the company have always been raised in part by the tolls imposed on wheat, not barley. In the first instance it was the bulk handling of wheat that was considered. At this moment we are offering a guarantee for the bulk handling of barley and the provision of facilities therefor.

The Barley Board, incidentally, does not collect tolls on growers' grain but it does, of course, have access to and control of the funds of the growers as they are provided from the sales of barley. So the board can recoup itself. But the board found itself in the position that recouping itself from growers' proceeds at a rate that would meet the need was a charge on the growers in the first few years when the cost was incurred, which would be far too great an impact on growers' returns. So the board felt there must be some long-term aspect to this project and it approached the Government for a guarantee of a loan through the Commonwealth Bank to finance this development. That is proper, as I am sure all will agree.

The honourable member then said that the Government should not have to guarantee the loan. If honourable members knew the support that the Commonwealth Bank has given to the Barley Board, and therefore to the barley-growers, over the years, they would hesitate to criticize the bank's operations. I happen to have had some experience in this matter during the years I was on the Barley Board, and can say that the Commonwealth Bank has stood up magnificently to the requirements of the operations of the board. When one realizes that the Barley Board has no source of finance, no Commonwealth Government support—

Mr. Nankivell: More's the pity!

Mr. PEARSON: I am not so sure about that. It has no support from the Commonwealth Government, as wheat has. It operates entirely on a business basis, accepting grain from the growers, selling it and handing on the

proceeds to the growers. Therefore, the first finance to the growers has to be provided entirely out of borrowed money. The Commonwealth Bank has year after year accepted the requisitions made upon it by the Barley Board and provided the money for the first advance. I think the relations between the Barley Board and the Commonwealth Bank have been of the happiest nature. The bank has met the board's requirements, has recognized that the board has been soundly administered over the years and, therefore, has been able to accept with confidence its applications. Perhaps that explanation will help clear up the position contemplated by the honourable member.

I should be the last person to criticize the Commonwealth Bank for the way in which it has supported the Barley Board. This is additional finance for capital expenditure over a period of years, and I think no criticism can be levelled at the bank or its administration for working with the Government. The State should stand behind the co-operative in providing this money. I agree entirely with the honourable member that there is no doubt whatever that the operation is sound, that the Government will not be called upon to make good its guarantee, and that it will not be called upon actually to pay any money. I refute the further point made, that the offering of guarantees to such organizations limits the Government's capacity to provide funds for other purposes. That is not so. The Government is not in the position of the private guarantor *vis-a-vis* an ordinary customer, where he has to provide collateral in support of his guarantee. Therefore, its operations in the financing of other works are not affected.

Mr. RICHES: Section 14 (4) of the Bulk Handling of Grain Act, 1955, provides:

The company shall not erect a terminal bin except in accordance with plans and specifications reported on by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works and approved by the Minister.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: That has been done.

Mr. RICHES: My point was that I considered that this matter should have been referred to the Public Works Committee for the erection of these additional bins.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: So it was.

Mr. RICHES: If that has been done, it meets that requirement. The Minister in reply said that that was not a requirement, that that was not necessary.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: No. There are two aspects involved: Government expenditure and company expenditure.

Mr. Coumbe: It is Paper No. 24 on the file.

Mr. RICHES: I have it here. My other point is the financing by the Commonwealth Bank. I think the Minister knows that the Commonwealth Bank did refuse the bulk handling company finance two years ago.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Yes, I am not complaining about that.

Mr. RICHES: The Minister said that the Commonwealth Bank was in order in refusing to make the advance.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I agree that, without security, they were entitled to refuse.

Mr. RICHES: You agree that the Commonwealth Bank should have made the money available. If the Minister is in agreement on that, I shall not say anything further.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.29 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 29, at 2 p.m.