

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, October 16, 1962.

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

QUESTIONS.**TROTTING.**

Mr. FRANK WALSH: In the morning's *Advertiser*, on page 15 under the heading "Form Pacers in Free-For-All", an article states that a trotting meeting is to be held at Gawler tonight, at which the feature race will be the "Victor-Gawler Free-For-All". I understand that Victor Harbour and Gawler each have meeting dates, so I do not understand why the main race should refer to both towns. On page 14 of the same paper, under the heading "Trotting Schedule is Crowded", it is stated that it is proposed to hold two country trotting meetings each week next year. The article lists the number of trotting meetings that are to be held in country districts. Gawler and Port Pirie will have most meetings, although there are 13 country clubs. Kimba is to have one meeting. Each trotting club is entitled to one delegate for the administration of trotting in this State. Country clubs are permitted to transfer from their normal registered courses to others. I have received a letter from the South Australian Trotting Club (as have, I understand, you, Mr. Speaker, and the Chief Secretary), item 5 of which states:

The league proposes to ratify amendments to its rules relating to the trust fund contributed by trotting personnel which do not provide adequate safeguards to ensure that the trust fund is used only for the benefit of those for whom it is intended.

Will the Premier consider the advisability of having these matters discussed in Cabinet with a view to having either the Betting Control Board or a Royal Commission inquire into the administration and control of trotting in this State with terms of reference to cover recommendations as to the number of persons who should be in the position to control trotting in this State, and whether the control should be on a basis similar to that which covers horse racing, and any other matters that need to be determined by any such investigation in the interests of the public?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Chief Secretary reported to me this morning that he had received a letter. I presume it is the letter to which the Leader has referred. Cabinet briefly discussed the subject without

going into the details of the matters involved in the letter. I am happy to ask the Chief Secretary to refer the matter to Cabinet formally. It has always been the policy of the Government—and I think honourable members generally agree with this policy—that it is a good thing for a sporting activity to control its own affairs. We do not wish, and never have wished, to set up a Government-controlled authority for either racing or trotting. We believe that the control of these sports (and, indeed, any other sport) should be vested in an authority that the sporting body itself has set up. I realize the present problems in trotting, and I know that for a number of years there has been much friction between the various factions of the trotting control authority, but I am not sure of the best way to deal with that matter. However, subject to the distinct understanding that the Government would not under any circumstance contemplate Government control of the sport, I shall be pleased to have the matter discussed in Cabinet and inform the Leader in due course.

Mr. JENKINS: I ask leave to make a statement.

The SPEAKER: Is this a personal explanation or a statement?

Mr. JENKINS: A statement, Sir.

Leave granted.

Mr. JENKINS: The Leader of the Opposition expressed concern that the Victor Harbour Trotting Club should have to hold its meetings on courses other than its own. The reason for this is that about 12 or 13 years ago when the club was established it purchased the greater portion of its grounds but the balance required for its activities had to be leased. Some months ago the lessor of that property died. Several legatees are involved in the estate and until the estate has been settled the trotting club will not be able to use its own grounds so it must have recourse to Gawler or some other course to be able to use the dates allotted to it.

PARKING.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I wish to refer to a matter arising from the Premier's telecast last week, which the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) very fairly described last week as the most popular show on television. According to the report in last Friday's *Advertiser*, the telecast referred to the possible use of the park lands for car parking. I understand from that press report that the Premier said that he

did not favour the proposal. An article in this morning's *Advertiser* states:

The Premier is understood to have indicated to the council that the State Government is prepared to make a £120,000 Loan grant available for permanent off-street parking amenities in Adelaide.

Can the Premier give the House further details of what he has in mind, and can he say what offer, if any, has been made to the council?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This matter arose out of a request to the Government for an alteration of the Local Government Act to enable a council that had revenues from parking meters to accumulate those revenues over a period of years for the purpose ultimately of using them for parking accommodation. The Government had some doubts about such a proposal. Sometimes those funds, if they are not directly appropriated for the purpose for which they are intended, become merged in the general funds of the organization and lose their identity. The Government, therefore, was not enamoured of the proposal I have referred to, and I expressed the view that we would be prepared to assist a council desiring to provide off-street parking by securing for it a Loan Council semi-governmental approval and even to assist a council, if possible, in raising the funds arising from that approval. Since then I have had an inquiry from the Adelaide City Council about whether a Loan Council approval could be granted, I think in February. I wrote back and said that it could be granted in February and, in fact, that if it was any advantage I could probably grant it immediately. I think the amount was £120,000 or £150,000. This matter, as far as it has advanced, has been satisfactorily concluded.

Mr. SHANNON: Recently the Municipal Tramways Trust purchased a property of three or four acres, previously owned by Simpson & Son Ltd., between Wakefield and Angas Streets. It has been suggested (and I think it is a good suggestion) that the area be used not only for off-street parking for Tramways Trust buses (for which it was originally purchased) but as a centre for buses which serve areas adjacent to the metropolitan area and which cause no end of nuisance to municipal authorities in finding space in the streets for them. However, I believe that because the Tramways Trust has for some years been subsidized by the State Government this scheme would need the approval of the Government, even though the trust is not directly a State undertaking. I think this project could answer many problems and, as the Premier announced that

financial assistance would be given to councils in this field, the Government could have a finger in the pie regarding policy. Will the Premier take up this matter with the trust in the first instance and with the city fathers, who are concerned with this problem, to see whether a solution to provide a useful additional parking area in a convenient site fairly centrally situated cannot be found?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I know the property to which the honourable member refers. I believe it is the last large one-floor area in the city proper, and it will undoubtedly be valuable in the future. It was acquired by the Municipal Tramways Trust because pressure had been brought upon it to vacate its premises in Victoria Square. The trust has a long-range programme to transfer its operations from Victoria Square to this property, which is not so close to the centre of the city. At present this property is leased and is producing revenue, so I do not believe it is readily available for the purpose the honourable member contemplates. Also, I am certain the trust would not be prepared to make it available, as it wishes to plan for its own use of the property in future.

RAILWAY REFRESHMENT SERVICES.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Notices frequently appear in the *South Australian Railway Weekly* calling for applications for vacancies as managers of railway refreshment services; these notices indicate the salary and say that the position includes the services of the wife of the manager. It is common knowledge that managers' wives often have to do the work of their husbands because the managers are called upon to work in the early hours of the morning and the late hours of the night and are rostered off duty on Thursdays. People who would apply for these positions are concerned because South Australia is the only State in the Commonwealth in which no provision is made for the managers' wives to be covered by workmen's compensation and, should they meet with an accident, they are not entitled to any payment, it being claimed that they are not employed by the South Australian Railways Commissioner. As the notices calling for applications mention managers' wives, as they are employed in accordance with those notices, and as they have to relieve their husbands in carrying out an essential service, will the Premier as Acting Minister of Railways have this matter investigated to see if workmen's compensation cannot be extended to these women in the event of accident?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The law relating to workmen's compensation would override any administrative provision of the Railways Commissioner or his officers. If a person is employed by an authority and has an accident in the course of that employment, that person is covered by workmen's compensation. I am not sure what duties these ladies perform or whether those duties amount to an employment but I am certain that, if the duties amount to employment by the Commissioner, as employer he must automatically take full responsibility for any accident that occurs during the course of that employment. However, I shall have the matter cleared up for the honourable member, get a full report from the Railways Commissioner and, if any action is necessary, I will see that it is taken.

COPPER EXPORTS.

Mr. RICHES: Recently the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn) and I asked the Premier questions about freight rates on copper ore between Australia and Japan and claimed that it was more expensive to send copper ore from Port Augusta to Port Kembla than from Port Augusta to Japan. The Premier undertook to have this matter investigated and to inform the House why there should be this difference in freight rates. Has he been able to investigate our statements?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have not yet received a full reply. I asked the Director of Mines to investigate this matter and he has informed me that copper ore is being shipped from Port Augusta to Japan because it thereby brings a higher return than if it were shipped to Newcastle or Port Kembla. Whether that is due to the freight rate or the price paid by the authority purchasing it I am not sure. I am pursuing the matter to see whether I can get information on the precise freight rates being paid in both instances.

UNEMPLOYMENT.

Mr. HARDING: Can the Premier indicate the present unemployment position in this State and say how the figures compare with those of other States of the Commonwealth?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have no direct knowledge of this matter; the figures the honourable member wants are compiled by a Commonwealth authority. I did notice in the *Advertiser* this morning a statement to the general effect that there had been a fall in unemployment throughout the whole

of the Commonwealth and that South Australia had shared in that fall. The percentage of unemployed in South Australia was stated as being 1.3 and, if my memory is correct, I think the highest figure was for either Tasmania or New South Wales, neither of which has the advantage of a Liberal Government.

WHYALLA PETITION.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Has the Government yet had an opportunity further to consider the petition from Whyalla in respect of an all-road bus service from Whyalla to Adelaide and from Adelaide to Whyalla and, if not, will that matter be given early consideration?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This is not normally a matter that is decided by Cabinet because, under the State's road control legislation, the Transport Control Board is a Royal Commission appointed under an Act of Parliament, and it is the controlling authority. It is true that on occasions we have made representations to the Transport Control Board, which has accepted them. It is equally true that on other occasions we have made representations that have not been accepted. So the only matter in which Cabinet would be directly concerned would be an amendment of the Act itself. I would hesitate to indicate to the House that the Government at this stage would consider abolishing the Transport Control Board because we believe it exercises a useful co-ordinating control in many districts. However, the matter is being examined to see whether something can be done. Incidentally, I have had (and they are available to the honourable member and other honourable members) factual reports from the Railways Commissioner about this matter. We are examining them to see whether we can usefully assist, but the Government would not be prepared at this stage to abolish the Transport Control Board; indeed, we do not contemplate substantially altering the law in that direction.

PREMIER'S DEPARTMENT.

Mr. COUMBE: His Excellency in his Speech opening this session of Parliament announced the Government's intention of setting up a Premier's Department. Can the Premier say what progress has been made in the formation of this department?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Much consideration has been given to the necessary legislation and to the main purposes to be achieved. I hope that appropriate legislation will be available this session.

ELECTORAL ROLL.

Mr. LAWN: Of recent years parts of what was formerly known as the British Empire have been granted independence. Ghana is one example, and there are others. In all cases, the new constitutions have provided that one roll shall be used for the election of both Houses. The press, both yesterday evening and again this morning, reported that a Select Committee in the last few days had concluded its deliberations in regard to a constitution for the Territory of Papua and New Guinea, and it was unanimously recommended by that committee that a common roll be used for the Legislative Council. How long will South Australia remain one of the backward countries and how long shall we have to wait for progressive legislation here to bring us up to the level of the countries I have mentioned?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It may be that we shall introduce legislation dealing with the franchise of the Legislative Council next year.

GUMMOSIS.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Has the Minister of Agriculture a considered reply to a question I asked on September 25 relating to an intensification of research work on combating gummosis in apricot orchards, in terms of the resolution passed by the State conference of the Australian Dried Fruits Association?

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

Apricot gummosis has for many years been a serious disease in the Barossa district and has been the subject of a considerable amount of research work. One of the most important results of this work was the recommendation to adopt a modified form of pruning or non-pruning. This is not a completely satisfactory solution to the gummosis problem but it has enabled reasonably successful production to continue. However these recommendations have not been followed by many Barossa growers. Another major contribution by research workers at the Waite Institute and Department of Agriculture was to discover the complete life cycle of the fungus and to obtain information on the release and distribution of spores. This work is being continued in the department, using a Hirst automatic spore trap, and is providing new avenues of investigation which will be followed up as quickly as possible.

Research on gummosis occupies a good deal of the time of a departmental research officer, working in collaboration with district horticultural advisers. Progress in gummosis research could be accelerated if funds and personnel were available. In planning

research programmes, however, attention must be paid to all aspects, and bearing in mind that gummosis is only a minor problem in the irrigated areas, it is felt that a fair proportion of the total effect is being directed towards gummosis research. It is pointed out that while this disease is important in Tasmania, New Zealand and California, South Australia is acknowledged as leading the field in an understanding of the problem. This is instanced by the fact that a leading plant pathologist from the United States has come to South Australia to study the work being done here. It is possible that this may be the means of stimulating research in California which will be of value to us. In the past, no leads or help of any kind have been received from other areas where gummosis occurs.

WEST BEACH RECREATION RESERVE.

Mr. FRED WALSH: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about the leasing of the kiosk at the West Beach recreation reserve?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Chairman of the West Beach Recreation Reserve Trust (Mr. Baker) reports:

With reference to the question by Mr. Fred Walsh in Parliament last week, I have to advise that an application for the lease of an area of approximately 350 yards by 300 yards for the construction of a holiday village on the West Beach Recreation Reserve has been approved in principle by the trust. The proposed holiday village will be equipped to house 300 guests in self-contained units with all modern amenities. The lessees will plant trees and lawns, construct a swimming pool, tennis courts, children's playground, dining and recreation rooms, and the whole project is estimated to cost approximately £250,000. Work will commence early in January, 1963, and complete and detailed plans and specifications are to be submitted for the trust's approval before any work is undertaken.

The lease will be for 25 years with the right of renewal for a further 25 years. Rental for the first three years will be at the rate of £2,000 per annum and for the following five years at the rate of £2,500 per annum, the rate to be reviewed thereafter at 10-yearly intervals. Rental is to be paid yearly in advance and to commence on January 1, 1964, or earlier if the project is completed earlier. Lessees will be responsible for rates and any taxes, and will maintain the whole area to the satisfaction of the trust. Apart from the rental payable by the lessees, the trust should benefit financially from patronage of the new golf links by guests at the holiday village. The project has the unqualified endorsement of the Director of the Government Tourist Bureau who regards it as a most desirable tourist attraction. The trust is satisfied that its action in granting this lease does not conflict in any way with sections 33, 34 and 35 of the West Beach Recreation Reserve Act. In fact, section 35 (b) specifically empowers the trust to grant building leases, which is being done in this case.

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES.

Mr. McKEE: Recently the Premier suggested two proposals regarding the redistribution of electoral boundaries in South Australia. Does he intend to do anything about those proposals this session?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I hope that the legislation will be completed in time for introduction, probably on Thursday.

BUS PERMIT.

Mr. HALL: Recently I had brought to my notice a complaint about another indiscriminate decision of the Transport Control Board—the type of decision to which we have become accustomed. This decision was as reactionary and as obnoxious as were past decisions. The Secretary of the Whitwarta Women's Agricultural Bureau has complained to me that a transport operator was refused a permit to charter a bus to the bureau for a one-day trip to Adelaide from Balaklava. The women intended coming to the city on an Agricultural Bureau trip, which is educational as well as enjoyable. These people are extremely irate at being refused the right to come to the city by bus. They were told that this decision was made because they would be competing with the railways. No Bluebird service has been supported more than the Gladstone service, and there seems to be little justification for stopping this one-day trip to Adelaide. Will the Premier use his great ability and infinite patience to endeavour to convince the Transport Control Board that it is not helping the Railways Department by refusing short day trips and that frequently it forces more private vehicles on to the road than would be the case were a bus chartered? Will the Premier have this policy reviewed for future occasions?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will obtain a report.

CRUSHING PLANT.

Mr. CASEY: I understand that the Premier has a reply to my recent question about the crushing plant that has operated between Yongala and Mannanarie.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Commissioner of Highways reports:

This department has no immediate requirements for additional crushed stone in the Yongala or Mannanarie locality. It is understood that the contractor left the plant in its present position as he did not have work for it elsewhere. It is not known if further stone will be crushed from this quarry.

GUIDE POSTS.

Mr. HEASLIP: Some time ago guide posts on our main country roads were marked with white illuminating paint on the right-hand side and red illuminating paint on the left. These signs were and are of great benefit to the travelling public, but on recent country trips I have noticed that whereas the white paint is still bright the red illumination has faded and has almost disappeared. Will the Premier, as Acting Minister of Roads, ascertain why the red paint has lost its brilliance and whether it can be restored to assist the motoring public?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will inquire.

THIRD PARTY INSURANCE.

Mr. RYAN: Members have frequently raised the question of the liability of insurance companies after they have gone insolvent. The member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke) has been interested in this matter. Last evening I was approached by a constituent who had insured, as required by law, for third party cover with the Nottingham Insurance Co. He was involved in an accident and he then discovered that he had to deal with the Australian and Overseas Insurance Co. Ltd. He is the defendant in a claim for £5,000. As he has been married recently, he is involved in considerable personal debts on his new home and he is concerned about what may happen if judgment is given against him for the full claim. Although the Premier has indicated that the Government intends to introduce legislation to cover these incidents in future, could this matter be taken up with the Fire and Accident Underwriters' Association so that individuals will not find themselves heavily in debt through circumstances over which they have no control when judgments are made against them?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: In reply to a question earlier this session I indicated that the insurance companies as a whole did not approve of legislation that would require one insurance company to be responsible for the shortcomings of a competitor, but that they would be prepared to co-operate if legislation were enacted to make them jointly responsible in future for the failure of one of their members. However, they said they were not prepared to co-operate or assume any liability regarding retrospectivity, and I think the honourable member can see that there is considerable justice in that statement. I personally regret that two insurance companies, one of which was a company of very long standing, have defaulted. If the honourable member will give

me the facts of the case he referred to, without promising that I can give redress in the matter I will have it examined to see whether there is any possibility of assisting.

ROBE PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. CORCORAN: I understand that steps were to be taken during this year to provide improved classroom accommodation at the Robe Primary School, that a new dual unit was planned for teaching purposes, and that it was intended to use the old stone building as a multi-purpose room. However, there has been no indication yet that this work will be carried out this year. I have visited the school and am aware of the shortcomings of the present accommodation, which is overcrowded and certainly not conducive to good education. Will the Minister of Education have this matter investigated and see whether he can have the provision of this accommodation speeded up?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Yes.

MODBURY-SMITHFIELD ROAD.

Mr. LAUCKE: I believe the Minister of Works has a reply to my recent question concerning the installation of safety fencing on certain sections of the Modbury-Smithfield main road.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Acting Minister of Roads, has been informed by the Commissioner of Highways that a contract has been let for the erection of safety fencing on the Modbury-Smithfield main road, which work should be commenced almost immediately.

SUGAR GUM PRESERVATION.

Mr. QUIRKE: As is well known, the treatment of radiata pine is now so effective that small growth three inches in diameter can be used for posts which will have a long life. It has occurred to me that our sugar gum, which is a very straight and fast grower, might be treated in the same way, particularly when used as part of shelter belts for farms, thus giving a final cash value to this timber. It would be suitable for that purpose only if it were grown in association with low-growing scrubby type of cover in order to break the winds, because it is a tall-growing tree. Incidentally, the sugar gum provides one of the best of our honeys and is much sought after. For bird shelter and for nectar it would be ideal, grown with small scrub, but unfortunately it is a favourite food of termites. However, by using the preservation methods adopted for radiata pine, sugar gum could

become a valuable timber, provided it was suitable for that type of preservation. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether tests have been made in this connection?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I do not know how sugar gum responds to treatment, but I know that many kinds of timber other than radiata pine can be treated satisfactorily. I believe the point on which radiata pine scores is that it is such soft timber that it will absorb the creosote or other treatment much better than can the hardwood. However, in any round timber the sapwood should absorb creosote to some extent. I shall inquire about the possibilities of treating sugar gum and let the honourable member know.

TAILEM BEND MAIN.

Mr. BYWATERS: Has the Minister of Works a reply to a question I asked some time ago relating to a water main adjacent to the main street in Tailem Bend?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes. The approved scheme for the improvement to the Tailem Bend water supply does not provide for the laying of a water main in the main street (Railway Terrace). The business houses and shops in Railway Terrace all face the western side of the street and are supplied directly from a 6-inch main at the rear in Murray Street. This main, which is adequately equipped with fire plugs at the standard 4-chain intervals, can be used to serve both the buildings facing Railway Terrace and those facing Princes Highway. The laying of an additional main in Railway Terrace does not appear to be justified.

HOUSING TRUST OFFICER.

