

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, June 12, 1963.

The House met at 12 noon pursuant to proclamation, the Speaker (Hon. T. C. Stott) presiding.

The Clerk (Mr. G. D. Combe) read the proclamation summoning Parliament.

After prayers read by the Speaker, honourable members, in compliance with summons, proceeded at 12.9 p.m. to the Legislative Council Chamber to hear the Governor's Speech. They returned to the Assembly Chamber at 12.42 p.m. and the Speaker resumed the Chair.

NEW MEMBERS.

Messrs. Allan Robert Burdon and James Rankin Ferguson, to whom the Oath of Allegiance was administered by the Speaker, took their seats in the House as members for the districts of Mount Gambier and Yorke Peninsula respectively, in place of Mr. Ronald Frederick Ralston and the Hon. Sir Cecil Hincks (deceased).

DEATHS.

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

That the House express its deep regret at the deaths of the Hon. Sir Cecil Stephen Hincks, former Minister of Lands, Minister of Repatriation and Minister of Irrigation and member for Yorke Peninsula, and the Hon. Lionel Laughton Hill, a former Premier, Minister of the Crown and member for East Torrens and Port Pirie, and place on record its appreciation of their public services: and that, as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased gentlemen, the sittings of the House be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

I think every member has had some close association with the late Minister of Lands, Sir Cecil Hincks. I believe I speak without fear of contradiction when I say that every member admired him for his personal qualities and for his integrity and devotion to his work which had a great impact upon the State's development, particularly in soldier settlement and the use of Crown lands. All returned soldier settlers recognized that in him they had a friend who would do everything possible to smooth the difficult task of closer settlement. His passing was a personal tragedy for me. I had worked with Sir Cecil for many years and had learned to respect his opinions and his integrity. During 16 years I recognized him as a man who was prepared

to do his utmost for the welfare of his country. I shall not refer to his military service except to say that probably no-one in South Australia had a more difficult physical handicap resulting from his war service than had Sir Cecil. His passing will be mourned by every member, and I express deep sympathy to his family on their sad bereavement.

Mr. Lionel Hill came from a previous generation of politicians. His service in the House concluded in 1933. He was a member from 1915 to 1933, during which period he played a conspicuous part in the State's affairs. He won a foremost place in the political arena of his time. He was Minister of Education on two occasions—for six years—and Premier for 3½ years. He was Treasurer during probably the most acute period of financial stress this State has experienced in recent years—the depression of 1930 to 1933 when the whole world had a depression complex that was particularly reflected in countries like Australia which depended so much upon her primary-producing economy at the time. The prices of all primary commodities fell below production costs and there was an army of unemployed. I doubt whether any member would want the job of Treasurer in such circumstances. The steps that were taken have been the subject of debate in recent years. I do not pretend to be an economist and to say whether the steps that were taken at the time were right: they were fearless steps that were taken by the seven Governments of Australia, and they were not easy steps for a politician to take. Undoubtedly, Australia emerged from the depression much sooner than did any other country. Be that as it may, I think everyone will appreciate that those were hard times, and hard times undoubtedly place a tremendous stress on the people who have to deal with them. I commend Mr. Hill for his public services to this State. I think that the people of Australia appreciate that the services given by the Premiers of that time were given not in fair weather but during a difficult period, and that they will commend their Premiers for the courageous steps they took to try to put the Australian economy on the right lines again. I express my deep sympathy to the families of these two men.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I join with the Premier in paying a tribute to the memory of the Hon. Sir Cecil Hincks and the Hon. Lionel Laughton Hill. Mr. Hill was Premier of

this State almost a decade before I entered Parliament. I do not desire to enter into a discussion with the Premier on what occurred during the depression years, but I doubt whether the nation of Australia would again accept the financial measures that were applied in the early 1930's.

All members will agree that Sir Cecil Hincks was most courteous and that he was most genial in his approach, not only to members but to the staff and the public generally. All of his friends, particularly those in the Returned Servicemen's League (to whom he was a real pal), will miss him deeply, and we here who are left will regret his passing. I support the motion, and I hope that a letter will be forwarded to the widows of these two gentlemen.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

[Sitting suspended from 12.58 to 2.15 p.m.]

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1.)

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

MARINE ACT AMENDMENT ACT.

The SPEAKER: I draw the attention of the House to a proclamation in the *Government Gazette* of February 28, 1963, notifying Her Majesty's assent to the Marine Act Amendment Act, 1962, which proclamation I now ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read the proclamation.

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH.

The SPEAKER: I have to report that, in compliance with a summons from His Excellency the Governor, the House attended in the Legislative Council Chamber where His Excellency was pleased to make a Speech to both Houses of Parliament, of which Speech I have obtained a copy which I now lay upon the table.

Ordered to be printed.