Mr. LANGLEY: I believe the Premier has a reply to my recent question concerning a South Australian Housing Trust officer travelling to Perth to board a liner to interview South Australian migrants regarding the purchase of Housing Trust houses.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Chairman of the Housing Trust reports that during the late 1940's and early 1950's the Housing Trust was continually embarrassed by the number of migrant families seeking housing accommodation throughout the State. Many of these families were, at that time, forced to live in poor circumstances and some were paying exorbitant rents for holiday or otherwise temporary accommodation. In an attempt to help these families the trust undertook in 1952 to make up to six houses available for sale each month from its normal group

schemes. This initial undertaking was so successful that the trust, at the request of and in close co-operation with the Director of Immigration, undertook to expand the scheme and generally assist in the overall migrant policy by making up to 16 houses available for sale each month from the normal group schemes throughout the State. It was found, however, that many families were still under a misapprehension in regard to housing and did not clearly understand the general Australian conditions, the value of Australian currency in relation to sterling, the cost of living, etc., and to overcome these and other factors the trust established one of its offices in South Australia House, London. During the last 10 months the trust has, in co-operation with the Commonwealth Immigration Department, also arranged for a member of its staff to board some migrant ships at Fremantle for the purpose of explaining to migrants, prior to their landing at Port Adelaide, general conditions in South Australia with respect to housing and to answer other queries. Sales of houses are not made on the ship and, if any migrant wishes to purchase a house from the trust, negotiations take place after he has been ashore for some time. The trust is informed by migration officials that the trust officer has on many occasions been able to give needed assistance and advice to migrants and is generally regarded as being most helpful.

MEDIAN STRIP.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Some time ago the Manager of the Commercial Bank at Clovelly Park made representations to me about the median strip at the intersection of South Road and Daw Road, and the management of Jansen Motors has complained about loss of trade because of this strip. This morning I received a letter from the proprietor of Kay's Frock Shop about loss of trade and the anticipated further loss of trade because of this strip. Although my representations to have it removed have not been successful, in view of the letter I have just received will the Premier call for a report from the Minister of Roads on whether this strip, which is a temporary measure, cannot be removed?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will refer this matter to the Minister of Roads.

NOTIFYING OF DEFENDANTS.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Under the Justices Act it is possible now for a defendant to plead guilty in writing where a form 4A (complaint and summons) with various endorsements on it

is sent to the defendant. This is normal procedure in minor offences and many people take advantage of the right to plead guilty in writing so that they do not have to make personal appearances before the court. This procedure has expedited the proceedings of justice. However, there is no requirement that the court must notify the defendant of the result and many cases have occurred in which defendants who have pleaded guilty on form 4A simply have not known what has happened to them and warrants have been issued against them for default on a penalty imposed by the court about which, until that date, they knew nothing. The form does not tell them they are bound to find out from the court what has occurred. A constituent told me that on October 12 a memorandum was sent to him from the Barmera Court of Summary Jurisdiction informing him that on October 11 he had to pay a fine or go to gaol for 21 days. He did not receive this letter until October 15, so it was a little late. The local policeman told him that it was quite possible that a warrant had already been issued against him. Will the Minister of Education take up with the Attorney-General the possibility of getting some uniform procedure by which defendants who plead guilty on form 4A will be promptly notified of the result in the court so that there will be no possibility of warrants being issued against them when they do not know what penalty has been imposed?

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

HOSPITAL CHARGES.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Premier a reply to a question I asked during the debate on the Estimates about medical benefits for invalid and age pensioners?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Director-General of Medical Services reports:

Much publicity has been given to the need for pensioners and all other persons to contribute to hospital funds, and to benefits which they will receive. This publicity has been given through pensioners' associations, through the hospital funds associations, which regularly advertise the advantages of membership, and through this department which advises all persons inquiring about hospital accounts to join a fund. Members of Parliament have previously raised questions in the House on hospital charges for pensioner patients, and these questions have been answered for Mr. Riches, M.P., Mr. Hutchens, M.P., and for Mr. Frank Walsh, M.P. In view of all this publicity I find it difficult to understand Mr. McKee's contention that pensioners in his district, and he himself, are under the impression that the cost of hospitalization is

completely covered by the payment of 9d. a week under the medical benefits scheme.

The following procedure is adopted in charging pensioner patients: In a Government hospital, where a pensioner is a member of a hospital benefit fund, a charge of 60s. a day less 8s. a day Commonwealth benefits, a net 52s. a day, is made, but when the patient is not a contributor to a fund the Commonwealth benefits are increased to 12s., making a net 48s. A pensioner may apply for a reduction of the daily charge by completing a form showing his weekly income, and, in the case of a husband and wife, their combined financial position, which includes bank assets, property (other than residence), motor vehicle, stocks, shares, bonds, etc.

Each application is considered on its individual merit, in respect of the financial position of the patient, the charge is reduced accordingly, and the balance is remitted. The remission scale is in accordance with approval given by Cabinet. Pensioners and all other patients in difficult financial circumstances are given special discretionary consideration for reduction beyond this approved scale. Normally, a pensioner with limited assets and in receipt of no income other than the pension would be charged 10s. a day. Assessment in other cases would depend on the value of assets, as stated above. However, if a pensioner is a member of a registered hospital fund, a charge would be made equal to the amount payable by the fund, provided that the fund benefit was not less than the patient's assessed charge. Where the assessed charge is paid by the fund, the pension is retained in full by the pensioner.

The scale of reduction of charges applicable to hospitals under the control of this department does not apply to Government-subsidized hospitals. These hospitals are under the control of their own boards and the charges made to pensioners are the subject of their own administration. If a pensioner is hospitalized at one of these or a private hospital, he may be required to pay the full charge; therefore it would be necessary to increase his contribution to a higher scale to meet the account. However, if the illness for which a patient is hospitalized is of a pre-existing nature, a hospital fund would only pay at standard rates, *i.e.*, 28s. a day, and the higher benefit would not apply. Following the revised means test, which became applicable as from March 1, 1961, many pensioner patients are comparatively well off, particularly when compared with a basic wage-earner who has a family to keep.

LIBERAL PARTY CANDIDATES.

Mr. LAWN: I understand from a press report that during the last show week the Liberal Party met in conference in a very depressed atmosphere, confidence being at a low ebb following the State elections of last March, as a result of which one Independent had to join the ranks of the Liberal Party and another Independent had to become the Speaker to give the Liberal Party Government a chance of carrying on. The report states

that the Premier, with the object of uplifting his Party's morale, gave one of his usual pep talks and assured the convention that the Liberal Party had only lent the districts of Unley and Chaffey to the Labor Party. Last week, the Liberal Party announced its candidates for the next election as Mr. McLeay in Unley and Mr. King in Chaffey. In view of the selection of these candidates to represent the Liberal Party at the next elections, can we take it for granted that that loan will be extended *ad infinitum*?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I believe there is not the slightest doubt that the remarks I made to the Liberal Party of Australia will prove to be correct.

ADELAIDE OVAL.

Mr. LANGLEY: I believe the Premier has a reply to my recent question about queues at the Adelaide Oval.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Commissioner of Police reports:

In view of the concern of Mr. Langley, M.P., in this matter, reports were called for from responsible officers and these are attached for the information of the honourable the Premier. Our experience has shown that there is always an initial surge forward with any large queue following the opening of the entrance gate or door, whatever the number of police on duty, and only the first few in the queue suffer any discomfort before passing through the turnstiles. No advice was received by either the officials of the cricket association or members of this department of the conduct complained of by Mr. Langley.

The reports from the officers are available for the honourable member or any other honourable member to peruse if he so desires.

SCHOOL LEAVING AGE.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Recently, I have noticed some proposals regarding the raising of the school leaving age. I appreciate the fact that in 1946 this Parliament gave the Minister of Education the right by proclamation to raise the school leaving age to 15 years. In view of recent comments, can the Minister say whether any consideration has lately been given to the raising of the school leaving age in accordance with the provisions of the Act, as amended in 1946, and, if so, may we expect a decision soon?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: No real consideration has been given recently, either departmentally or governmentally, but my own view is, as it has always been, that we should endeavour progressively to raise the school leaving age. I should like to see it raised in the comparatively near future so

that it would be compulsory for a boy or girl to continue at school for the remainder of the year during which he or she turned 14. Perhaps the honourable member knows that the minimum leaving age in Tasmania is 16 and in New South Wales 15, while in Western Australia I think only a week ago the Act was amended to make it compulsory for a student to remain at school until the end of the year during which he or she attained the age of 14.

That is the minimum age we should require in this day and age in South Australia, and I believe it is possible of achievement. I think our accommodation and staffing have so improved that we could do that, but that is purely my own personal opinion; I do not think it is shared by my department, and I have not recently discussed it with Cabinet. However, in the recess I hope to consider it seriously, and it would be easy, if my colleagues agreed with me after due consideration and investigation, for a proclamation to be issued in ample time for the law to be altered next year.

PORT AUGUSTA SCHOOLS.

Mr. RICHES: On October 3, the Minister of Education said that he would discuss with the Director of Education the Port Augusta Central Primary School and requests relating to fencing and to the policy of the department with regard to a proposed fourth school. I remind the Minister that it is 13 months since the department was informed that the land was ready for fencing. We are anxious to get on with the work so that the ground can be used in the coming cricket season. Has the Minister of Education yet had an opportunity of discussing the matter with the Director?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Yes, I have had several opportunities and have taken advantage of them, but the Director cannot yet give me a final recommendation. The last talk I had with him was today because I understood that the member for Stuart would be on his feet asking me a question. The Director said he hoped (and there may be a promise in that) that he would be able to give me definite information so that the honourable member would be able to report on this matter to his constituents next weekend. I hope that either tomorrow or on Thursday I shall be able to supply further information.

POISONS CENTRE.

Mr. RICHES: Has the Premier a reply to questions I have asked about the estab-

lishment of a poisons centre at the Royal Adelaide Hospital?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Director General of Public Health reports:

Poisons centres are often referred to as poisons information centres, and their object is to give immediate advice on treatment to medical and other inquirers in cases of known or suspected poisoning with poisons of known composition or substances whose exact nature is not known to the inquirer. There is such a centre at the Adelaide Children's Hospital operating at all times. In addition the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the Department of Public Health deal with many such inquiries. The Commonwealth Health Department is at present preparing, at the request of the National Health and Medical Research Council, a comprehensive poisons register of poisonous substances in use in Australia, and their nature and treatment. This register will be distributed to all Australian poisons information centres, and will be kept up to date by regular supplements.

The correspondent quoted in the question raises a different problem—that of the diagnosis of poisoning in patients brought to hospitals. It is stated that "it should be possible to diagnose such cases at least within 48 hours". This is usually possible and many cases are diagnosed much more quickly than that. There remain some difficult cases where symptoms are unusual or complicated by the presence of other diseases. Medical staffs in the hospitals and other doctors are aware of these problems, and facilities for speedy diagnosis are available and in regular use.

CEMENT BRICKS.

Mr. TAPPING (on notice):

1. What quantity of cement bricks was manufactured at Yatala Labour Prison by prisoners in each of the financial years from 1957-58 to 1961-62?
2. Who are the principal purchasers?
3. What is the current selling price?
4. To what extent (if any) are those engaged in the production of these bricks compensated?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The replies are:

	Quantity.
1. July 1, 1957, to June 30, 1958	2,304,816
July 1, 1958, to June 30, 1959	3,700,457
July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960	4,072,100
July 1, 1960, to June 30, 1961	3,254,446
July 1, 1961, to June 30, 1962	2,463,855
2. South Australian Housing Trust; Public Buildings Department; Engineering and Water Supply Department.	
3. Inside greys	£10 a thousand.
Faced greys	£11 15s. a thousand.
Red-faced	£14 a thousand.
Cream-faced	£13 10s. a thousand.
4. Prisoners are compensated by payments as earnings at an average rate of 2s. 6d. a day.	

WAR SERVICE LAND SETTLEMENT.

Mr. Bywaters, for Mr. CURREN (on notice):

1. How many settlers in the Cooltong, Loveday and Loxton war service land settlement areas, respectively, have had their properties assessed and have been notified of their annual commitments?

2. How many settlers in each of these areas have met their commitments on the due date?

3. How many have not met their commitments on the due date?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The replies are:

1. Cooltong, 47; Loveday, 11; Loxton, 170.

2. Cooltong, 8; Loveday, 7; Loxton, 54.

3. Cooltong, 39; Loveday, 4; Loxton, 116.

PRICE CONTROL.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What goods and services are declared goods and services pursuant to section 19 of the Prices Act, 1948-1961?

2. What orders, pursuant to section 21 of the said Act, are in force?

3. To which declared goods do they apply?

4. What is the maximum price fixed in each case for such declared goods?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The replies are:

1. The list of declared goods and services covering the principal items controlled is as follows:

Foodstuffs:

Breakfast foods.

Flour.

Infants and invalids' foods.

Sauce.

Soap.

Milk (country only).

Bread.

Wheat.

Some stock and poultry foods.

Clothing:

Infants, boys and girls and youths and maids' clothing and garments including school and college wear.

Men's working attire.

Cooking and kitchen utensils:

(Utility items only).

Footwear:

Men's.

Women's and children's.

Building:

Most building materials.

Building services (plumbing, electrical, plastering, etc.).

Erection of dwellings.

Repair work, additions and renovations.

Metals, raw or processed:

Galvanized steel pipes and fittings.

Malleable pipe fittings.

Leather and rubber:

Leather.

Tyres and tubes.

School requisites:

Kitbags, satchels and cases.

Exercise books.

Text books.

Miscellaneous:

Firewood.

Superphosphate.

Sulphuric acid.

Petroleum products.

Cartage.

Footwear repairs.

Icecream.

Bags and sacks (secondhand).

2 to 4. As regards these questions the member for Mitcham virtually requires full details of the department's activities on all prices fixed, and even if it were permissible to give a complete answer it would require the mammoth task of extracting the information from the files of the department, as in many cases prices are issued to individual traders—e.g. hundreds of differing country prices for bread, milk and cartage alone. Furthermore, many prices which are fixed on other than a retail basis are confidential other than to those directly concerned and this fact precludes their publication.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORT.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the final report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Port Adelaide Bulk Handling System and Port Adelaide Bulk Grain Bin.

Ordered that report be printed.

METROPOLITAN AND EXPORT ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

MINES AND WORKS INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from October 11. Page 1432.)

Clause 3—"Amendment of principal Act, section 4."

Mr. McKEE: During the second reading debate I suggested that this Bill was designed to give the Broken Hill Associated Smelters Pty. Ltd. control of an area of the Port Pirie wharves where it intended to install

modern shiploading machinery. Can the Premier assure me that if this legislation becomes law and any demarcation of employment on the Port Pirie waterfront becomes evident he will take steps to introduce legislation to overcome it?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): I was not here when this matter was discussed previously, but my colleague, the Minister of Works, has pointed out that this matter was discussed in the Legislative Council and that the Minister of Mines explained it. I do not know whether I would be in order—

The CHAIRMAN: The Premier would be out of order in referring to a debate or discussion in another place.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I refer the honourable member to the *Hansard* report of that discussion.

Mr. McKEE: I have already perused the statements made in the Legislative Council, but the explanation does not answer my question. I am concerned about a possible demarcation of employment. Before the Bill goes further, will the Premier assure me that if a demarcation of employment dispute arises he will take action or introduce legislation to meet that position? The waterside workers at Port Pirie are fearful that this legislation could lead to a demarcation of employment.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: So far as the Government is concerned the sole purpose of this legislation is to fill a gap that exists at present regarding the control of important plant and equipment. The Bill is designed to safeguard industrial workers. The Government does not seek to be involved in an argument between unions and employers over demarcation. We want plant to be operated safely and under proper supervision by a Government department. At present no-one can be officially in control to ensure that safe conditions are maintained.

Mr. McKEE: I agree that the Premier has good intentions and possibly so has the Mines Department, but this provision gives the company control of an area: it could send its employees into this area to load ships, and there is no doubt that that would affect the waterside workers at Port Pirie. I ask the Premier to give some assurance that steps would be taken to prevent that happening.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I can only repeat that the purpose of this amendment is to ensure that a competent authority accepts responsibility for safe working conditions on the wharf adjoining the Smelters.

At present there is no authority that could control such conditions.

Mr. McKee: The waterside workers.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The waterside workers have no control in the form of an official inspection.

Mr. McKee: They are covered under an award.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: All the equipment of this nature being used in the State is supervised by some Government authority. For instance, scaffolding is so supervised. I should have thought that the honourable member, instead of being suspicious about this matter, would have welcomed the fact that the Government is taking action to see that everything possible is done to ensure the safety of the people in question.

Mr. McKEE: My Party at all times supports legislation that secures safety for any employees or improves their conditions. I am concerned about this amendment because it could cause a demarcation of employment. If the Premier claims that it is being introduced purely as a safety measure, I cannot understand why he will not give me his assurance that steps would be taken if it caused a demarcation of employment.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 9. Page 1332.)

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla): This very important Bill affects mining operations in this State, and with the exception of clause 5 it has the Opposition's full support. I will deal with the clauses of the Bill other than clause 5, to which I will return later. Clause 3 deals with the basis of royalties under leases. At present, the Act permits the holder of a mining lease to deduct expenditure incurred on treatment of his material before delivery to the buyer, but not the cost of treatment necessary to make the ore a marketable product. Thus, royalty can be levied on what may be unsaleable material. The amendment provides that the licensee may deduct all costs in the treatment of the ore up to the point where it becomes marketable. This seems to me to be a reasonable provision and one that is only fair to all parties.

Clause 4 deals with the case of a lessee using the material himself. At present the Act

empowers the Minister, on the Auditor-General's recommendation, to agree with the lessee on a royalty based on the weight or volume of the material instead of royalties fixed under the lease. This flat rate royalty now only applies where the lessee uses the material in manufacturing or where the material is salt or gypsum. The amendment removes these limitations and makes the provisions applicable to all minerals, and this again seems a desirable amendment.

Clauses 6 and 7 make additions to the covenants contained in the mineral or coal lease to ensure that where required a lessee will make good any damage to the leased land arising from his operations; lessees may be required to carry out back-filling in certain circumstances where it is considered necessary. That is desirable, because we all know of circumstances where back-filling is necessary and without it considerable damage may be done to the property and to the landscape. In fact, I understand that in Great Britain it is essential and obligatory for back-filling to be carried out in all quarrying operations.

Clause 8 deals with mining on private land. Under the Act at present, any person can obtain authority to enter private land by agreement with the occupier or, if that agreement is not forthcoming, by application to the warden. The occupier has 14 days to lodge an objection if the application is not granted by either the occupier or the warden. Under this clause the warden considers the character of the applicant or applicants and whether there are materials capable of being mined on the land. Any number of persons can simultaneously obtain authority for prospecting or pegging a claim. No time limit on the currency of authority is made, and the occupier is compensated only for actual damage done. There is doubt at present whether the Minister can obtain an authority, and the Minister has no rights or power in respect of minerals located by departmental activities.

The Crown has a large prospecting organization in the State at present, but has really no rights or security in regard to its operations on private land, and it is obvious that this should be rectified. The clause in the Bill tightens up the obligations of the warden in considering the applications, and makes authority to enter exclusive to the holder. It limits to two years the currency of authority to enter, and there may be a renewal. It enables the warden to fix the rent to be paid to the occupier, apart from compensation for actual damage and for inconvenience, the amount to be fixed by

the warden in each case because of differing circumstances. Authority may be issued to the Minister, and the authority may be assigned by the holder to another person. These amendments will enable the Government's mining experts to undertake work in any part of the State and protect the Government's rights, and they have our full support.

Clause 9 increases the penalty for unauthorized mining, which has been at an unrealistic level. The penalty has been £1 a day, and the increase is to a maximum period of imprisonment for two years and up to a fine of £300, or both. This increase of penalties appears fairly great, but the Minister in his second reading explanation referred to the fact that there had been much unauthorized mining. Having regard to the substantial profit that could be obtained, it was considered that these penalties were realistic and not too harsh under the circumstances.

I turn now to clause 5, with which I am most dissatisfied. It inserts an entirely new section that has special application to the two opal fields. In his second reading explanation the Premier said that two mining wardens (I think he referred to them as officers) had been stationed on the opal fields at Andamooka and Coober Pedy at the request and to meet the convenience of opal miners. He also said:

The Government considers it not unreasonable that an appropriate registration fee should be paid by those who register and enjoy the benefits of precious stones claims; accordingly, this amendment is introduced.

It is correct that two mining wardens have been appointed to these fields and I understand that when problems associated with claims at the fields have been sorted out the number will be reduced to one. It is also true that additional expense will be incurred as a result of their being placed on the fields but I point out that these wardens, whose salary is about £1,000 each, are also appointed special constables. The miners on both fields have applied on several occasions for a police officer to be stationed at each field, but this application has not received any support from the police authorities for reasons which I think have been recognized as being good reasons. However, the appointment of the wardens as special constables has relieved the Government of any responsibility that might have been associated with the appointment of police officers to the two fields, and I think this should be considered. I understand that each warden has a caravan and a temporary dug-out and that a permanent dug-out will be made available at Coober Pedy. I have submitted

this matter to the progress associations at each opal field, and for many reasons they have objected to this clause. The Andamooka Progress Association wrote as follows:

We realize that the Government will have some expenses on the field but if the proposed amendment is for the purpose of recouping such expenses then the basis of collection is most unjust. We feel that the person who normally would do most of the work to prove the continuation of the field, which normally is the prospector, under the amendment would be paying the most.

The clause increases the cost of registration of a claim from 2s. 6d. to £5 on registration and £10 in the second year. In order to prospect, one must have a miner's right, which costs 5s.; when the claim is pegged out it can be worked for 30 days before the registration fee is paid, but several difficulties are associated with the increased fees.

Many people who go to the opal fields have nothing. In the last two years many unemployed people have drifted there because they have not been able to obtain work elsewhere. Many of them have relied on being grub-staked by the local storekeeper to enable them to continue digging. Obviously it will be difficult for them to meet a fee of £5, and 30 days is not always sufficient for a miner to prove the value of a claim. He must sink a shaft 30 feet or more deep and work out horizontally from it, so he may need far more than 30 days to know whether a fee of £5 is warranted.

One of these progress associations pointed out that if the fee were raised to £10 on the second year many people would be deterred from carrying on with a claim if they thought there was some doubt about its value. This could be to the detriment of opal mining because many claims that may not appear to be valuable are subsequently proved to be most valuable. If there is a deterrent because of the extra £5, it is possible that many claims will be abandoned. Clause 5 enacts new section 41a (2) as follows:

If a person does not renew any such claim within thirty days after the expiration of the registration thereof his right to the claim shall lapse and he shall not be entitled to peg another precious stones claim containing the whole or any part of the land in the lapsed claim or to prospect or mine for precious stones on any such land without the written consent of a warden.

In other words, a miner will have difficulty in renewing that claim if he wishes to do so later. A claim is 150 feet square, and it is interesting to note that as at June, 1961 (the latest figures available from the Mines Department) 284 claims were registered on both fields, yet

between July, 1961, and June, 1962, 485 miners' rights were issued for Andamooka and 638 at Coober Pedy—a total of 1,123 miners' rights for which a fee of only 5s. was payable.

Another problem that arises over what the miners consider to be the high fee of £5 on registration and £10 subsequently is that many pensioners are on these fields. These men work when they feel like it because their physical condition may not be the best; they like living in this fashion because they can earn a little without being under supervision and they are able to obtain the pension. The new fees will be a hardship to pensioners working under these conditions, and in my opinion they should be exempt from them. This mining enables pensioners to work when they like, and surely they should be permitted to carry on this mode of living.

I have pointed out many times in this House that the value of opal exports rises each year. Last year opal valued at £1,250,000 was exported from Australia—a considerable increase over the previous year's exports. This shows that it is a valuable industry to this State that gives employment to many people unable to find employment elsewhere. It also provides employment for many Aborigines, and here again these new provisions could create a problem. It might be got over by the Aborigines Department undertaking the registration of claims. That again is something that needs a second look at in order to arrive at the correct solution.

I emphasize again the point that the prospectors prove new ground on these fields, and the work of proving new ground is expensive. I agree that there has been extra Government expenditure on these fields, which has been necessary, and I do not believe the miners would object to some increases in charges which, in their opinion, would be practicable and not in any way adverse to the proper development of the two fields or to the welfare of the people in the early stages of developing their claims. If those points could be met in a practical way, I believe there would be all-round satisfaction. I suggest to the Minister that he withdraw this clause from the Bill until a Mines Department representative has visited the progress associations on both fields and discussed the question with them so that satisfaction may be arrived at by both parties; then the Act can be amended next year so that it will achieve the aims I suggest.

I point out that the two wardens have been on the opal fields for only a short period. It

would be impossible to say at this juncture just what effect their presence will have on the number of claims registered. The number could be considerably greater than it has been in the past. As the Minister has said, there has been unauthorized mining. The whole question of an increase in these charges should be dealt with after the wardens have been there for a longer period so that the condition of the fields may be looked at while the wardens are operating. Only then shall we know what the number of claims likely to be registered will be while the wardens are overseeing operations. By the middle of next year we could arrive at a far better solution to the problem than by trying to provide for it in the Bill as it is at present drafted. I put those suggestions to the Minister in the hope that he will accept them: simply to withdraw clause 5 from the Bill and proceed with the rest of it, which has our full support. I am sure that doing so would go a long way towards meeting the wishes of the people on the fields. If my suggestions are acceded to, then a proper solution to this question can be arrived at. I support the Bill apart from clause 5.

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa): I, too, like the member for Whyalla, regard this as an important Bill. It bears on the rights of property owners, and it is from that angle that I wish to direct my remarks this afternoon on these amendments. Clauses 6 and 7 are important because they provide that a lessee shall make good any damage to leased land arising from the lessee's operations. That is most important when viewed from the point of view of the landholder's interests where that land is so situated as to have a greater value for other purposes than for mining.

I refer to the Modbury, Tea Tree Gully and Golden Grove areas where there are large deposits of sand and clay and where mining has taken place for many years in certain locations. But now I note that in areas about to be subdivided there is entry on to private land—in one instance, entry without the knowledge of the owner but with the acquiescence of the occupier, and the damage done to that land has been such as to render it unfit for subdivision where there has been excavation for clay. I should like to cite this case of entry on to private land. It is ludicrous to note the ease with which a miner can peg a claim on private land and gain access to that land for the purpose of removing a mineral of little value, but which adversely affects the value of the holder's assets.

A widow at Yatala Vale owns 74 acres adjoining Hancock's Road, which is the main connecting road between Tea Tree Gully and Golden Grove, along which will pass the water main to service the new subdivisions in the Golden Grove area. Opposite this 74 acres of excellent building land a subdividing organization, the Anglo-American Building Corporation, has purchased land to provide for 500 high-class houses. Next to this section, land has been purchased for a further subdivision. Noting the entry on to this excellent building land and observing the mound of clay and sand rising on that fine site make one realize that this Act requires immediate amendment to prevent such activity when it is not with the concurrence of the owner of the property. This elderly lady had leased her land to a farmer for grazing purposes, and a miner desiring to mine on that property came along and spoke to the occupier, though not to the owner, and applied for a miner's right to mine there. The occupier raised no objection. The owner, being unaware of the situation, raised no objection either. So the ludicrous situation has arisen wherein some person who is paying a very small rental for grazing land has in actual fact and without the authority of the proprietor allowed certain things to be done on that land that will materially damage the owner.

That is why I shall move certain amendments to section 69d of the original Act, which amendments will make it incumbent upon the miner to obtain the acquiescence of the owner as well as of the occupier, and, should the Warden of Mines give certain rights to a prospective miner, redress could be had by the owner as well as by the occupier, as now applies in the original Act. Section 69d of the principal Act states:

- (1) No person shall enter upon any private land to which this Part applies for any mining purpose unless he has an authority to do so pursuant to this section.
- (2) Any person desiring to enter as aforesaid may obtain the written authority of the occupier of the private land and may thereupon enter upon the land. Within seven days after entering as aforesaid the said person shall give to the registrar of the Department of Mines at Adelaide notice in writing of the granting of the authority and the entry.
- (3) If any person desiring to enter as aforesaid does not obtain the consent as aforesaid of the occupier of the private land, such person may make application to a warden for an authority to enter upon the said land.

- (4) The warden shall give notice of the application to the occupier of the land.

Members can see that "owner" is not mentioned in the Act, yet we have this situation whereby an extremely valuable asset—land that can command a price of £600 an acre—can be taken over for the purpose of removing clay or sand therefrom. When I note that men of straw, with no money to pay compensation to an aggrieved party, can take out a miner's right, it is high time we provided greater protection for the owners of property to avoid ridiculous entries on to their property that decrease the value thereof. About two or three years ago a similar situation arose in Tea Tree Gully—in Milton's subdivision—where a mining right was pegged for sand in land worth between £800 and £1,000 an acre. I welcome amendments to give added protection to owners. Before miners' rights are granted to applicants, consideration should be given to the intrinsic value of the minerals to be taken from that land.

Clause 6 relates to the reinstatement of land. However, I cannot imagine how a huge excavation, as deep as this Chamber and 10 times as wide and long, could be economically reinstated, because after all if sand has been removed from it sand would have to be used to restore it. I hope that the Mines Department will in future be careful not to grant rights to individuals to remove minerals, the value of which would not be economic when compared with the price that could be obtained for land for residential purposes. I welcome the proposed amendments and will move others in Committee. I support the Bill.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I support the Bill and shall comment on the foreshadowed amendments.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member would be out of order in so doing.

Mr. COUMBE: I can confine my remarks to the Act and suggest how I believe it should be amended. At present the occupier of land can enter into a miner's right and undertake excavation work on property without the knowledge of the property owner. That, of course, results in rank injustice to the owner in many instances. This provision has been in the Act for many years, but it has been highlighted in recent years through the spread of the outer metropolitan area to the nearer foothills in the Houghton, Modbury and Tea Tree Gully area which is particularly rich in mineral deposits. I have been approached by owners who did not know that miners' rights had

been taken out on their properties. The first knowledge they had of the position was when they saw big holes appearing on their land. The occupiers had formerly been using the land for grazing purposes, but when they discovered that the land contained valuable building sand and clay they took out miners' rights. Imagine the feelings of an owner who wishes to sell his land for subdivisational purposes when he discovers huge holes in it. Under the law he cannot sell the land because he is prevented from so doing.

An amendment along the lines suggested by the member for Barossa would ensure that a leaseholder or occupier of land could not obtain a miner's right unless he had the written permission of the owner. I am amazed that such a provision has not been suggested before. It may also act as a deterrent to quarrying in areas that are eminently desirable for residential purposes. In areas that are likely to be settled, numerous public services and utilities will be required and it will be undesirable and uneconomic if gaping holes exist all over the place. Frequently the price demanded for a miner's right greatly exceeds the value of the land. An owner is unable to sell his property, which may be worth £1,000 or £2,000, because the person holding the miner's right demands a fantastic price, amounting to tens of thousands of pounds, for that miner's right.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member can develop this argument in Committee.

Mr. COUMBE: I understand that I can also develop it now, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: When the amendment is moved in Committee.

Mr. COUMBE: Then I will not pursue that topic. Such practices will be remedied by the Bill which will afford greater protection to property owners, and the proposed amendments will meet some of the undesirable features of the trading in miners' rights. I have much pleasure in supporting this Bill, and I only wonder why certain of these provisions were not introduced years ago.

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray): I briefly add my support to the Bill, with the exception of clause 5, which increases the registration fee from 2s. 6d. to £5 and in the following year to £10. I oppose that provision in the Bill. Much money has been spent at Andamooka and Coober Pedy. I consider that both those areas are extremely valuable to the State, because people are mining precious gems there and this is of great assistance to our overseas trade.

People who go to those places should not be penalized or discouraged through this fee being made prohibitive. Therefore, I support the remarks of the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday). Earlier this year I asked the Premier whether work was to proceed at the Callington copper mines, having in mind that many areas had been pegged throughout the districts of Kanmantoo and Callington, and the Premier replied:

we have a complication in South Australia. In the early days the mineral rights were sold with some of the land and so those mineral rights do not belong to the State but to the landholder or to another person altogether. The land may have been sold a second time, but the mineral rights may not have been sold with it, so in some instances the land is owned by one person and the mineral rights by another. This complication has delayed consideration of one or two of our older mining areas. I think Cabinet will approve of an amendment being placed before the House to enable the present legal obstruction to be removed. If that is done I believe it will be possible to get a company to explore the possibility of re-opening the mines at Kanmantoo and conducting mining activities there.

I know of the company that is interested, and I believe it would be an asset if what the Premier suggested came about. However, I find it hard to read into this Bill that the Premier has made provision to bring these areas back under the Crown as was suggested. It may be possible that I have not understood the matter fully, and in Committee I will ask the Premier whether that matter is covered in this Bill.

Mr. Quirke: The Bill provides for payment of royalties; the mineral rights are not affected.

Mr. BYWATERS: That is so. It is rather interesting to trace some of the history of the Kanmantoo and Callington mines. There was a time when both these places were bigger than Murray Bridge; in about 1860 there were 900 people at Callington and about 600 at Kanmantoo, and one mine employed more than 60 people and another one 40. The South Australian *Gazetteer* of 1867 contains the following reference to the mine at Kanmantoo:

There are several other workings which are much the same as the deep shaft, the country round the lodes being hard mica schist, with every probability of killas country a little deeper; this has been proved by a shaft sunk to the depth of 40ft. in the Paringa mine. There is little doubt that when the workings are taken a little deeper, and when machinery is placed on the ground, by which the extraction of the ore can be expedited, this mine will become one of the best in the colony.

It was proved at that time that there were extensive lodes of copper through the Kanmantoo and Callington areas. I consider that with the possibility of this area being opened up again for exploration, these mines could come back into working order and possibly lift the population of both these little hamlets, as they are today. It is interesting to see that a number of claims have been pegged throughout that area, and it would be wonderful to see some of these areas producing copper again. The history of the early mining companies is very interesting. Of course, those companies have long ceased to exist, but they showed that even at that time, with the limited amount of machinery available, they could make copper mining a profitable undertaking. Of course, the price of copper materially affects the chances of success of areas such as this. I know that the same situation applies at Burra and Moonta. If some of these mines can operate it will be a great advantage to the people of those localities. With the reservation that I previously mentioned, I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee:

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Enactment of section 41a of principal Act."

Mr. LOVEDAY: I move:

In new subsection (1) to strike out "ten" and insert "five".

This amendment will greatly improve the clause. I understand from the Premier that since their is no chance of the clause being withdrawn, this amendment will be accepted by the Minister in charge. Our objection to the clause was centred mainly on this increase of the registration fee from £5 to £10 in the second year. The two progress associations I mentioned based their main objections on this increase for the second year. I consider that this amendment will go a long way towards meeting their wishes on this question, because I am sure that £10 for the second year would not only be considered very high by the miners themselves but might have the effect of deterring people from continuing with their claims. Increasing the fee to £10 would be a retrograde step. The amendment provides that the registration fee will remain at £5.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 6—"Amendment of principal Act, section 53."

Mr. BYWATERS: Early this year the Premier spoke about mineral rights in the Callington and Kanmantoo area, saying that

in some cases one person owned the mineral rights and another person the land. He said that this matter would be considered by Cabinet. In the temporary absence of the Premier, can the Minister of Works say whether the Government intends to amend the Act to overcome this problem?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Works): I am afraid I have not got the information the honourable member seeks.

Mr. QUIRKE: As some land at Burra is owned by one person (in one case by the council) and mineral rights belong to another person, I have made inquiries about this matter.

Mr. Bywaters: Some owners of mineral rights are not known.

Mr. QUIRKE: In this case they were known. Before 1880, it was necessary for a person to buy land to enable him to work it. At Burra 20,000 acres was bought at £1 an acre before the mines could be worked. This position was changed in 1880, but the original mineral rights went to the people who bought the land. People who own mineral rights will not be deprived of them under this Bill, but if the Government prospects and finds minerals the owner of the mineral right will obtain royalties not on the ore but on the finished product.

Clause passed.

Clause 7 passed.

Clause 8—“Amendment of principal Act, section 69d.”

Mr. LAUCKE: I move to insert the following new paragraphs:

- (aa) by striking out the words “the occupier” in subsections (2), (3) and (4) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the words “both the owner and the occupier” in each case;
- (bb) by inserting before the words “the occupier” (first occurring) in subsection (5) thereof the words “the owner and”;
- (cc) by inserting after the word “satisfied” in subsection (5) thereof the words “after due inquiry that the owner of the private land cannot be found or”;
- (dd) by inserting after the word “aforesaid” at the end of subsection (5) thereof the words “to such owner or as the case may be to the occupier”.

The effect of the amendment is to bring the owner into the picture. Section 69d (2) provides:

Any person desiring to enter as aforesaid may obtain the written authority of the occupier of the private land and may thereupon enter upon the land.

Subsection (3) provides:

If any person desiring to enter as aforesaid does not obtain the consent as aforesaid of the occupier of the private land . . .

No mention is made of the owner. In subsection (4) again no mention is made of the owner. In each instance I desire to have the words “both the owner and the occupier” take the place of “occupier”. It is obvious to me that under the existing Act it is necessary only to obtain the consent of the occupier of private lands before carrying out prospecting and that only the occupier has the opportunity to lodge objections with the warden if an authority has been granted by the warden. I think there is a basic need for the owner of an asset to have some direct say in the control of his or her property and that it is essential that the owner should know what is happening on the land. This amendment gives to the owner his or her rights.

Amendment carried.

Mr. LAUCKE moved:

In new subsection (13) before “occupier” to insert “owner and”.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 9 and title passed.

Bill reported with amendments.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT. BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON (Minister of Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is designed to make provision for a second deputy master of the Supreme Court. Section 82 (1) of the Supreme Court Act, 1935-1960, provides that the court shall have a master and a deputy master. A deputy master was first appointed to the court in 1921 at a time when the population of the State was about one-half its present population. Since that year there has been a steady increase in the volume of the business of the court and, in its civil and matrimonial jurisdictions alone, its business for the current year already shows a 10 per cent increase on its business for the corresponding period of 1961, while the total business for 1961 was 23 per cent greater than the business of the court for the year 1960.

Since 1921 the work of the masters has increased to a greater degree than the general volume of court business. This is due largely to the exercise of the chamber jurisdiction conferred on the masters and their increasing administrative and statutory duties consequent on the increasing volume of court business. In the circumstances the Government considers that the appointment of a second deputy master is now warranted. Amending legislation is necessary to make the appointment

possible and clause 3 of this Bill amends section 82 (1) of the Supreme Court Act so as to provide that the court shall have a master and not more than two deputy masters. This will have the effect of enabling the appointment of a second deputy at any time and of preventing a further increase in the number of deputies unless Parliamentary approval is first obtained.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

THE ELECTRICITY TRUST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA (TORRENS ISLAND POWER STATION) BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 9. Page 1323.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): It is with much scepticism that I rise to speak on this Bill. From the report submitted by the Premier, there is no doubt in my mind that the officers of the trust have intensively investigated the proposed establishment of a power station on Torrens Island but, as has been the case with other major electricity power station proposals placed before the House, it is apparent that the trust investigates these proposals purely as regards its own financial commitments in the matter and does not take into consideration other costs that have to be borne by a centralized community. At the outset, I would emphasize that practically the only factor making for centralization of population and industry in this State and in most of the Australian States is the scarcity of good harbours. Almost every other factor that fosters centralization is man-made, such as the way in which our road and railway systems have been developed, the availability of power and water, the system of freight rates, and the provision of social amenities such as housing, education and hospitals. Even the accessibility of raw materials and markets has been influenced by the way in which our road and railway systems have been developed. To illustrate this, the main arterial road and rail links radiate from Adelaide like the spokes of a wheel, which tends to make the accessibility of both raw materials and markets dependent on the metropolitan area. However, this type of development has taken place also in other parts of Australia but, when the administration accepted the necessity for decentralization, it found that a centralized development was not something that must be accepted as an unalterable adjunct to progress.