NEXT DAY OF SITTING.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD moved: That the House sit its rising adjourn until Thursday, June 13, at 2 p.m.

Motion carried.

CONDOLENCES.

The SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that I have received the following letter from Mrs. Ralston, of 13 Chute Street, Mount Gambier:

December 17, 1962.

To the Speaker, Members and Officers of the House of Assembly.

Dear Sirs,

I sincerely appreciate your very kind letter of sympathy in the loss of my beloved husband, which gave me great comfort in my hour of trouble, and which I shall always remember.

Yours sincerely,

Nell Ralston.

I have to inform the House that I conveyed its resolution passed on October 31, 1962, to Mrs. Jean Hookings, widow of the late Hon. A. C. Hookings, and in reply I received a letter of appreciation from Mrs. Hookings and family.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1.)

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make provision by Bill for defraying the salaries and other expenses of the several departments and public services of the Government of South Australia during the year ending June 30, 1964.

In Committee of Supply.

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

That towards defraying the expenses of the establishments and public services of the State for the year ending June 30, 1964, a sum of £18,000,000 be granted: provided that no payments for any establishment or service shall be made out of the said sum in excess of the rates voted for similar establishments or services on the Estimates for the financial year ending June 30, 1963, except increases of salaries or wages fixed or prescribed by any return made under any Act relating to the Public Service or by any return or by any award, order or determination of any court or other body empowered to fix or prescribe wages or salaries.

Motion carried.

Resolution adopted by the House. Bill founded in Committee of Ways and Means, introduced by the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford, and read a first time.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time. It provides for the appropriation of moneys so that the public services of the State may be carried on in the early part of the next financial year. Clause 2 provides for the issue and application of £18,000,000 which should suffice to meet normal expenses of the Public Service in July, August and a part of September. It will be necessary to introduce another small Supply Bill before the Budget is completed for introduction in this House. Another Supply Bill will be required in mid-September,

probably as soon as the House meets again after the Royal Show, and this should enable the Public Service to carry on until Parliament has considered the Estimates of Expenditure and passed the Appropriation Bill for the financial year 1963-64. Clause 3 provides for the payment of any increases in salaries or wages which may be authorized by any court or other body empowered to fix or prescribe salaries or wages. The Bill is in the normal form of an Appropriation Bill and contains no additional matter.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I do not intend to delay the passage of this Bill, which is in the usual form and provides the normal safeguards. I therefore support it.

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

Later:

Bill returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make appropriation of the sum set forth in the accompanying Supplementary Estimates of Expenditure by the Government during the year ending June 30, 1963, for the purposes therein stated.

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

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

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I understand that within the next few minutes we will be asked to vote a sum of money to the University of Adelaide. The matter I now raise relates to one aspect of the administration of the university and arises from an incident that has occurred since the House last sat. I raise it for two reasons: first, I believe that Parliament is entitled to know, and certainly to consider, how the university is being administered; and, secondly, I point out respectfully that this House has three members on the council of the university and I look to them for an alteration for the better of the present arrangements.

Mr. Malcolm Thomas Hewitson, who lives in my district at Belair and who is a master at King's College, applied to the university to take the subject Educational Psychology II this year for the degree of Master of Education. Mr. Hewitson obtained the Bachelor of Arts degree in 1951 and the Diploma of Education in 1955. He now wants to do the course leading to the degree of Master of Education,

which was instituted in 1961. Educational Psychology II. is one of the four subjects that must be passed before one can obtain that degree. He did not know of this subject until the first week of the university term, some time in March, and if any fault is his, it is in not finding out about this subject earlier. As soon as he did, he immediately went to the university to apply to enrol for that subject. It was a late enrolment, of course, but the university provides, under clause 5 of chapter VIII of its statutes, for late enrolment for various subjects. That clause states:

A candidate shall enrol for his year's work not later than the date prescribed by the council. An enrolment submitted after that date shall not necessarily be accepted, and if accepted shall incur such late enrolment fee as the council may prescribe unless there be adequate reason why it had not been submitted by the prescribed date. Application for remission of the late enrolment fee must be made in writing and be addressed to the Registrar. The instructions for enrolment that are issued by the university go further and under the heading "Late enrolment" state:

No entry will be accepted after the first day of term save in very exceptional circumstances and with the consent of the dean of the faculty concerned and of the chairman of the education committee. An application for such acceptance must be in writing and must explain why the enrolment was not made earlier.