To me, there appears great potential for the encouragement of decentralization of industry at Wallaroo by the establishment of a power

station at that site because it possesses the natural advantages of an excellent harbour. The trust's officers investigated this possibility but on the grounds of cost recommended against it. With due respect to the recommendations of these officers, I suggest that the point that influenced their recommendation was how the cost of the power station operated on the finances of the trust. It is my view that the establishment of another large power station in the metropolitan area will lead to a further centralization of population in this State, and I should like to know whether the officers of the trust considered the additional costs to the community brought about by this concentration of population. For example, we have been told that it would cost an additional £10,000,000 to establish a power station at Wallaroo, but I suggest that consideration be given to offsetting costs now being incurred as a result of our congested metropolitan area. In that regard, I would ask members to bear in mind the cost of the following proposals: the by-pass freeway from Gawler to Reynella, the multi-lane highway on the South Road together with the similar Mount Barker Highway, the expansion of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, the sewage treatment works at Bolivar, the Chowilla dam on the River Murray, and the duplication of the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline—just to mention a few of the proposals that the Government has put forward in recent months.

Mr. Millhouse: Would you add to that the tunnel under the hills?

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I announced in a speech to the electors in March of this year—

Mr. Jennings: Which the electors endorsed.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is not making an election speech in this House.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: If we were given the opportunity, development projects would be considered and investigated with the assistance of the Commonwealth Government. In the case of such projects, we can depend more upon whoever may be in power in Canberra than on the State Government to assist in their implementation. Tally up the millions of pounds that these proposals will cost, bear in mind that they are caused mainly by a metropolitan area that is gradually choking itself to death, and compare it with the cost of a balanced and planned decentralization programme. As regards centralization, I need refer back no further than to last week when we were discussing the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Act Amendment Bill. The trend

is towards centralization. What about some consideration of decentralization?

I believe that the officers of the trust have carried out their investigation in the proper manner in so far as the proposed development affects its own finances—and I do not disagree with that—but, if the Torrens Island proposal was considered by the Government together with these other additional costs to which I have just referred, perhaps from the aspect of the balanced development of the State as a whole, we should arrive at a conclusion that it would be better to establish the power station at some regional centre with good natural harbour facilities instead of encouraging the congestion that is occurring in the metropolitan area.

When the Port Augusta power station was being investigated, the trust's officers at that time recommended the establishment of another power station at Osborne, and apparently that recommendation was based purely on the financial effect on the operations of the Electricity Trust. I suggest that the same thing is occurring on this occasion, and now that the Government has received a report as it affects the finances of the trust it should consider the overall effect on the balanced development of this State before the trust is permitted to embark upon an expansion scheme of this magnitude in the metropolitan area.

Another point that was made in the report presented to us was that adequate transport facilities must be available for the transport of raw materials such as coal and oil, but what have we at the Torrens Island site? The member for Port Adelaide (Mr. Ryan) made an arrangement with the Minister of Marine whereby he and the member for Semaphore (Mr. Tapping) and I inspected the proposed site yesterday. It has no shipping or railway facilities, no oil berths, coal-handling plant, or railway facilities whatsoever, and to obtain berths of sufficient depths substantial dredging will have to be undertaken. We have been told that the establishment of the station on Torrens Island would represent a saving of £1,500,000 on the establishment of the plant at Osborne. However, this represents only a saving of 1 per cent on the total estimate, and if the officers of the trust can keep within this 1 per cent of their estimate, no matter where they erect the power station they will be doing a magnificent job. At Osborne we have the oil berths and coal handling plant already established and I am wondering whether all these costs have been taken into consideration

with the proposed establishment at Torrens Island. For example, are the costs of the establishment of the wharves, together with dredging, coal handling plant and the railway facilities included in the total cost of £150,000,000 or are these costs to be borne by the respective authorities, such as the Harbors Board and the Railways Department? These are matters which are not clear at all in the report that the Premier submitted to us on this proposal.

Before going any further, let us trace through the trust's recommendations on this project from time to time and what the Government has achieved in relation to them. Like most projects of this Government, we have to go back a long time to see when they originated and, in this instance, it would appear to have started in about 1950, because the following is a statement that appeared on page 11 of the annual report of the Electricity Trust in that year:

The trust has had in mind for some time the necessity of establishing a new powerhouse, which it is estimated will be required for initial operation in about eight years' time. A possible metropolitan site for this powerhouse is on the eastern side of the Port River adjacent to the North Arm where the South Australian Harbors Board intends to develop coal unloading plant. A powerhouse with an ultimate capacity of 500,000 kilowatts is envisaged. The major problems involving a station of this size are coal supplies, availability of ample circulating water for condensing purposes, and the transmission lines for delivery of power to the load centres, and careful consideration is being given to these problems in their relation to possible sites.

Members will notice that at that time, a 500,000 kilowatt station was envisaged. What happened to that scheme? Apparently it was scrapped, for actual events have shown that the only new power station to be erected and equipped since 1950—or rather it is still in the course of construction—is the Port Augusta B power station which is due to reach its ultimate capacity of 240,000 kilowatts in 1964. Osborne B and Port Augusta A power stations were brought to ultimate capacity in 1958, but these were under construction in 1950, and, therefore, cannot be accepted as part of the 500,000 kilowatt station envisaged at that time. In February, 1957, the Chairman of the Electricity Trust (Sir Fred Drew) said:

The next major power station to be built by the Electricity Trust will cost more than £30,000,000 and will be erected on a site on the Port River about half a mile north of the Osborne power station. It will use black coal and oil.

Continuing, he said:

Preliminary work on the site of the new station would have to start next year so that the first turbo alternator would be available to generate power by 1964. The station would probably have a total capacity when completed of 400,000 kilowatts. . . . It is obvious that the phenomenal growth in demand for power which has occurred in the post-war years will continue, and make the first output from the new station a necessity by 1964. Indications from overseas were that future designs of nuclear stations would enable them to be located close to centres of population. A nuclear power station could therefore be established on the eastern side of the Port River, even as far north as the North Arm, or it could be constructed near one of the towns with shipping facilities on the eastern side of Spencer Gulf.

These statements were made by the Chairman of the trust in support of a three-year £25,000,000 development plan for the Electricity Trust which had just been announced by the Premier. Members will notice that the proposed establishment of the plant at Port Adelaide, which was mentioned in 1950, was resurrected. From these statements in the reports of the Electricity Trust over the years, it can be seen that in 1950 a 500,000-kilowatt plant was considered necessary, and 12 years have elapsed, but there has been little progress other than publicity announcements from time to time of bigger and better stations required or envisaged. Little or no work appears to have been done on the £30,000,000 expansion programme recommended in 1957 except to shift the proposed site to the other side of the Port River and state that the size of the station will need to be 2,000,000 kilowatts in lieu of the 400,000 kilowatts. Capital expansion during the three-year period was only about £18,000,000 instead of the promised approximately £25,000,000 which achieved 72 per cent only of the target and is evidence that funds have not been spent in accordance with recent promises.

When considering the latest £150,000,000 proposal, it must be borne in mind that the annual capital investment by the trust is about £6,000,000, of which about one-half, or £3,000,000 is spent on power stations. The Assistant General Manager of the trust put the figures in the proper perspective when he indicated that it was proposed to expend about £15,000,000 on the Torrens Island project by 1967, which is about £3,000,000 per annum, and therefore more in keeping with the current capital expansion of the trust. However, at this rate of spending, it will be 50 years before this proposed station is completed. Several

years ago, the indications were that nuclear power potential would be capable of replacing conventional fuel systems by about 1965, but capital costs are still a limiting factor. Relevant factors change quickly, as evidenced by the rapid fall in coal prices in recent years, and the present indications are that nuclear power will become an economic proposition in about 1970. I know that the trust intends to keep the examination of nuclear power potential to the fore, and it is to be commended for this. The only conclusion possible from this analysis is that the officers of the trust have repeatedly informed the Government of the needs of the State for additional power stations and provided a comparison of trends between conventional and nuclear fuel costs, but that the Government has not the ability to ensure that the well considered recommendations are put into practice. Rather than admit failure, it attempts to confuse the people with grand announcements and schemes, but the schemes are always for the future and not for the present.

Similarly, with the Bill before us today, there is no guarantee that a power station will be erected because the bill is merely making a grant of 1,300 acres, valued at £2,000,000, to the Electricity Trust, but the trust may or may not carry out certain works. In the past, the trust has received substantial grants from the Government, but normally they have been for specific purposes. For example, £1,000,000 was granted towards the cost of the transmission line to the South-East. It is interesting that Parliament passed this amount in 1950, but it was 10 years before the Government was prepared to make the funds available. Further grants passed this year, totalling a maximum of £600,000 over the next five years as a subsidy on electricity tariffs, are also to be paid to the trust, but there is no similar provision in this Bill. In view of this further substantial grant to the trust, I believe it should be obligatory on the trust to commence erecting a power station on the site within a specified time, and I suggest a period of three years. I do not think such a provision would impose any hardship, and therefore the Bill could be amended in this way. This should tend to avoid a repetition of past events. For at least 12 years the trust has stated that a power station is necessary, but now, although the necessity has become four times the size it was in 1950, not one practical item of construction has occurred on this project. The trust made its recommendations based on its finances, and it is now up to the Government to determine

whether all aspects of the advancement of the State have been taken into consideration and whether or not a definite time should be stipulated for the erection of the power station as a condition of this further £2,000,000 grant to the trust.

Substantial sums are involved, but I rarely complain about expenditure on projects that provide employment. A work force has only its labour to sell at any time. It seems that the trust has examined this matter purely from its own economic interests. I recall that some years ago the trust examined a potential water scheme in the north of the State. The Government asked the Public Works Committee to investigate further, and the result was a saving for Leigh Creek because the investigation made by the Public Works Committee proved its value compared with the proposal submitted by the trust. I do not suggest that the Public Works Committee can do any better than the trust's engineers. However, I should like the Government to state where there is better potential than exists at Wallaroo.

On one occasion the trust announced that it would extend on its land at Osborne. It then planned to go across the river to what is known as the North Arm. However, it has now decided, according to the plan contained in this Bill, that it will go to another place and have a temporary barrage across the inlet, temporary bridges across the North Arm and permanent embankments across another section of it, and a permanent bridge across the North Arm. It is apparent that one of these bridges will be at least 15 chains long. I do not know whether the trust has had soundings taken, but I know that the Garden Island section has mangroves and other growth around the water's edge and I cannot see that it is a very good proposition for bridge construction. However, a bridge to Torrens Island is to be built.

I maintain that a further investigation should be carried out. Under this Bill, about 1,300 acres of land is being vested in the trust. The trust has said that on this land it might spend £150,000,000 on a power station at some time or another, but there is no definite indication that it will do so. Unless something more definite can be put before this House to justify the exchange of land worth about £2,000,000, I think we should consider telling the trust that, in view of its past performances and of its estimates being out, it shall commence within three years of the passing of this Bill.

Mr. TAPPING (Semaphore): With mixed feelings, I support this Bill. I realize that, because of the rapid progress of industry and increase in population, another industry will come to South Australia, but I am disappointed that it will be established in the metropolitan area. For a long time members of my Party have stressed the need for decentralization, at which this proposal is another blow. In the daily press recently it has been reported that the Adelaide City Council, which is perturbed about the lack of parking facilities in the city, wants to use the park lands. As the years pass it will be more difficult not only to find parking facilities but to obtain houses in the city.

This Bill provides for a new powerhouse to be erected, and the Premier said that the first machine would be ready to function in 1967. In 1965 the Osborne station will be completed and, as in the next three or four months our population will reach 1,000,000, a powerhouse is essential. It is a tragedy that it cannot be constructed at a place like Wallaroo, however. Wallaroo has deteriorated for many years because of the closing down of industry and other things. I think it would be better to have the power station at Wallaroo than on Torrens Island. The Premier said the undertaking would require a port with facilities suitable for recovering the fuel needed to keep the station functioning. Any person who has been to Wallaroo would concede that it is ideal. We must realize that the Premier based his argument on economics, and I concede that the economics favour Torrens Island rather than Wallaroo. However, if the Government is going to adopt the attitude that economics should be the first consideration, country areas cannot expect much in future. We should face up to the fact that it is sometimes essential to disregard the economics of a proposition and to build up country areas: in other words, to have some system of subsidies. We owe a duty to country people to give concession railway fares, cheaper fuel, cheaper electricity, and so on to endeavour to stimulate industry. This is necessary because 62 per cent of the population now resides in the metropolitan area and in the next 10 years, unless we as a Parliament do something about it, it will increase to 70 per cent. This will be a tragedy, and I appeal to the Government to consider these matters realistically instead of only on economic grounds. Although we may lose in the first instance, subsidizing something of this nature will pay dividends and remove some problems that exist in the city.

The Premier said that the cost of erecting temporary and permanent bridges would be borne by the Electricity Trust: in other words, the Government would not have to face up to the expense. I think that is only an excuse as it does not matter whether the Government pays for the installation from Loan money or whether the trust pays it—it is still owned by the people. A permanent bridge will be constructed over Angas Inlet to connect Garden Island with Torrens Island. Members may or may not know that for some years ketches based at Port Adelaide have played a big part in shipping cargoes to the various outports. In the past shipping companies have taken cargoes to ports such as Cowell and Ardrossan, but most of these ships have now been sold and ketches are shipping this cargo. At present, about 20 ketches are operating between Port Adelaide, Port Wakefield, Ardrossan and Price, bringing salt and other cargo back to Port Adelaide. If a bridge is constructed across Angas Inlet ketches will not be able to go around the back of the island to Ardrossan and Price but will have to go through the main channel at Outer Harbour, which will mean an extra three-hour journey.

I have studied the map that is part of the Bill and from it can be seen that at Point Grey, which is well north of Torrens Island, there is a cutting used by small craft and ketches when the tide is reasonably high. If, because of the bridge, ketches cannot go around the back of the island they will have to go through Outer Harbour or, if the tide is high, through the cutting at Point Grey. This difficulty could be overcome to some extent if the Government would consider dredging the cutting to enable ketches and small craft to go through it in almost any tide. It is a retrograde step to make ketches go through Outer Harbour, and I appeal to the Government to consider this aspect.

Another important aspect is the need for a precipitator to be constructed when the power station is being built. On many occasions over the years I have mentioned in this House the need for a precipitator at the Osborne power station to overcome the soot problem that has caused damage to homes and risk to the health of people in the area. Some years ago the Minister said it would cost about £1,000,000 to erect a precipitator at the A and B stations at Osborne. I believe that is correct, but it may only cost £200,000 to build a precipitator as part of this proposal.

Mr. Quirke: It would have to be. It could not be built without a precipitator.

Mr. TAPPING: Power stations have been built in the past without precipitators, so I issue a note of warning that it would be wise to build a precipitator when this station is being built rather than leave it until later. About 12 years ago I had many complaints from Birkenhead people living near the works of the Adelaide Cement Company Limited. Considerable damage was done by the smoke and the complaints were supported by the local board of health. The manager of the company went to Germany about a precipitator and after two years had elapsed one was installed at the works. He said it was brought here at a cost of £125,000. Since its installation there have been no complaints from the Birkenhead people. If no precipitator is installed in the Torrens Island project an alternative should be provided. Although the proposed power station will be only about a quarter of a mile from Osborne, we can imagine the pall of smoke there will be over the area when the wind comes from the east. The Osborne area is being rapidly occupied now. It would be most unwise to establish the power station without installing a precipitator.

The Bill deals with an important project and I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that it should be referred to the Public Works Committee for inquiry and report. In saying that, I do not reflect on the experts, but the committee in all proposals placed before it questions the experts, and matches the opinion of one expert against that of another. It then sorts things out. We all know that experts differ in their opinions on matters. On this project we have already had the reports of experts from the Electricity Trust, in addition to information from overseas, but I do not think we have all the information needed. The Premier spoke about the tests being made to see if the temperature of the water adjacent to Torrens Island was ideal for a power station of this magnitude. Here again I am not convinced that the information given by the experts is all that should be obtained. The matter should be referred to the committee, which could obtain all the information required, and if necessary visit other States to take evidence. I am disappointed that the station is to be established in the metropolitan area and not in a country district.

Mr. RYAN (Port Adelaide): I support the Bill and the amendment that has been foreshadowed.

Mr. Lawn: You will not get a new Jervois bridge merely because you support the Bill.

Mr. RYAN: No. My main point is that the island will be linked with the mainland by a bridge, and that it will not be a seven-year project.

Mr. Lawn: You know the reason. This bridge project does not have to go before the Public Works Committee.

Mr. RYAN: The island must be linked by bridge with the mainland. I cannot say what the cost will be, but it will be the first part of the project to be dealt with. For the past seven years we have seen the Harbors Board trying to stop the progress of work on another bridge, and we shall see it again. I will bet any member in this place—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. RYAN: The point is that there will be no interference by the board in this matter, and the reason is that the Premier has sponsored it and has asked Parliament to approve it. We all agree with the project, so I cannot see any subordinate under-study department like the Harbors Board opposing a project on which the Premier has set his mind. It will be an argument when a report on Jervois bridge is submitted, either this week or next week, again showing that the board is interfering with the progress of a State work. I agree with the project as submitted, and with the Leader of the Opposition's remarks. For some time now we have had important projects approved by Parliament but unfortunately they have been shelved until someone has made a move on them, which has been usually prior to an election. It would be a waste of time for Parliament to debate this £150,000,000 project, which is a necessity for the State in the very near future, unless Parliament controls the commencement of the work.

The completion of the work is another matter. I shall never be an expert on this subject, so I cannot say how long the work will take. However, Parliament in giving its approval to the project should stipulate that the work shall be commenced within a certain time. Then Parliament would be the overriding authority. I agree with the member for Semaphore that this project will not make a difference to Port Adelaide because it already has one of the largest power stations in the State. South Australia would benefit more if the station were established in another district. I regret to say that there is a political instruction as to where the station shall be built. I should like to see it built on a decentralization basis.

Mr. Lawn: Do you believe in decentralization?

Mr. RYAN: Yes, and so does the public of South Australia. Occasionally it has its say, and if it had a say on this matter it would demand decentralization.

Mr. Lawn: You know why the Government does not want decentralization.

Mr. RYAN: Yes. Why are big projects constantly being established in blue-ribbon Labor areas?

Mr. Lawn: Because of the gerrymander.

Mr. RYAN: Exactly. What would be the position if the project were established in the district of the member for Mitcham?

Mr. Lawn: What about Barossa?

Mr. RYAN: Unfortunately they have not enough cold water there. Although we can refer to this matter of a gerrymander in a joking way, there is much sincerity in the argument for decentralization. Prior to an election we hear much about swinging seats, but can we imagine such a project being established in the Wallaroo district? We could say that Wallaroo is a swinging seat. I do not say that it is, but if it were there would be no doubt about the voice of the electors in that district. It is evident that in some State projects political instructions have been given as to where they were to be established. It is unfortunate that the State's progress should be impeded because of the set-up of our electoral districts. Together with some of my colleagues I visited the site of the new power station, so I am not speaking on hearsay. The site has outstanding advantages, but it will be necessary to house the men who will operate the power station. Torrens Island is such an isolated spot that the Government must consider a housing project in the Port Adelaide district and nearby. When people living in the district apply for a house from the Housing Trust, they are sometimes sent as far away as Salisbury and Elizabeth and told that that is the best that can be done for them.

I hope to see the day, in the near future, when the Electricity Trust will become a Government instrumentality, and then as such it will come under the jurisdiction of a Minister in this Parliament, who will have the complete say in its administration. In saying this, I am not criticizing the trust. We can have an instrumentality that is 99 per cent Government and one per cent non-Government, and then the argument is used that it is not a Government instrumentality. If it is to be 99 per cent Government, let us go the other one per cent and make it wholly a Government

department. Then it will be answerable to this Parliament for its administration. No-one will say that the Public Works Department or the Education Department should be trusts outside the control of Parliament. When any legislation is necessary those departments have to come to Parliament for the necessary authority to go ahead.

Mr. Lawn: You are looking into the future and foretelling what will happen after the next general election?

Mr. RYAN: I say in three years from now—

Mr. Clark: Before that!

Mr. RYAN: I cannot see the Government's lingering on much longer on the dependency of someone else's vote to keep it in office. We must be right on occasions, and sooner or later the member for Ridley must see the wisdom of our legislation and vote with us.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is not in order in questioning the mentality of the Speaker in this Chamber.

Mr. RYAN: I am not questioning the mentality of the Speaker. I mentioned the member for Ridley. You must admit, Mr. Speaker, that there are occasions when you become the member for Ridley and not the Speaker of this House.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is not in order in continuing that type of debate.

Mr. Shannon: That has nothing to do with the Bill.

Mr. RYAN: That is true, but it is about time the Government considered bringing down a Bill to make the Electricity Trust a Government instrumentality. Too often we have seen such trusts set up and no information concerning their administration or conduct can be provided to this House until a Bill is placed before us. When a member asks questions on the administration of such trusts, he is told by the Minister in charge that he will see if he can get the information from the authority concerned. We should not be in the position of the Government's having to go cap in hand to someone "who will see if they can get the information required". As Parliament is the elected authority in this State, these instrumentalities should be under its control, and they should be answerable to Parliament for their conduct. I say that within three years the Electricity Trust will be a Government instrumentality, and not one that is 99 per cent a Government instrumentality, as it is today.

I believe that the Torrens Island project is the largest undertaking for which the approval of this Parliament has been sought. I do not know of another costing as much as £150,000,000 that has ever been placed before Parliament for its sanction. I am not denying that officers of the trust are experts in their field. As Mr. Tapping pointed out, if this undertaking necessitated Parliament's authority, it should at least have gone before the Public Works Committee for investigation and report.

Mr. Shannon: Are you recommending that?

Mr. RYAN: I certainly am. As a Parliamentary Committee, the Public Works Committee must expect criticism sometimes. On other occasions I have criticized it.

Mr. Shannon: We can take it.

Mr. RYAN: I agree and we do criticize when we think it is necessary. No-one wants the committee to be comprised of "yes" men. If criticism is necessary, it will be given. At least we can criticize the committee, but we have not the opportunity to criticize the Electricity Trust because it is not a Government department. My main criticism is that the proposal for a new power station should have been placed before the Public Works Committee so that it could have heard evidence from the experts. I am not one to say that this project is not necessary, but such an inquiry could have enabled experts to express their views in evidence before a Parliamentary committee. They could have been cross-examined on their knowledge on such a project, whereas now no-one has the right to examine the experts who recommended this £150,000,000 power station. No doubt the officers of the trust have submitted their recommendations through the normal channels to the Government, which has introduced this Bill to authorize the project. It would have been to the advantage of the trust and to the greater advantage of Parliament if the Public Works Committee could have had this matter placed before it, so that ultimately it could bring down its recommendation to Parliament. If it is necessary to get the authority of Parliament, I believe that in such a case as this it should also be necessary for the Parliamentary committee set up for this purpose at least to make its inquiry and bring down its recommendation. This undertaking will be an asset to the State. I have no doubt that, before the project is completed (and when that would be the Premier did not indicate when he made his second reading speech), the

Government will be the authority that will have to supply much of the finance needed for it. I shall be very much surprised if in 10 years' time this project is completed at a cost of £150,000,000 with not one penny of Government money invested in it.

What is the trust? It is 99 per cent Government and, if that is so, it must be that at least some Government money is invested in any project undertaken by it. The same arguments could be used with the Housing Trust. Money is allocated each year to the Housing Trust, and yet it is a trust that is supposed to stand on its own feet. No-one will deny that the Housing Trust is similar to the Electricity Trust as regards Government ownership and expenditure of money. The only difference is that under a Liberal administration the trust is known as the Electricity Trust, whereas under a Labor administration it would be known as the Electricity Department or a Government department with some other name. Some people call that socialization—and so it should be. When a project is sponsored by the Premier and he wants it commenced as soon as possible, I would say that the Public Works Committee would give it the necessary haste.

Mr. Fred Walsh: You are not being fair in saying that.

Mr. RYAN: I am not saying that the committee brings down its judgment in haste. Such an important project as this needs to be considered closely.

Mr. Shannon: We have never been, and never will be, told what to do. We are not a Government body: we are a Parliamentary body, and that is what you do not understand.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Public Works Committee is not under question.

Mr. Fred Walsh: It is under criticism.

Mr. RYAN: Under the provisions of the Act, such a project as this should be submitted to the Public Works Committee.

The SPEAKER: You have said that 10 times already.

Mr. RYAN: Yes, and I shall say it another 10 times.

The SPEAKER: You will not do it while I am in the Chair. Please proceed with the Bill.

Mr. RYAN: I will. One noticeable point is that, even though this Bill is submitted by the Government, no-one will deny that it at least receives the support of the Opposition. We are not here for the purpose of holding up the progress of the State or any essential work required for the future well-being of South Australia. Whilst we may disagree with

certain trivial aspects of the legislation, we shall support it even though it is Government-sponsored.

Mr. Lawn: If the Government does not start the project quickly, we may shift it when we become the Government.

Mr. RYAN: The only thing is, of course, that, had it been possible for the Bill to be submitted by the Opposition, I have no doubt that every member opposite would have opposed it. The difference is in the consideration that the Opposition gives to legislation necessary for the progress of the State. Although the project will be undertaken in my district (for which I am naturally grateful), I should much prefer to see such an important institution as the Electricity Trust further consider future development from the point of view of decentralization. Since I have been in this House I have never heard the Premier make such an explanatory statement about a Government project as he has made about the proposed power station for Torrens Island. We have had other explanatory remarks and statements from the Premier, but much briefer. In this case, however, I thought the Premier went out of his way to explain why it was necessary to build this new power station in the Port Adelaide district. We have not had that from him previously in respect of any other Government expenditure. It is rather unusual. I do not doubt that the reason for such a long explanation is the fear of criticism on decentralization that may come from us on this side of the House. It has been suggested that the power of the future will be nuclear. If nuclear power is to be the basis of the Electricity Trust's future operations, Wallaroo and other places mentioned are certainly able to cope with such a project as this.

Mr. Lawn: They would welcome it there.

Mr. RYAN: It would be to the advantage of this State as a whole. The industry of this State will not always be concentrated in the metropolitan area: it must move outside to the country districts, and Wallaroo, situated within 100 miles of the metropolitan area, would be central for the siting of a power station. We have been told that the life of a power station is about 40 years so, if this proposed power station is to generate power, or be the main centre of the generation of power, for the next 40 years, it means it will be one of the main central power stations operating still in the year 2010.

Mr. Lawn: Your remarks make it certain that the Government will lend Midland to the Labor Party after next Saturday.

Mr. RYAN: I hope it does. It is proof positive that these projects have to be regarded from a long-range point of view, especially when they are to be still in operation 40 years hence. The year 2000 is a long time from now, but this power station will still be the centre of power generation then. It is probable that 30 or 40 years from now we shall say, "It was built in the wrong place", having regard to the development that will have taken place outside the metropolitan area. Although Labor members cannot say that the Government must choose another site for the power station, at least we are saying that a site should have been selected elsewhere. At this stage I intend to support the Bill, because this power station is essential and will become more essential as time goes on. The sooner this undertaking is completed, the better.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I am happy to follow my friend, the powerhouse from Port Adelaide. He was generating much heat and was sparking well for a time. I was happy that he did not blow a fuse. The project covered by this Bill will certainly be the largest Government or private enterprise undertaking in this State. It will certainly be the largest project we have seen, and it will probably be the largest for many years to come, involving an expenditure of about £150,000,000 over the next 20 years. It is difficult to assess the magnitude of this undertaking over that period. Depending on the progress of the work, about £7,000,000 annually will be spent on the project, but in some years the amount spent will be less than £7,000,000 and in others it will be more. That is a large sum to spend on one project and indicates the size of the undertaking we are asked to deal with.

This money must be spent, because the demand for electricity is growing year by year, and a graph has been produced showing that consumption is rapidly rising. Unless this work is undertaken the supply will lag behind the demand. Fortunately, over the years through funds granted by Parliament to support the Government's long-sighted policy of planning for electricity power stations well ahead of demand, we have been able to avoid shortages. This project comes before us in the planning stage, and at least part of the new power station will operate before the demand exceeds the present output from the existing power stations. It is difficult to assess the magnitude of this undertaking and it would be interesting, if we could see a few years ahead, to observe the effect that this project will have on employment in this State, in civil

construction work, in the manufacture of the various equipment going into it, and in the ancillary work undertaken in factories here and in the rest of Australia.

I understand that when the Electricity Trust's experts, including officers of the trust, went abroad recently and consulted with the trust's consultants overseas, they were advised to build a thermal power station, not a nuclear power station, as our next project. In other words, the time is not yet ripe for a nuclear station of this size to be built. The advice received was that the new station should be on the same lines as power stations built in recent years. The generators and alternators installed in the proposed power station will be much larger than those in existing power stations and, if members care to examine the second reading explanation, an indication is given of the manner in which unit costs produced by these larger machines are considerably lower than the unit costs produced in a medium-sized machine. That is understandable and with the continuing large demand for electricity the trust, quite rightly, is planning to have much larger machines so that the unit cost can be reduced to a minimum. I am sure all members will agree with that.

Regarding the aspect of the thermal power station versus the nuclear power station, I suggest that South Australia cannot, at present, afford to be the guinea pig in this matter because much experimental and planning work has yet to be undertaken in both the United States of America and the United Kingdom on nuclear stations. Some nuclear stations are operating but they have not yet reached the stage where, with any great certainty, they could be introduced here to meet our requirements without taking certain risks. At this stage we must have some protection, but we cannot afford to delay this project unduly while the necessary experiments are made to test nuclear devices, because we have a pretty tight time table to maintain in order to meet the demands for power in this State. We have to get on with this job quickly. The experts (including officers of the trust and the overseas consultants) have advised that we should build a thermal power station on similar lines to those we have built in the past. Then, when the time comes for a further large power station of this size to be erected that might be the time to introduce a nuclear power station.

Mr. Riches: Who are these experts from overseas? Whom have they advised? Have you access to some report that is not available to the House?

Mr. CUMBE: I am reading from the second reading explanation, and I have examined the Electricity Trust's annual report, which is in Parliamentary Papers. I have also noticed certain things from conversations I have had over the last year or two with officers of the trust. I know that the trust's officers have been abroad to investigate this problem.

Mr. Riches: I was asking about the overseas experts.

Mr. CUMBE: The honourable member probably knows as well as I do that any large undertaking has consultants in the United Kingdom. All big companies have them as a matter of policy. They retain engineers and prominent men in this field of engineering. That is mentioned for the honourable member's information in the second reading explanation, and overseas consultants have been consulted in this matter. When the time comes for the next power station to be built, that might be the time to consider building a nuclear power station. Then such a station might be erected in a country area, because the problem of transporting raw materials would not be such a vital factor. Information is given in the second reading explanation of the importance of transporting coal to the new power station and it is stated how, in the case of Murray Bridge, it would be a problem compared with transporting coal to Wallaroo.

Mr. Bywaters: It was Tailm Bend, not Murray Bridge.

Mr. CUMBE: All right, say the River Murray. If a nuclear power station were erected on a River Murray site, however, transportation of raw materials would present no problem and the finished product would not have to be transported either. The next power station after the one under discussion might be a nuclear power station and it could well be established at a country site. I understand that the pump storage system of generating power has been explored and I have asked a question on that system. Investigations were made on the South Coast where sea-water could be used for the purpose of generating power. I believe that that method has been discarded, because it is not completely practicable at this stage. It is an interesting development of which we may see more in future years. I think all members agree that this power station is absolutely necessary to the State's progress. The only differences that have arisen, apart from a few minor details, relate to its location. Apparently the Government and the Electricity Trust are satisfied that the Torrens Island site is the best available in the interests of the

State and in the interests of the electricity undertaking itself. This decision has been arrived at by the technical staff of the trust assisted by overseas consultants.

Mr. Riches: Did the trust decide on a site on overseas advice?

Mr. CUMBE: The technical staff of the trust, assisted by overseas consultants, decided that the Torrens Island site was the best in the interests of the State and of the electricity undertaking. If the honourable member wants to argue he will have his opportunity later. The trust has obviously gone to considerable trouble, and I should imagine some expense, in investigating country sites. I believe the trust was obliged to examine all promising sites. On page 1320 of *Hansard* are listed the sites that were examined—the coast south of Adelaide, particularly Port Stanvac; the River Murray; Port Pirie; Wallaroo; Osborne, north of the S.A. Gas Company works; the south bank of the North Arm; and Torrens Island.

What savings would be achieved if the station were located at Torrens Island as compared with Wallaroo? I know that the member for Wallaroo will appreciate that my remarks are made in all sincerity. If this project were located at Wallaroo it would cost between £8,000,000 and £10,000,000 more over the years than it would at Torrens Island. All things being equal, I am in favour of decentralization, but should the taxpayers of this State, as well as the consumers, be expected to pay this additional sum for decentralization? Some people would have to pay twice. Members may ask how they would have to pay. At present we have one of the lowest tariffs—domestic and industrial—in Australia, and we should keep it that way. I would oppose a steep increase in tariffs. In fact, I spoke recently on a Bill that sought to reduce tariffs. If we are to keep costs of living stable for housewives and to assist industry in creating employment, we must take every possible action to do so. By erecting this station on Torrens Island we shall be keeping the economics of the project within bounds.

I do not see how members opposite could justify putting the station at Wallaroo or elsewhere in the country when it would cost so much more. I could not follow the Leader's reasoning in this regard. How could he justify such a proposal to the electors? Every member of this House has the duty to watch the economics of all public works. The members for Port Adelaide (Mr. Ryan) and Semaphore (Mr. Tapping) urged that the Public Works Committee should investigate this proposal and

bring down a recommendation on it. I assume that the recommendation would be as to site. In fact, I think that is the only matter in dispute.

Mr. Riches: The committee would also make sure that the trust did not repeat its past mistakes.

Mr. COUMBE: Possibly. The member for Semaphore was a member of that illustrious committee and he knows that the committee always examines the economics of a proposal, so how could that committee report favourably on a proposal to site this station in the country? I have yet to see that committee recommend such excessive expenditure. It would undoubtedly recommend Torrens Island as the site. The member for Stuart referred to past mistakes, but we all make mistakes, and I am certain that the trust has gained much experience from its mistakes. I am sure the trust is capable of building this power station, and it should be permitted to get on with the job.

Mr. Riches: Do you suggest that the only reason why water supply projects are put before the Public Works Committee is that the Engineering and Water Supply Department is not capable of undertaking them?

Mr. COUMBE: Not at all. Public money is being expended and we have to consider the interests of the public. As this is a semi-governmental or quasi-governmental undertaking, it falls outside the ambit of the committee, but if it were within its ambit the committee would recommend the Torrens Island site; make no mistake about that.

Mr. Quirke: How do you know?

Mr. COUMBE: My friend watches the economics of these things, and I could not see the committee favouring an undertaking that would involve much more expense.

Mr. Bywaters: You haven't had any evidence on it; you are only accepting the Premier's second reading explanation.

Mr. COUMBE: That explanation is based upon the trust's reports.

Mr. Bywaters: You would need more than that in an inquiry.

Mr. COUMBE: Yes, there would have to be confirmation of what is contained in the second reading explanation.

Mr. Bywaters: You would ask for much more.

Mr. COUMBE: We would get more detailed information. The member for Port Adelaide (Mr. Ryan) was highly critical of the trust, and in some ways he sang a hymn of hate. I would have thought it was about time the

honourable member gave some credit to the trust for a job well done. Many of the trust's employees live in the honourable member's district. His main contention, as I understand it, is that the trust should be a Government instrumentality, directly under the control of a Minister. Obviously, the trust is doing a good job.

Mr. Riches: The member for Port Adelaide said that, too. You said he indulged in a hymn of hate.

Mr. COUMBE: That is what it appeared to be. The member for Port Adelaide carried out quite a tirade against the trust, and said that it should be, in effect, a Government department under the control of a Minister.

Mr. Riches: He also said it had done a good job.

Mr. COUMBE: I say that he should give some credit to the trust for a job that I consider it has done very well indeed.

Mr. Riches: He did.

Mr. COUMBE: His suggestion that the trust is 99 per cent a Government department is quite fallacious. Year after year we allocate funds to the trust, but that is only a small part of the expenditure, for at least twice a year the trust goes to the public for financial support. The people who support the trust are the thousands and thousands of small bondholders in this State, men and women in many walks of life, including many of the trust's employees who derive their living from the trust and re-invest their savings in its loans. Many widows and pensioners are bondholders. Honourable members opposite must be aware of these things.

Mr. Hughes: Do you invest your money in it?

Mr. COUMBE: I do not know whether I am allowed to do so, but if I had as much spare cash as the member for Wallaroo I would take the opportunity of doing so. However, I am only a city member.

Mr. Hughes: It is a good investment, anyhow.

Mr. COUMBE: I agree; it is one of the best investments in Australia. It compares more than favourably with the State Electricity Commission's public flotations in Victoria, many of which do not fill. Year after year the trust's public loans in South Australia are filled and even over-filled; I presume the over-subscriptions have to be repaid. The trust is also supported financially by many investors in other States. If honourable members care to peruse the trust's bond register—and they can do so—they will be pleasantly surprised to

see how many of the bonds are held in small denominations.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Are you saying that the public would not support the Government?

Mr. COUMBE: The member for Port Adelaide (Mr. Ryan) said that the trust should be under Ministerial control and that anyway it was 99 per cent Government-controlled now. I was asking how that could be, when the trust gets its funds from the public as well as from this Parliament. This is not a huge Mogul or a Goliath that is operating to swallow us and become a *gigas* in this State; it is controlled largely by many small investors as a result of the trust's bond issues each year, and those small bondholders have a stake in the country and a share in its future.

Mr. RICHES: Don't these people subscribe to other Government loans?

Mr. COUMBE: I suppose they do, if they have the money to spare. Perhaps they support the trust because it pays 7s. 6d. per cent more than the Commonwealth bond rate, although, of course, they do not get the 2s. in the pound rebate on their income tax. It is a credit to this State that those issues are filled year after year. I deplore the suggestion of the member for Port Adelaide that the trust should be taken over as a Government department and placed directly under the control of a Minister. What would happen to the bondholders? Would we have to redeem their holdings, and if so how could we afford that? I support this Bill, and I suggest that every honourable member in this House really supports it, for it will implement the largest single undertaking ever considered in this State by any organization. Admittedly, it will be spread over 20 years, but it is comparable financially, although in a minor way, with some of the larger undertakings such as the Snowy Mountains project. Like other members, I have had the privilege of being able to inspect many of the trust's power stations, particularly the more modern ones at Port Augusta.

Mr. RICHES: You couldn't go to a better place.

Mr. COUMBE: True, nor a better country district.

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

Mr. COUMBE: Before the dinner adjournment I was speaking about the importance of having this Bill passed quickly. The obvious physical advantages of having this station on Torrens Island have been amply set out by the Premier in his second reading explanation and in reply to questions directed by members from

both sides of the House, including the member for Stuart (Mr. Riches). I think one comment made by the member for Port Adelaide should be cleared up. Perhaps he has a more suspicious mind than I have. He suggested that the Premier, in giving such a long and detailed explanation of the reasons why this station should be constructed on Torrens Island instead of at some other place, had to go to these lengths to satisfy his own conscience, or something like that. I, and probably other members, recall that the Premier did this as a result of direct requests made by several members for more information on why the trust wanted to go to Torrens Island. I will remember the searching questions the member for Stuart directed (quite rightly) from his electors' point of view. However, this is why the Premier went to such lengths to explain why the Torrens Island site had such advantages, and I think the House was entitled to that information. I appreciated it, and I am sure other members did too. The criticisms made by the member for Port Adelaide (Mr. Ryan) were ill founded.

This is an important measure. It is the largest undertaking that has ever come before this House and it must be implemented quickly because the trust must get on with its forward planning and order some of the large machines it will require so that they can be manufactured and installed to produce electricity for the needs of South Australia before our ever-increasing demands overtake the output of power stations throughout the State. I have great pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart): I suppose every member will support the second reading of this Bill, and possibly will support the Bill in its entirety. I am glad that the Premier gave the House the benefit of inquiries made by the trust. I cannot say that I accepted all the findings he gave or that I was satisfied that the inquiries were exhaustive enough, as it seemed to me that, as I feared when I asked for this information, the report demonstrated why this station should not go into the country rather than the pros and cons of establishing it in a country area. I will examine some of the reasons given by the Premier for the decision by Cabinet, on the recommendation of the trust's engineers, that Torrens Island represented the best site available. The Premier said:

Cabinet is satisfied that the Torrens Island site selected by the trust is the best available in the interests of the State and the electricity undertaking.

I have never questioned that it would be the best site from the point of view of the electricity undertaking; I doubt whether anyone would query that. However, that is not the point at issue. I think everyone will agree that for convenience of operation having the plant close to the source of consumption and to the trust's headquarters has obvious advantages. That is exactly the situation the trust faced when it considered decentralizing the supply of power in the first instance, when it decided to establish a regional station at Port Augusta. Now the Premier has set out (I take it on the advice of the trust) the requirements of a site for a station of the magnitude of that proposed for Torrens Island.

As the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) said, this is the biggest single undertaking this State has ever encountered. Because of this, it is proper that Parliament should attach due importance to the question of site. The Premier said the first essential was an adequate area. Nobody would deny that there was adequate area on Torrens Island, but I do not think it would be denied that there was adequate area at Port Pirie or Wallaroo. He said that there must be adequate water for cooling purposes. Those who know anything about the establishment of the power station at Port Augusta know how important that is, but the inference to be drawn from the Premier's statement was that adequate accessible cooling water would not be available at Wallaroo or Port Pirie. I believe it could be obtained at Port Pirie and possibly at Wallaroo, although I am not as conversant with Wallaroo as with Port Pirie. From the point of view of the State as a whole, the establishment of a power station at either of those sites would have such far-reaching advantages that they should be taken into consideration on the credit side of any statement prepared to assess the relative economic values of sites.

At Port Augusta, because of the ebb and flow of the tides, a good depth of water had to be secured. It was not possible to draw water in one side and pump it out on the other side of the station without the tide's bringing the same water back into the pumps a second time. However, I believe there is a site at Port Pirie (although I am not sure about Wallaroo) where an operation such as that proposed for Torrens Island could be embarked on and where hot water could be disposed of in such a way that it would not be re-used.

The next point the Premier made was in relation to access by fuel ships. Nobody can deny that shipping facilities are available at

Port Pirie and Wallaroo. The Government is spending large sums to rehabilitate the wharves, deepen the channels, and make other provisions for shipping at both these centres. Further, the disposal of the ash would not present a problem at Port Pirie.

Mr. Hughes: Nor at Port Hughes.

Mr. RICHES: I am indebted to the honourable member for that interjection. We are told that these difficulties make it unwise to put the station in a country area. We cannot but query the investigation that has been made and stand behind the Leader of the Opposition for an inquiry by an independent authority. Regarding soil and foundation, no-one who has not made a test can speak with authority. I am not an authority and I do not think any member here could speak authoritatively on the matter, but an area that could take the largest smelting works in the world should be able to provide what is needed. The only difficulty would be the need for proximity to the load centres. This is a matter that must be weighed against the value created in a country centre by the establishment of a power station. To say that there would be an additional cost of £2,000,000 to establish a country station indicates the expenditure of much money, but what would it be when put against £150,000,000? The engineers have estimated the cost, and have said that there would be an increased capital cost for a country station, but no-one has assessed the value of the station to the district in which it would be established. An independent inquiry might well find that the additional £2,000,000 would be money well spent.

Mr. Jenkins: It would be about £10,000,000.

Mr. RICHES: There is a multiplicity of figures in this matter, which supports the claim that the inquiry has not been complete. When the Premier first mentioned the matter he said that the inquiry had been going on for four years, and that the additional cost would be £1,000,000. We said that such an addition should not rule out a country station because of the value to the community that would be created by its establishment. Now we are told that the cost will be much more. The Premier said that for Wallaroo it would be £2,500,000 more, and to that would have to be added the cost of the transmission lines. Several estimates of the cost have been given. The Premier said that the additional capital expenditure on a station there, plus the cost of transmission lines, would be about £10,000,000. Can any member estimate the improvement in capital values if the station were established at either

Wallaroo or Port Pirie? The member for Semaphore said that the workers at a Torrens Island station would probably have to live at Elizabeth. Transport would have to be provided for them, but transport costs at either Wallaroo or Port Pirie would be much less. No-one has looked into this matter. There would be inevitable development in the country area where the station was established.

Mr. Jenkins: What has been developed at Port Augusta because of the station there?

Mr. RICHES: The development has been considerable.

Mr. Jenkins: There has been no new industry.

Mr. RICHES: The power station carries Port Augusta, and a station in another area would mean a rejuvenation for that area. There would be a terrific economic benefit to the State, but no-one has assessed that value. It should not be the work of trust engineers to do it. No-one can query their findings, and from their point of view I agree that Torrens Island has an advantage over other areas, but I am convinced that it would be a good thing for a policy of decentralization in this matter to be followed, even if it meant the expenditure of more money. Until an inquiry is held we shall not know the cost. At Whyalla, in order to establish a work force and to develop the ship-building industry, the Commonwealth Government subsidized the building of a tanker to the extent of £1,000,000. That could not be regarded as an economic proposition, but it was economic from the point of view of the State, because it helped to establish a city. It brought into being a work force and nobody regrets or criticizes that subsidy of £1,000,000 to build in South Australia a ship that could have been built at half the cost in almost any other shipyard in the world. There is no criticism of that; I believe it was worthwhile and it has paid dividends. All I am asking is that somebody in a position to assess the situation should be able to give us an assessment of the value of this power station's being built on one site rather than on another, taking into account the cost of providing services, of transport to and from work, and the effect it would have upon the part of the State in which it was built; then let us have a look at it. Because I consider that that is desirable, I believe that the Leader of the Opposition advised this Parliament wisely when he suggested that this project should be subject to an inquiry by the Public Works Standing Committee. We have competent Government departments. Our Engineering and Water

Supply Department is competent, but that organization would not be allowed to build a main from Iron Knob to Lincoln Gap without an inquiry by the Public Works Standing Committee. Does the fact that this scheme is not subject to such an inquiry mean that there is no confidence in that committee? I think not.

I believe this House regards an inquiry as a wise proceeding, and members generally would agree that in many respects the seeking of a second opinion has helped in giving a full measure of consideration to some of our public undertakings. It may well be that that could obtain in this case. We do not have to be critical of the Electricity Trust's engineers to point out mistakes that have happened that possibly could have been avoided, even in the erection of power stations. They themselves have sought overseas advice. I do not know whether or not that advice helped them in deciding the locality of the power station, but I appreciate the wisdom of seeking overseas advice, as the trust has done, from a purely engineering and not from a community point of view. That is the point I emphasize.

The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe), when he addressed himself to this debate, said that we were asking for a country station too early; that he believed in decentralization, that this station should go to Torrens Island and perhaps, when South Australia was ready for the next station, we should have atomic energy, and that station should go to the country where the difficulty of access to raw materials would be overcome. I remind the honourable member that access to raw materials has not been advanced as a factor determining this issue. It is just as easy to off-load Newcastle coal at Wallaroo or Port Pirie as it is at Port Adelaide. That is no argument at all. It merely shows that, if that is the basis of his thinking on this subject, he, too, needs further to consider this matter because, if every other situation can be met and it is feasible to have a country power station the next time that South Australia needs to duplicate its generating capacity, then it is feasible now because the availability of raw materials, so far as we have been advised, is not an issue in this debate.

The member for Torrens also said that, if this matter had been referred to the Public Works Standing Committee, he knew what the report would have been. That may well be—I do not know—but my past experience of this committee is that it is ready to hear representations from various localities. It has tested

the evidence placed before it and, whether it be the Public Works Standing Committee or not, some authority should be given the power to assess the value to the State of establishing a power station like this in some part of the State outside the metropolitan area, weighing the advantages against the disadvantages in each case and then reporting to Parliament. I suggest as firmly and eloquently as I possibly can that that is not the job of the engineers of the Electricity Trust. I have the greatest admiration and respect for them. I do not think we could get better engineers. The efficiency of the trust is, generally speaking, accepted by everyone throughout the State, but this is not the engineers' job. Having seen railway centres disappear because decisions were made by railway engineers only and no consideration was given to the community interest, I believe still that these communities could have been saved had someone taken into account their value and included them in the final reckoning. I am sure that the new Premier occupying the Treasury benches (Mr. Jennings) will give due consideration to what I am saying!

Mr. Jennings: You can rely on that.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must not interject from the Treasury benches.

Mr. Jennings interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must not interject from the Treasury benches.

Mr. Jennings: You said that before.

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable member disobey the Chair?

Mr. RICHES: I think I have said all I need on this point, but I do urge, even at this late stage, that the Government see fit to refer this matter for investigation to the Public Works Committee. Lest some members say, as they have said in the past, that there was a time when I was not so keen that the Public Works Committee should examine electricity projects, I say that if they take the trouble to look through *Hansard* they will discover that I have always advocated that they should be so examined, even in the very first instance when members on this side tested the House on a vote. It was a great pity that the House did not listen to representations from this side on that occasion. The proposals that have been put into operation since the establishment of the trust would have lost nothing by examination by the committee, and the State may well have benefited from getting the advice and opinions of outside authorities. It is a sound principle. This House regards it as sound in every other undertaking in which the

State is interested, but this one was singled out and it was said: "There is no need." I do not agree. I believe it is just as desirable to have this matter investigated by a committee as it is with every other Government or semi-government undertaking. The Housing Trust is almost in the same category as the Electricity Trust, but we do not allow the Housing Trust to erect a factory for an industrial undertaking at Elizabeth without inquiries being made by a committee appointed by this Parliament.

Mr. Fred Walsh: It builds factories on its own initiative.

Mr. RICHES: Not unless it is empowered to do so by the Industries Development Committee. Parliament may have given authority and found money from time to time for the building of houses, but the trust is answerable to Parliament. We do not allow the Railways Department, the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Education Department, the Public Buildings Department, the Hospitals Department or anyone else to do that. No-one has claimed that their work has been hindered and no-one will argue that that action has not been wise. The action in this case is not wise. With those reservations I support the Bill.

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa): I listened with great interest to the member for Stuart and thought that one must judge on results. In business if a branch is operating satisfactorily and is efficient, I would not put any authority over that branch to direct how it should be run. In the Electricity Trust we have an organization which, over the years, has clearly shown a capacity to run its affairs extremely efficiently, and this is indicated by the fact that apart from the Tasmanian hydro-electric scheme we are supplied with power at lower rates than those applying elsewhere in Australia. That indicates a pretty good approach to the running of the affairs of the trust. I have no intention of supporting my friend in his advocacy of a Public Works Committee inquiry into this matter. The trust operates with its own money. It has received loans from the Treasurer of about £52,800,000 and from sundry institutions and persons of about £33,900,000. Its total debenture funds are about £86,800,000. That is all money for which the trust is responsible, and it is not the taxpayers' money, but money on loan to the authority, which puts the funds to good purpose by providing low-cost power spread over most of the State. That is an outstanding achievement when we view power reticulation in other States.

Mr. Riches: I do not think that is quite a fair comparison. Fuel costs come into it.

Mr. LAUCKE: The trust's operations at Leigh Creek have demonstrated its capacity to operate the fuel resources extremely capably.

Mr. Riches: Do you know what the freight rates are from Leigh Creek compared with the Victorian rates?

Mr. LAUCKE: We have a concession there, but we provide industry with power at a rate that enables it to compete with other State manufacturers. Householders are receiving power at rates that compare favourably with those applying in other States. That is a pretty good show. May I indicate the need for forward planning by the trust. We cannot wait for a crisis to arise, because that might involve power rationing. We have never had rationing and have always had access to power as the State has grown and the demand has increased. We have always had power on tap and it is good to know that the trust is still receiving increased custom. During the last financial year the following increased income was received by the trust compared with the previous year:

Power supplied.	Per cent increase.
Residential	3.73
Commercial	4.61
Industrial	12.97
Public lighting	9.71
Bulk supply	20.28
Traction	28.67

This reveals a substantial increase in revenue from the supply of power for certain purposes.

Mr. McKee: Where would the trust be supplying that power?

Mr. LAUCKE: That is from its overall activities.

Mr. Fred Walsh: It is a very good institution.

Mr. LAUCKE: Yes, indeed.

Mr. Fred Walsh: It is a State enterprise.

Mr. LAUCKE: I believe, and have always believed, in the State's providing the basic needs for private enterprise on which to operate, and there we have the basic framework. I do not deny power reticulation, water services and things like that their rightful places in the community. The State has the right to supply those services. With that background, we can progress to the best advantage collectively and individually.

Mr. Jennings: Would you include all transport or only the unprofitable transport?

Mr. LAUCKE: I believe in the provision of transport through our present railway system. The number of the Electricity Trust's consumers has increased, and this increase indicates the forward planning to which I have referred. In the year ended June 30, 1962,

the number of consumers increased as follows:

Residential	11,639
Commercial	869
Industrial	1,852
Bulk and traction	1
Total	14,361

All this demonstrates the basic need for reviewing future requirements and preparing to meet them when they arise. This Bill provides for access by the trust to Torrens Island and for the provision of a 2,000,000-kilowatt station. The water usage for cooling purposes will be 80,000,000 gallons an hour and that consumption would empty the Warren reservoir in 50 hours.

Mr. Lawn: Is there any reason why this power station should not be built at Wallaroo?

Mr. LAUCKE: Yes; we must ensure the lowest possible unit cost for power. We have been clearly shown that by the trust's investigations into the comparative costs of production at Wallaroo as against Osborne.

Mr. Lawn: And at Port Augusta?

Mr. LAUCKE: Anywhere at all. I would like to see power generated in the country if it could be produced at rates comparable with those applying at Osborne.

Mr. Lawn: What about Port Augusta?

Mr. LAUCKE: The cost of transmitting power is high. I can visualize that with the power station situated at Torrens Island we shall continue to have the cheapest power of any State in Australia except Tasmania. I believe that due consideration has been given to possible country locations for the new power station. I should like to see it in the country if it could be provided economically and if consumers would have to pay only the same charges as would arise from a power station at Torrens Island. As that cannot be achieved, I wholeheartedly support the Torrens Island project. I commend the trust for asking the Government for access to Torrens Island to establish this new power station. It is pursuing a policy of providing a continuous supply of power at the most economic rates to all consumers. I support the Bill.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): As a country member I oppose the Bill. Every country member who supports decentralization should do likewise. I have not heard one Government member who represents country electors advocate the establishment of this project in his district. Several country districts would be suitable for this power station, and I feel obligated to my constituents to press their claims.

Members opposite have not advocated the claims of their districts for a power station because they know that with an influx of working people their district would have a broadened political outlook and they would not be here after the next election. Will any member opposite deny that?

Mr. Lawn: Shouldn't this Bill be submitted to the Public Works Committee?

Mr. McKEE: If everything were fair and above board it would be submitted to that committee. No evidence has been taken in country areas.

Mr. Lawn: You have silenced the Government members!

Mr. McKEE: Yes, and they were silent when I asked them why they did not advocate the establishment of a power station in their districts. It is obvious why they did not. The member for Stirling has a suitable harbour at Victor Harbour and I do not know—

Mr. Jenkins: I want my people to enjoy good tariffs.

Mr. Lawn: You don't want working people there.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McKEE: Ever since I have been a member of this House—and that is not a long time—the Opposition has argued for the equalization of electricity tariffs. Indeed, we introduced legislation to achieve that, but not one member opposite supported our effort. What do members opposite have to say about that?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This is not a bear-garden; this is Parliament House.

Mr. McKEE: Has this Government any intention of trying to decentralize industry? Two years ago the Industries Development Special Committee was appointed to investigate the needs of country districts for industries, but as yet it has not submitted a report of its findings to this House. It has visited Whyalla, Port Augusta, Port Pirie, the South-East—

Mr. Hughes: And Wallaroo!

Mr. McKEE: Yes. Wallaroo has a good case for a power station or any other project that may assist the district. If this power station is established on Torrens Island it will be the most backward step possible and hinder the State's progress. When we debated the equalization of electricity tariffs members opposite said that the extra charge on country consumers was to enable the extension of electricity to country areas. Country consumers are being victimized to assist the development of the metropolitan area.

Mr. Hall: Talk sense!

Mr. Coumbe: Wake up!

Mr. McKEE: How many small businesses have been pushed out of country areas? Every country town has empty shops and empty houses. Let members opposite get up and deny that. I can take them to any country town within 60 miles of the metropolitan area and show them empty houses and empty shops. In Port Pirie every street has empty houses.

Mr. Hall: It is badly misrepresented!

Mr. McKEE: I am glad that the honourable member interjected. He had the opportunity of having a big industry established at Mallala but his better judgment prevailed and he thought, "Many workers might come here and they will outnumber the farmers." His district is monopolized by big farmers. If we want to discuss monopolies in South Australia we need only refer to the pastoral industry which is controlled by about nine or 10 families.

Mr. Lawn: The member for Gouger wants sewage works in his district. He said that he would be proud to have sewage in his district. He would get a bit of stockyard confetti.

Mr. McKEE: Country people have been victimized. Many country districts would welcome a power station. Small businesses and small farmers would welcome an influx of people to their areas. The new workers would spend money which would foster business, and this would help to develop the State generally. However, the influx of workers to the country would bring about a reformed political outlook, so members opposite oppose decentralization. They welcome only supporters of the Liberal Party. Unfortunately, some districts can support only the Liberal Party because of the electoral boundaries. If the Government continues to ignore the needs of the country people and to give preference to big business interests in the metropolitan area, it will eventually find that the country electors will forsake it, and we cannot blame them; they are talking that way now, and there are some smoke signals in country districts.

Mr. Lawn: There were some last March.

Mr. McKEE: Yes. I think that should be a warning; if the Government cannot be told, it cannot expect to achieve anything. In the position it is in today, it should take heed. It was forced into giving the country electors a 10 per cent reduction in electricity tariffs.

Mr. Nankivell: It was 50 per cent in my case.

Mr. McKEE: The member for Albert is such a nice fellow and has such a good personality that I would not like to take anything from him.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's personality is not mentioned in the Bill.

Mr. McKEE: He has such a personality that it could be; he might even assist it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot see anything about that in the Bill.

Mr. McKEE: Ever since I have been in this House I have voiced my concern at urbanization—the drift of country people to the metropolitan area. If this state of affairs continues—and no doubt it will if the Government insists on establishing great projects and cramming everything in the metropolitan area—in a very short time nobody will be living in the country, except the people who have taken advantage of those who have been forced to leave. I do not think anybody can deny that. Great monopolies in different spheres of business have gone into the country and gobbled up small businesses, which have not been able to carry on because of the movement of people to the metropolitan area. I point out that Whyalla has the biggest turnover of labour in the whole of Australia.

Mr. Nankivell: Why?

Mr. McKEE: Because the jobs at the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited are the most poorly paid. Not one member opposite will deny that that company is a monopoly. I know that the B.H.P. Company will not contradict me when I say that it has the biggest turnover of labour in Australia. As a union official, I have visited Whyalla several times, and I know that there are men there operating machines and getting only 3s. over the basic wage. Men with four and five children were taking home £27 a fortnight and paying £7 of that in rent.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will link up his remarks with the Bill.

Mr. McKEE: I am dealing with decentralization, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is a most backward step. How can we expect to develop the State when we continue to cram all our great industries and projects into the metropolitan area?

Mr. Quirke: Would you call Whyalla a decentralized town?

Mr. McKEE: I have just mentioned Whyalla, which has grown because of Iron Knob and the fact that the B.H.P. Company has had control of the iron ore deposits right through the Middleback Ranges for practically nothing.

In fact, it was paying only about 1s. 4d. a ton royalty until an overseas visitor came out here, when it got a fright and increased it by 2d. a ton on its own initiative.

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

Mr. McKEE: I am discussing decentralization, Mr. Speaker. If this power station is established at Torrens Island it will be a retrograde step. We talk about the expense of reticulating power to the country areas. Why not put a power station in a centrally situated country area where an electricity supply is required? If we are to make country industry pay more for power than industries in the metropolitan area, it is only common sense that industries will not go to the country. I would not establish an industry at Alice Springs if it were going to cost me much more for power. That has been the case with the differential prices for petrol. We argued until we received a reduction in those prices, but it is still not good enough. These are not the horse-and- buggy days: everything is automation and machinery, which relies on modern fuels. I will not support the establishment of this project on Torrens Island, because I think it is detrimental to the development of South Australia. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. JENKINS (Stirling): I support the Bill. The member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee) said that Victor Harbour would be a suitable place for a power station, but he knows nothing about it whatever. I am more concerned to see that my constituents obtain power at a reasonable tariff than I am to see the establishment of a power station where it would be uneconomic not only to my people but to the whole of the State. This proposed establishment has been thoroughly investigated over the years by very competent officers of the trust, and those officers have found that there are advantages in setting up a power station on Torrens Island. I should like to give some reasons why I support this Bill. The Premier, in his second reading explanation, said:

Torrens Island presents many advantages. A causeway across Angas Inlet will completely separate the inlet and outlet cooling water at comparatively small expense. There is available adequate land for the power station proper, and swampland for reclamation by ash disposal. The site is adjacent to the metropolitan area, where the power will mainly be used. Of all the sites, metropolitan and country, this provides the best features for cooling water and is the most economical site available. The capital savings compared with Osborne or the North Arm site will be at least £1,500,000; hence the capital saving compared with Wallaroo is £9,400,000 and the annual

saving approximately £1,000,000. The advantages of the Torrens Island site are so clear-cut that the trust has no hesitation in asking the Government to make Torrens Island available for the new station.

If it would cost £9,400,000 more to bring power through transmission lines from Wallaroo to the metropolitan area where it would be mainly used, how much more would it cost to bring it from Port Augusta or Port Pirie?

Mr. McKee: Aren't you going to develop the State at all?

Mr. JENKINS: I will quote what the members of the board had to say on this subject of decentralization. The Premier's second reading explanation continues:

The members of the board controlling the trust have reported to me that they are particularly conscious of the fact that an undertaking such as the trust can contribute to decentralization, and this aspect is always considered when they are taking important decisions on localities for major works. The trust has already played a very important part in decentralization in this State by the development of the power stations at Port Augusta, Mount Gambier and Port Lincoln, and the coalfield at Leigh Creek.

A saving of £10,000,000 in capital cost and £1,000,000 annually in running costs is sufficient to convince me that Torrens Island is the most economic and favourable site. If we are to compete with other States and possibly with overseas countries we must have the lowest tariffs available and the only way to get them is to have this plant established where it is most economical and where it can be managed and conducted properly. The member for Stuart (Mr. Riches) said that Port Pirie was a good site. The Premier said:

A power station at Port Pirie to deliver power to Adelaide would be considerably more expensive than one at Wallaroo, and there are no compensating advantages. The possibility of building a power station at Wallaroo was considered in detail in comparison with the metropolitan area. It is estimated that, at the 1,000,000 kilowatt stage of development, the capital cost of the Wallaroo station would be £7,900,000 in excess of that of a similar power station at Osborne.

I am satisfied that these things I have mentioned would justify the establishment of a power station on Torrens Island. I have every confidence in the Electricity Trust's officers, who have done a great job in extending power throughout the country. As the member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke) said, our electricity charges are lower than those of every other State except Tasmania. Consequently, the trust should be supported. Torrens Island is

the place where this power station should be established.

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray): This has developed into a rather unusual debate; we have just heard a second second reading! I join with other members on this side in expressing disappointment that (according to the Premier) it is not possible for the power station to be erected in a country area. The Premier went out of his way to build up arguments against the claims of various members on this side.

Mr. Jenkins: They asked for it!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Stirling has made his speech.

Mr. BYWATERS: The Premier went to some lengths to explain why this station could not be erected in various country areas.

Mr. Clark: Is this the stuff the member for Stirling gave us?

Mr. BYWATERS: I think so. The Premier referred to most of the members who had submitted arguments for a power station to be erected in their districts. The unfortunate aspect was that the River Murray came a poor last. I was disappointed at this because I believed there was a good case for establishing a power station at Tailm Bend. The argument has been advanced, not only by me but by officers of the Mines Department and by the trust itself, that if another power station could be established in a country area Tailm Bend would be an excellent locality, because it could use Moorlands coal and supply power to that part of the State. We were told during the debate that one reason against having a power station at Wallaroo or Port Pirie was the heavy transmission cost. The Premier said that an extra £5,400,000 in transmission costs would be involved if the station were built at Wallaroo. This, I believe, is an argument for having smaller power stations in country areas so as to save taking electricity long distances. For instance, a line to cost £1,000,000 is to be constructed between Tailm Bend and Mount Gambier. Power must be reticulated to Tailm Bend before going to the South-East. This week a tender was called by the trust for a powerline to be erected between Adelaide and Tailm Bend to carry this power. Scheme after scheme has been inaugurated to take power to the river areas, the Murray Mallee and the South-East; these schemes make it necessary to reticulate the power by transmission lines.

Mr. Loveday: Should not the power generated at Port Augusta be cheaper in that area than elsewhere?

Mr. BYWATERS: That is the natural thing to assume; power generated at Osborne is

cheaper in Adelaide than in country areas, despite the fact that country tariffs have been reduced recently. I think it would be better to have several smaller stations throughout the country than one big station on Torrens Island. This undertaking, to cost £150,000,000, is the biggest ever engaged in by this State. Because of this, I think it is fair for members on this side to ask for it to be referred to some committee for investigation. We have been told by Government members that this is not necessary, but the member for Stuart (Mr. Riches) has repeatedly requested that such big projects be submitted to the Public Works Standing Committee or to some other committee to investigate. If that were done, we might find it more advisable to erect several smaller stations in country areas. Although I do not want to cast gloom, this will probably be the main supply for the whole of the State. Should we ever be subjected to enemy attack, it would be the most vulnerable point and the State could be thrown out of commission.

Mr. Quirke: That would happen wherever it was.

Mr. BYWATERS: It might, but if we had several small stations all our eggs would not be in one basket. We have been told that costs have entered into this decision, and I believe this has been the major reason for deciding to build one large station. Possibly it would be cheaper from the point of view of administration costs but, as the Leader pointed out, roads and many other things would have to be provided and these could easily outweigh the savings made in other directions. Although I am sure that, with Government support, Torrens Island is where this station will be constructed, I want to have it recorded that I said I believed it would be in the best interests of the State to have a series of small power stations rather than one big station.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I support the Bill wholeheartedly. I listened with much interest to the remarks of members on both sides. If I gauge correctly the drift of the argument by Opposition members, it is that the station should be erected in the country in the interests of decentralization, and that if we do not want to do that immediately the matter should be referred to the Public Works Committee for inquiry and report. I am not sure how many Opposition members said they opposed the Bill outright. It seems that some did, and others said they supported the second reading. We shall see the position when the numbers go up.

Mr. Bywaters: It might be something like you on legislation dealing with rent and price control.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That may be. I think I have put in a nutshell the argument that has been expounded over the last two or three hours. There has been fallacious reasoning, and I shall give my reasons. This station is to be the biggest public undertaking in the State, and I understand that the cost will be £150,000,000 spread over about 20 years. That is an enormous sum. The member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke) has said that the total fixed assets of the trust are about £100,000,000; therefore, this will be a large undertaking. We had some close reasoning in the Premier's explanation of the Bill. He set out the pros and cons in connection with various sites. I am prepared to accept his reasoning. To me it makes good sense. On the information given, Wallaroo is apparently the next most acceptable site. However, at Wallaroo the additional capital cost would be £10,000,000, and the additional annual cost would be £1,000,000 for about 40 years. That would be an additional cost of about £50,000,000.

Mr. Riches: How would the additional capital cost be made up?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know. I have already said I am prepared to accept the Premier's figures. That is the estimated additional cost to the State.

Mr. Riches: It was not said how the sum was made up.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No. I am prepared to accept the figures given, and I noticed that the honourable member could not challenge them.

Mr. Riches: Nor anyone else.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Quite so. With Mr. Riches I am a member of the Industries Development Special Committee that is inquiring into decentralization. With the committee I have travelled to many country areas, and with Mr. Riches I accept wholeheartedly the sentiments expressed in country towns in favour of decentralization. I accept them and nothing would give me greater pleasure than to be able to help fulfil the hopes and desires of country people in this way. I believe we can have decentralization in South Australia, but we must be prepared to pay for it. That is the real point at issue in this Bill, and in the committee's inquiry. Can we afford decentralization? I do not believe that South Australia can afford the extra £50,000,000 to put the station at Wallaroo, and I am sure that the extra cost there would be less than it would be in any other country town. South Australia is developing and it has pulled itself up by its

shoestrings with the generous assistance of the Playford Government over the last 25 years or so. Every advance in this State has had to be worked for and paid for. It has not been an easy process, and South Australia is not a wealthy State. Unless every developmental step is economically sound, our economic progress must come to a speedy end.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: The station is to provide power, not only employment.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: With his usual perspicacity the Minister has hit the nail on the head. In development water and power are necessary. If we are to develop, the cost of providing these two things must be kept as low as possible. That is the crux of the argument. We cannot afford the extra expense of putting the station elsewhere than on Torrens Island. With great respect and charity to members opposite, I believe they know that is the position. It is plain common sense, and when they want to use it they are not without common sense. Politically it is all very well for the Opposition to say that we must have decentralization, that the station must be in a country area, and that the matter must be considered by the Public Works Committee. Opposition members know that there will never be an opportunity to prove whether they are right or wrong, because their plans will not be put into operation.

Mr. Fred Walsh: Don't kid yourself!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Who is kidding himself? It is the honourable member, if he thinks differently from what I have said. It is the responsibility of this Government to develop the State as economically as possible; otherwise the whole thing will come to an end, and members opposite know it. That is why I entirely reject the arguments about decentralization that have been put forward by Opposition members in this debate. They are fallacious, because as a State we cannot afford the luxury of the extra expense involved in putting the station elsewhere than on Torrens Island. For those reasons I support the second reading.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): I support the Bill in its entirety. If it were economically possible to do it, it would be great to have the station established at Wallaroo, the second choice, but it is not economically possible. That is the whole argument. We had the idea that a nuclear power station could be established just around the corner. Whether Wallaroo would want it, I do not know. Mention has been made of the cost of £150,000,000, but I doubt whether the cost will reach that figure. The trust will build unit by unit, and the cost might not reach the estimated figure.

Time and time again the old war-horse of decentralization is dragged out, and it is broken-kneed now because it must be apparent to everybody that decentralization as far as the Government can encourage it has been accomplished. Water and power are available. The mains and pipelines that criss-cross this State have given water where any industry can go.

Electricity has been reticulated through the whole State. It is a mammoth scheme. I should say it will be not more than about six years hence at the very outside before every farm and homestead north of Adelaide—say, as far as Orroroo—will have a reticulated electricity supply. The same will apply to the South-East, so the elements of decentralization will be there and, in the major centres, are there. The member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee) seemed to think that one could put a power station such as this anywhere, but that is not possible. Such a power station can be put only on the sea-board. For instance, if we built it at Burra, it would run the duplicate water main dry in the cooling of it. It is impossible to site a large power station inland. If we built it on the River Murray, it would kill all the fish at the other end because of its discharges. Some 80,000,000 gallons of water an hour is used, which represents the average pumping capacity of the Mannum-Whyalla main for about 24 hours. It can be boosted, of course. How silly it is to think that there is any place in the country away from the coastline where this power station could be put!

As a result of all the investigations made, Wallaroo was placed second; and Wallaroo falls down on the clear-cut economics of the case. If this power station were at Wallaroo, transmitting a tremendously high voltage to Adelaide, it would be more costly for the State than having the station on Torrens Island and sending the power to the country on much lower-powered lines. We would get the same feed. That power can be decentralized from Torrens Island better than it can be decentralized from Wallaroo because these huge powerlines have to have at their termination the major consumption. They are not checked halfway; they have to be taken to the place of consumption. At present there are two of them, a circuit coming down, five miles apart, twin power lines of about 250,000 volts, coming from Curlew Point down to Magill, then going back again, circulating the whole time and so regulating the supply. This would give a terminal between Curlew Point and the metropolitan area. Then the lower-powered and cheaper lines could take it to Wallaroo

much more cheaply than it could be brought from Wallaroo to Torrens Island.

Mr. Harding: Or Mount Gambier.

Mr. QUIRKE: Or Mount Gambier or anywhere else. They are the economics of the situation, as I see them. To try out decentralization every time such projects as this come before the House is just begging the point. If water and power are available, what stops any industry from going into the country? If the Opposition members were in power tomorrow, how would they decentralize any industry anywhere in the country? They just could not do it. Even if industry were socialized, there could be no compulsion. What socialized industry could be put into the country? Is there any industry that we can name? The country is wide open, with sources of water and power supply available. It is said that the country needs industry. So it does. Country towns need industry to keep the population there—I admit that—but how is it to be done? It is no use anybody talking about decentralization unless he can say how it is to be done. Nobody yet in this House has ever put forward a proposal on how to decentralize any industry in the country. It is my personal view, based upon the history of the human race, that the time will come, probably sooner than we think, when industry will decentralize itself throughout Australia. There will be a revulsion against this further gathering of people into great metropolitan areas; it will come spontaneously; it will never come through force.

In New South Wales, where a Labor Government has been in office for a long time (and I am not criticizing) where are the industries? Has that Government been able to decentralize them? They range from Wollongong to Palm Beach. There is a congested area 100 miles long and probably its only equivalent is the east coast of the United States of America where there are some hundreds of miles of the same type of development.

Mr. Casey: This stretch goes to north of Newcastle, 110 miles north of Sydney.

Mr. QUIRKE: Flying in to Sydney one can see one continuous chain of development. One can go further than that but I gave it only as far as the break at Palm Beach. Going north from that stretch of country, one goes into isolation. The development in New South Wales is on its coastline. The whole of the New South Wales industrial development for heavy industry is on that coastline, and the coastline is where, unless there are mighty rivers as there are in the United States and

other places, industrial development takes place—on lakes, on rivers, or by the sea.

Australia is the driest continent on earth, and this is the driest State in the driest continent. It is difficult to decentralize industry under the natural conditions obtaining in South Australia. This mammoth station to be built here can send power into the country more cheaply than power can be sent to Adelaide and then back. I am prepared to accept that the Electricity Trust's figures are correct; we have no right to disprove them. I put forward a mild criticism and I am prepared to support some remarks made by members of the Opposition in this regard. We have a second reading explanation here, and the trust gives us certain figures that back its request for this station to be built on Torrens Island, but it comes to this Parliament.

It has been suggested that it go to the Public Works Committee, but the scheme could not go there as one entity. It would have to go in separate segments, such as the expenditure for three years, the expenditure for another three years, and so on. We on that committee have to do that with such things as the duplication of the Morgan-Whyalla main. Such a project is not approved all in one fell swoop, because costs differ from year to year. A true picture of all the facts of the case cannot be obtained by considering the facts of this case as the committee would a main from Morgan to Whyalla. It is done in sections. The Torrens Island project would have to be undertaken piecemeal, and the first three years' experiment would be undertaken with plans for another three years hanging over the trust's head. This is an enormous scheme costing a colossal sum and this House is entitled to more evidence supporting the trust's claims. If the trust's figures are correct it would not be detrimental to the trust to prepare and lay on the table of the House a paper giving some detailed evidence. We do not need all the evidence that the trust has because that must comprise a massive document, but we should have the reasons why it arrives at this conclusion and we should know how the costs compare with overseas costs. When Parliament is asked to support a project like this I should appreciate more evidence than we have received in the second reading explanation. That is due to Parliament. We should be able to obtain some interesting evidence on which to act without referring this question to the Public Works

Committee. We could be supplied with something to think about when dealing with this terrific expenditure, because we are the Parliament that makes these things possible. The House is entitled to receive more than it has been given. I advance these arguments so that something like that might be done in future. I do not doubt the summary of the evidence, but should like to know something more of the evidence because it is therein that the interest lies. We would not then be left to wonder whether the facts were as stated. I support the second reading and know that when this station is built it will be not only a credit to the Electricity Trust but to the everlasting benefit of the people of South Australia.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh): I support the second reading and at the outset say that I appreciate all that the Electricity Trust has done for the economic benefit of this State. The trust is a credit to Government enterprise. I accept, as did the member for Mitcham, the figures from the Electricity Trust, submitted by the Premier. I do not doubt the accuracy of the figures, but I wish to say one or two things to support members on this side of the House and to express concern that such a huge project, costing about £150,000,000 to be spent over 20 years, is to be established in the metropolitan area, while country areas will not receive similar new establishments. The member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) said it was easy enough for Opposition members to talk about decentralization. I agree that those who criticize must always be conscious that the swing of the political pendulum may put them in government, and when I rise to criticize the Government that is always in the back of my mind.

Having said that, and having accepted the estimated cost of this project, I agree with the member for Mitcham. I believe that he said we must have decentralization and we must pay for it. If he said that, the rest of his argument falls flat, because he immediately invoked the economics of the proposal. Members opposite adopt a very short view of the economic position and show a complete lack of confidence in the State.

Mr. Millhouse: You are being a little hard.

Mr. HUTCHENS: One has to be a little hard to drive it into someone who is a little soft, so I will be hard for definite reasons. I agree with the member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) when he says we have to think of the future; we cannot now say that we are free from or independent of other nations.

The spending of £150,000,000 on a huge power station alongside an existing power station, rather than distributing power stations around the country to strive for some degree of safety, is a short-sighted policy.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Where would you put this power station?

Mr. HUTCHENS: We should re-examine this question and ask ourselves whether a further £10,000,000 spent over 20 years to construct this power station at Wallaroo would not be more than offset by additional benefits. If all the expenditure goes out in one fell swoop we are then defenceless. Those of us who have studied past war events know that the chief target of an attacking side is the power-producing centre. The story of the Dambusters brings that right home to us. Therefore, a wider distribution of the power stations would give us a chance of retaining some. The member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) rather surprised me when he said that decentralization had been accomplished in South Australia. I do not know what he meant, but it is safe to assume that the Government is no longer further interested in decentralization of industry and population. The member for Burra asked how further decentralization could be achieved. We have had some decentralization of industry and population and that can be done by supplying services that attract people and industry. Whyalla is a glorious example of this, because that town would never have been an attraction without River Murray water.

The member for Burra went to no end of trouble to direct our attention to other States. He said it would be difficult to show where there had been any decentralization in New South Wales. I agree that New South Wales has a long line of industries along its sea coast from Sydney to Newcastle, a distance of well over 100 miles. Newcastle is no small town; it is highly industrialized and, if I remember correctly, one industry there pays wages totalling £17,000,000 annually. If one examines Queensland one finds big towns such as Mackay, Rockhampton, and Cairns—examples of decentralization of that State's population. I join with other members on this side in urging that this Parliament be supplied with more facts similar to those advocated by the member for Burra in his concluding remarks. We should not accept bald statements about the cost of the project at Torrens Island compared with the cost at Wallaroo without proper evidence to substantiate the claims. If we want decentralization we must acknowledge

that we will have to pay for it. Professor Copland recently said that the salvation of this nation depended on decentralization.

Mr. Lawn: It depends on a Labor Government.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Wherever the Labor Party has been in power some progress towards decentralization has been made. Members opposite have referred to the cheap power that we enjoy in South Australia, but they have failed to acknowledge that this power is provided so cheaply because of the subsidy received from the Commonwealth Parliament, and introduced when the Labor Government was in power.

Mr. Lawn: It made money available to develop Leigh Creek.

Mr. HUTCHENS: That is so.

Mr. Nankivell: You mean the Commonwealth Government, not the Labor Government.

Mr. Lawn: The Chifley Government. It was probably before you were born.

Mr. Nankivell: I thought the Government might have been changed.

The SPEAKER: Order! I understood that the member for Hindmarsh had the floor.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I thought that when the tornado stopped blowing the little wind over here might be heard. The member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) said that decentralization was an accomplished fact so far as this Government was concerned. Speaking of winds, it is amazing how winds can change. On July 30, 1947, (according to page 151 of *Hansard*) Mr. Quirke said:

I told electors who attended my meetings that so long as the Playford Government occupied the Treasury benches there was no more chance of getting decentralization than of getting manna from heaven. Can anybody imagine for one moment the Playford Government putting an industrial concern into the District of Light, or even Stanley, and converting their rural population into an industrial population?

Mr. Heaslip: He has seen the light since then.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I suggest that he would see the light better if he advocated the establishment of industries in country districts. He should tell his electors, as he told them before, that only a Labor Government would take steps to decentralize industry in Australia to provide security for the nation in the event of war and to lead to this country's progress.

Mr. FRED WALSH (West Torrens): I support the second reading. My views possibly do not coincide with those of my colleagues. I had intended to refer to Mr. Quirke's former attitude on decentralization, but my colleague beat me to it by quoting from *Hansard*. I

do not subscribe wholeheartedly to the views expressed by my colleagues about decentralization, although as it is my Party's policy I must embrace it. I look at this subject from the viewpoint of the State's economic position. I agree that this State has the worst record of decentralization in the Commonwealth, but every other State is better situated for water, fuel, and raw materials, without which an industry cannot be decentralized. We can provide fuel and water, but we must have raw materials in the area in which we seek to decentralize an industry. Whyalla exists because of its proximity to the mineral deposits in the Middleback Range and at Iron Knob and Iron Baron. However, we have not sources of raw materials in other areas to justify the establishment of country industries. If to establish country industries we must grant subsidies, then I question whether that is sound economics. We must fully examine projects to determine whether it is profitable to establish industries in country areas. In view of the employment situation in some towns, the establishment of industries may be justified: Wallaroo is an example.

Mr. McKee: Industries should be enticed to establish in areas where land is cheap and where harbours are available.

Mr. FRED WALSH: Wallaroo is badly in need of an industry. The Public Works Committee has been mentioned during this debate, as has been the Industries Development Special Committee. Mr. McKee referred to this special decentralization committee, and the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse)—a member of that committee—spoke of its travelling all over the State and coming to the conclusion that strong evidence had been submitted by some people to support the decentralization of industries. We are waiting anxiously for that report to come before Parliament. We can only assume that the committee will bring down a recommendation, but whether or not it will be favourable we can only wait and see. Only a body of that kind can assist us in this matter, for I presume that that committee will be guided by the economic aspects of the evidence submitted to it. It is no use discussing the question of decentralization merely on, shall we say, the sentimental aspect of just providing employment.

Mr. McKee: I don't think this committee has ever been consulted on the economic aspects.

Mr. FRED WALSH: I am not on the committee, so I do not know. That committee, of which the member for Stuart (Mr. Riches) and the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) are members, has been considering the question

of decentralization and taking evidence, and we believe that it will be submitting a report. We know that the members representing country districts are more closely interested and concerned in this matter than are metropolitan members. I have regard for those members' views, and I sympathize with them and with their constituents, particularly those who may be affected from the employment point of view. I think the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) struck a pertinent note in the closing stages of his remarks when he referred to the lack of information supplied to us by the Premier in his second reading explanation. The Premier certainly told us of the trust's desires and the trust's report regarding the expert information supplied to it, which information I, with other members, accept. One could not go beyond that information regarding what is required, but that information is of very little use for the future. Actually, no information is supplied as to the actual cost of this project, and all we know is what has appeared in the press. The sum of £150,000,000 has been mentioned; if I remember rightly, the Premier first announced it in his broadcast and telecast, and it then appeared in the *Advertiser*, under big headlines, the following day. I think it was rehashed again in the *Advertiser* two or three months ago. No mention of the amount required is contained in the Bill or in the Premier's second reading explanation, and therefore we are at a loss to know the estimated cost of the project.

I believe we should be advised of just what is contemplated and of how the amount is to be spent. I do not know whether or not it will be spent by way of public moneys. We know that the trust has bond issues from time to time. I am interested in those issues to the extent that the trust is a socialistic undertaking, and I have a small financial interest myself because I find it more suitable to have an interest in such an organization than in a private enterprise. We have no idea of the extent to which the Government will be involved, and I hope to be able to get that information from the Premier when we reach the Committee stage. Because of the very magnitude of this undertaking, we should have more information; even if it is not provided now, I consider that we should get further information from time to time, because it would appear that once this Bill is passed the trust will have the green light to go ahead and we shall have no further say in the matter. I do not think we should be placed in that position.

Mr. McKee: That will be the position.

Mr. FRED WALSH: I do not know, but I expect the Premier to tell us about it when we reach Committee. We must look to the future. I understand that it is contemplated that this station will be operated by coal, and it could be that later it will be run by oil. We have been told that it will be cheaper to run it by coal, but whether it will be Leigh Creek or black coal I do not know. However, I could not imagine that it would be run on Leigh Creek coal, for that would be very costly inasmuch as with every 100 tons of coal brought down there would be 40 tons of moisture. I assume that if we are to burn coal it will be black coal, and perhaps later, with the advent of the Port Stauvac refinery, we shall burn oil.

Mr. Ryan: If this were an inquiry by the Public Works Committee wouldn't all these questions be answered?

Mr. FRED WALSH: If the committee had to thoroughly examine the economics of the expenditure of about £150,000,000, it would be occupied for nearly 20 years inquiring into the project, that is, if it took as long as it has taken in considering the Jervois bridge project. The committee must consider all the economic aspects. Incidentally, I think the member for Port Adelaide (Mr. Ryan) was having a shot at the Public Works Committee, and I think that was rather unfair. I assure the honourable member that neither the Premier nor anyone else influences the Public Works Committee in coming to a decision; if the committee thinks a matter is urgent and in the public interest, its members might work extra days and over the weekend in order to hasten a decision.

Mr. Ryan: Then it would not take you 20 years?

Mr. FRED WALSH: It would depend on the circumstances. It is possible that in the not far distant future we may be using nuclear power. Many of the older members of the House, including you, Mr. Speaker, will recall that about 10 years ago, when we were dealing with the establishment of Radium Hill, the Premier predicted that a nuclear power station would be established in South Australia within 10 years. I see the member for Angas (Hon. B. H. Teusner) nodding his head. I believe that the Premier was sincere in making that statement.

Mr. Clark: He named the place, too.

Mr. FRED WALSH: He predicted that by 1960 we would have a nuclear power station in South Australia. That never materialized and, as we all know, Radium Hill faded out. By the same token, we could be using nuclear

power in a station on Torrens Island in the not distant future. Early this year the *Advertiser* reported that a power station of about 2,000,000-kilowatt capacity would be built in Great Britain at a cost of about £70,000,000—half the cost of this station. I admit that machinery for our new station would cost less in England than the price at which it could be imported to Australia and that most of the machinery would probably be made in England or on the Continent, but a nuclear power station could be constructed at a lower cost than the proposed station. By the time it is completed, we may be using nuclear power. We must anticipate these possibilities.

In all the circumstances, I believe the place where it will be constructed is ideal and that the days for its use as a quarantine station (which it has been for as long as I can remember) may be numbered. For the reasons submitted by the Premier in his second reading explanation, I believe it is an ideal site for a power station such as that intended, irrespective of the fuel it may use. The Bill simply provides for the work to be commenced, and I believe it can be commenced almost immediately. I have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Mr. CLARK (Gawler): I hope that members will not sigh too much; I intend to be brief. It appears to me that many red herrings have been drawn into the debate. I support the second reading and for once I am in complete agreement with one thing the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) has said. To be frank, I do not agree with much else he said, but towards the end of his remarks he said most sincerely that he believed that more evidence and information should have been given to the House on this project. I think the real reason for the prolonged debate and the wide diversity of opinions expressed by members is the lack of information. Full information should have been given to us because we would all like to know what it will cost. If the Premier could not give an exact figure—and nobody would expect him to do so—he could give us some idea. The sum of £150,000,000 has been bandied about as though it were nothing. No matter who is spending the money, this is an important matter for the people of this State who will eventually provide the money for it.

Many members have suggested that the matter should be referred to the Public Works Committee. I, like the member for West Torrens (my colleague on the committee), am not sure whether it could be presented to the committee, but, if that were the wish of this

House, I am sure any obstacles could be removed. The committee is not anxious to have it because it has plenty to do already, of course. I agree with the member for West Torrens that neither the Premier nor anybody else has any influence on that committee, which goes to much trouble in its investigations and makes an honest attempt to make the right recommendation. The member for West Torrens mentioned several things that had been running through my mind, particularly nuclear power stations. By an association of ideas, I well remember what happened a few years ago about a projected nuclear power station. Just before a State election I was doing a little work in the interests of democracy in the district so ably represented now by the new member for Chaffey. We heard a certain announcement over the air by the Premier, and I hope I am not being unjust in thinking a certain amount of it was election propaganda. Members opposite quietly mentioned a few moments ago the place he named—Lake Leake—where, he said, a big atomic power station would be erected. At the time my colleagues and I did not know where Lake Leake was; all we knew was that it was somewhere in South Australia. The members for Victoria and Millicent would have known that it was in the South-East, but before the Premier mentioned it I am sure that only people living in the South-East knew where it was. Of course, nobody has heard of it since. That does not mean that the possibility of nuclear power stations must be ruled out, or that we have any idea of what the cost of a nuclear power station would be, but when a project estimated to cost £150,000,000 is to be built by the State we should know as near as possible what it will cost. Why not refer this matter to the Public Works Committee for investigation? Somebody suggested that such reference would be a reflection on officers of the Electricity Trust.

Mr. McKee: You would get a trip to America out of it.

Mr. CLARK: I have no desire to reflect on the trust's officers, for whom I have much respect. Before the boundaries of my district were altered, several country areas were within it and I attended many meetings held for the purpose of obtaining electricity extensions. I have nothing but the highest praise for the officers who go to small country meetings attended by 20 or 30 people and explain plainly everything involved and—what we are not told in connection with this project—the cost. In saying that we should have more

information, I am not criticizing officers of the trust. That would be like saying that in investigating certain matters the Public Works Committee was criticizing various Government departments. Recently the Public Works Committee gave interim reports on such projects as the Public Library additional buildings, the Strathalbyn water supply, the Port Lincoln gaol, the trunk water main from Mannum-Adelaide main to Wattle Park service reservoir, the junior boys' training school at Lochiel Park, and the Port Adelaide bulk handling system. Surely no-one would suggest that the Public Works Committee's being asked to report on these matters was a reflection on the departments it was investigating. I believe, and I think all members will agree, that Parliament is responsible to the people for the money it spends.

If we had a thorough investigation and knew as near as possible what the cost would be, it would be a great help. Other matters could be investigated also. The two or three matters I have mentioned have been the bone of contention in this debate. Some members have strongly supported the establishment of a country power station. A reason was given in the Premier's remarks why it could not be established, but I should like a fuller investigation into the matter. The money value of a country power station is not the only consideration. Other things must be considered as well. All the economies of the position must be examined fully. Of course, there would be a voluminous report on the matter, but every member, whether from the country or not, would be satisfied that the station was to be built in the right place. Some members have advocated certain areas for the station. Some have rightly sought it for their own areas and given reasons, but that is something I cannot do. I cannot imagine where a station could be put in my area. There is not enough water in the Little Para River. I should like to see all the economics of the matter investigated.

As usual, references have been made to Labor's ideas on decentralization. Some members have said that the Government is doing all it can in this matter; and others have said that more can be done. We must find a way to bring about decentralization soon. The member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) said it was easy for Opposition members to make certain statements. There is not much difference between the Government and the Opposition, and when I am on the Government benches, which will be soon, I shall be as

keen an advocate for decentralization as I am now, and have been for 10 years, as an Opposition member. I support the second reading and hope that in Committee we shall get more details about the project. We should have a clear picture of the cost, and the information sought by some members should be given.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): I support the second reading. There seem to be some guilty consciences amongst Government members. After listening to the Premier's second reading explanation, and the remarks today by Government members, it seems that they are trying to cover up some matters referred to in the Bill. Otherwise, they would not have gone out of their way, as they have, today in particular, to try to make it appear that Wallaroo had been considered seriously.

Mr. Bywaters: Wallaroo was the second choice.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, and that did not come as a surprise to me. Without trying to ridicule anybody, the examinations of the various sites by the experts, as they are called, and the overseas consultants, were made to support the Government and the trust in the selection of Torrens Island. About two years ago the Industries Development Special Committee was set up to collect evidence from various parts of the State on decentralization for a report to Parliament. It seems a pity that the selection of Torrens Island was made before the committee submitted its report. When it visited my district a case was made out in support of a power station in the Wallaroo area, yet before the committee could present a report on the matter a decision was made to have a station on Torrens Island. I believe we shall not have another power station in South Australia for many years. It is a pity that the decision was made before the committee's report was presented.

This afternoon the member for Torrens spoke about the number of small investments in trust loans. The people of the State have every confidence in the trust because it is a socialistic organization. They have no fears about lending their money for trust purposes. I have such confidence, and that is the attitude adopted by many small investors. I regret that Wallaroo was the second choice because in that district we have practically everything required. It seems that the greatest drawback against Wallaroo being the most suitable site is the cost of transmission lines. However, when we speak of £150,000,000 another £10,000,000 is not a great sum to spend in the interests of the State. We must think of the

value of the rehabilitation of country centres, and the added asset to the State. South Australia as a whole should be developed, not only the metropolitan area. Although the additional cost for Wallaroo might be £10,000,000 it would be money well spent in the development of a country area. Three towns could be restored to their former prosperity, if the Wallaroo site were selected. Hundreds of houses are available in Wallaroo and Moonta, which have become pensioner towns because of the lack of interest displayed, not so much in the individual towns as in the development of the State as a whole.

Wallaroo district, as we all know, has suffered over the years from unemployment. When the children at the secondary schools graduate there is no work for them there so they are compelled to go to Adelaide. If the Government in its wisdom had examined the position, as I am examining it tonight, it could have advised the Electricity Trust of the great benefits to be derived if a country area had been selected. Only last Friday I attended a football dinner at Wallaroo at which the mayor remarked, when he saw about 50 or 60 lads from the Wallaroo district celebrating at the dinner, that it grieved him to think that within the next two years most of them would be compelled to leave the area to seek employment. It is not good for the development of the country when so many young people should have to congregate in the metropolitan area. With the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) I consider that more information should have been made available to this House, and then perhaps there would not have been so much opposition to the Bill. We should have been taken into the confidence of the Government and the Electricity Trust, and then there would not have been the need for all these speeches against the Government. Various experts and consultants from overseas have been mentioned concerning the selection of the Torrens Island site. With great respect to the experts, I maintain that they studied only the economics of the project itself and not its effect upon the development of the State. I remember, as you do, Mr. Speaker, the time when two experts from South Australia were sent overseas to examine various projects and bring back information on the best means of bulk handling wheat. In their wisdom they recommended that the tip-truck system should operate at Wallaroo. It is indeed a great tribute to the late Mr. Cecil Chapman that he stood out firmly and influenced the members of the wheatgrowers' organization, proving that

these experts were wrong. He understood the real development of the country, and at last others saw the wisdom of his views. Today, South Australia is enjoying the conveyor belt system: It would have been a retrograde step if the report of the two experts had been adopted. I do not think that such experts consider the State as a whole; as experts, they examine merely the economics of a project. When the Premier was answering questions regarding the Torrens Island project and the examination of the State as a whole he said (and I do not quote him exactly) that it required 200 acres for the establishment of this project, yet in his second reading explanation he quoted 1,300 acres. When the House was discussing this matter previously, I said that we had 150 acres of good land that did not need to be reclaimed just south of Wallaroo—not 200. It appeared then that I was 50 acres short. Yet, I find that we need an additional 1,000; so sometimes even the Premier is misled by the recommendations of these experts.

The Premier also said that about 80,000,000 gallons of water an hour was needed for cooling purposes for this station and that the outlet water must be prevented from mixing with the inlet water. I do not think any fault could be found at Wallaroo or Port Hughes with the water, because we have just as much and just as deep water there as at Port Augusta or anywhere around Port Adelaide. If the water were taken through an inlet near the grain distillery it could be discharged into a bay nearby without much heating of the inlet water. I see the Minister shaking his head. One does not need to be much of an expert to know that, if there is an inlet with plenty of deep water and the water is then pumped to a bay at least a quarter of a mile away, it will not have much effect upon the inlet water. It would not be necessary to build a station right at Wallaroo. The economics would not come into it so much if the station were built at Port Hughes, where there is plenty of deep water and the outlet could go to Sims's Cove. The experts had no argument there about the cooling system. We have the jetty at Wallaroo and it is hoped that in the near future work will commence on deepening the harbour so that the ships can unload coal or any other fuel there. I did not intend to speak on this Bill, because it was made quite clear that no matter what we said it would be passed. However, I wished to point out that the experts are not always right when it comes to considering the development of the State as a whole.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Construction of power station."

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): Clause 3 provides for the vesting of the land in the trust for the construction of a power station, but no time is prescribed for the commencement of the work. Is the Premier able to say when it is likely to commence?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): This is an urgent matter. The trust, with the approval of the Government, has been making extensive tests in the area and in my second reading explanation I set out the power requirements of the State. I said that tenders had already been called for the first unit. When tenders are received the trust will almost immediately start on embankments and other work to enable access to be gained to the island. The volume of the work will progressively increase. The first stage of 120,000 additional units has to be in operation by 1967. It will take nearly five years to complete the power station. Experience at the Port Augusta station revealed that we had to increase our volume of production each year to cater for the demand. Speaking from memory, I believe that the trust has brought into operation in the last four years about 200,000 additional units. That rate of completion has to be maintained. I assure the honourable Leader that this matter is urgent and that the trust has for some time been anxious to have this matter considered. To overcome any delay the Government has given the trust authority to do certain testing and other work. The Mines Department has undertaken certain work and other authorities have also assisted. Testing of tides has been undertaken and other work on that is to be carried out in the near future.

Mr. FRED WALSH: What coal is to be used?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The trust will use mainly Newcastle coal at this stage. The generating capacity at Port Augusta is sufficiently large to maintain the Leigh Creek coalfield in full operation. The trust will make provision for oil as an alternative fuel, because honourable members will appreciate that this is a vital matter to South Australian industry and we cannot rely only on one source of fuel when it has to be imported.

Mr. FRED WALSH: Will the passage of this Bill enable the trust to proceed with the completion of the project?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The trust did not actually require the approval of Parliament to do this work, because it has a general power under its charter. The reason for the Bill was that the trust was to occupy Crown land. We did not have to pass similar legislation for the erection of power stations at Mount Gambier, Port Lincoln or Port Augusta. In the peculiar circumstances of this case, the Government decided it was proper to place the matter before Parliament. The trust has power to build power stations on its own land.

Mr. FRED WALSH: To what extent is the Government involved financially?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Government is not involved financially in any way. The trust is wholly responsible for its own finance. It has to pay its way, borrow its own money, and pay interest rates and amortization. There will be no grant except the grant of the land, and that is why the Bill was submitted. The Government could, under the Crown Lands Act, have granted the land to the trust because it is an instrumentality of the Government.

Mr. FRED WALSH: The loans are guaranteed by the Government?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No, the trust raises loans on its own debentures. It is not guaranteed by the Government. The trust is fully responsible for its financial obligations and it is highly desirable that it should be. The Government is not making any contribution in this regard. This is a project that the trust will finance.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (5 to 7), schedules, and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2).

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

EXCHANGE OF LAND (HUNDRED OF TICKERA).

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's resolution.

TRAVELLING STOCK RESERVE: HUNDRED OF FINNISS.

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's resolution.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.15 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, October 17, at 2 p.m.