As soon as Mr. Hewitson went to the university he saw the Professor of Education, Professor Neal, and Mr. Roe, who is the tutor in the subject. He was told that only three other students had enrolled for this course and he was directed to Professor Malcolm Jeeves, who is the Dean of the Faculty of Arts. Professor Jeeves directed Dr. Gibbs to enrol Hewitson provisionally as a student in this course. It was obvious from Hewitson's conversation with these four men that it was expected that his late entry would be accepted. In fact, these are the very people whose decision one would expect it to be as to whether a student would be permitted to enrol late. Subsequent to submitting his provisional enrolment he attended lectures and tutorials and did much work. In fact, he was actually asked by Mr. Roe to prepare a paper to be given at a subsequent tutorial.

However, on April 5—some weeks after his provisional enrolment—he received a letter signed by Mr. V. A. Edgeloe, the Registrar, which contained the following:

Your application for late enrolment in 1963 for a subject for the degree of Master of Education has been considered and, I regret, not approved. Your provisional form of entry for lectures has therefore been cancelled.

Mr. Clark: Who would make that decision?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know at this stage, but I should like to know, and that is one reason why I am raising this matter. At this stage Mr. Hewitson communicated with me. I spoke to Professor Neal who, I think, saw Mr. Edgeloe, but the only result of that was a letter from Professor Neal forbidding Hewitson to attend any more lectures as his provisional enrolment had been cancelled. I then spoke to two of the members of this House who are on the University Council—the members for Rocky River and Barossa—and subsequently wrote them letters asking them to take this matter up at council level. They inquired about this matter, but entirely without success. I do not know whether it was actually raised at a council meeting, but the result was entirely negative and Mr. Hewitson was not permitted to go on with the course. Those are the facts. I am not at all satisfied with the treatment Mr. Hewitson received, and I wonder whether it is typical of the treatment that other people may have received at the hands of the university.

Mr. Lawn: It is like the gerrymander in South Australia.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Let us confine ourselves to this subject for the time being.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must confine himself to the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will do so. This course will not be given again until 1965, so there is no chance of Mr. Hewitson's doing it next year. No-one would have been inconvenienced or have suffered by his being allowed to enrol. There are only three other students and it would have been rather a benefit than otherwise to have had another student in such a small class. The university is the poorer by £29 as a result of the refusal to accept Mr. Hewitson, because the fee for this course is £24, as set out in the regulations, and Mr. Hewitson would have had to pay a further £5 as a late entry fee.

Mr. Clark: Mr. Hewitson would have had to pay that himself.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and he was willing and happy to pay it to be able to do the course. The university rejected his enrolment and therefore lost that money which would have been clear profit. More important, why was he refused? Surely at a time like this when Australia is crying out for people to study for higher degrees and when we are trying to raise our educational standard as a whole, the attitude of the university, or any other body connected with teaching, should be to encourage

people to try for higher qualifications and not to discourage them in the way that Mr. Hewitson has been discouraged. The only reason that I can see why he was refused enrolment was the blanket application, without any thought at all, of the rule that one may not enrol after a certain date. That rule was obviously introduced in case there would be inconvenience to anyone concerned, but there would have been no inconvenience in the case I have mentioned. This is the thoughtless application of a rule laid down by someone at the university—either the council or the administrative authorities.

Mr. Shannon: Doesn't it have to go to the council?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course it does; the university council must eventually decide it. This incident arose only a few weeks after the following statement appeared under the heading of "Students Urged to Think" in the *Advertiser* of March 12:

The principal aim of a student was to become a better thinker, the Vice-Chancellor of the university said yesterday.

I do not blame the Vice-Chancellor for this. He had gone overseas before the incident blew up, but it is ironical that he should beseech students to think when, at the same time, the council of the university should apply a rule thoughtlessly.

I thank members for their indulgence. This is an important matter that should be considered here, and I hope that the three members of this House who are members of the University Council will do something to bring about an improvement in matters of this kind at the University of Adelaide.

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa): An important principle is involved in administration and the affairs of the university in connection with enrolment procedure and, bearing in mind that about 7,000 students are enrolled this year at the university, members will appreciate that there must be regulations to control entry procedure. Without this there would be chaos, and I think the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse), in view of the huge numbers seeking enrolment and the chaos that would result if regulations were ignored, will agree that there must be an orderly approach to enrolment.

Mr. Clark: What is the £5 penalty for?

Mr. LAUCKE: It is for late application. In 1959 the University Council amended the statute relating to enrolment, and the amendment was allowed on December 17, 1959. The statute now states:

A candidate shall enrol for his year's work not later than the date prescribed by the council. An enrolment submitted after that date shall not necessarily be accepted, and if accepted shall incur such late enrolment fee as the council may prescribe unless there be adequate reason why it had not been submitted by the prescribed date.

On August 28, 1959, the council decided:

That as a matter of policy no entry be accepted after the first day of term save in exceptional circumstances and with the consent of the dean of the faculty concerned and of the chairman of the education committee.

I am giving this information to show that certain procedures must be followed to ensure an orderly approach and the proper administration of the affairs of the university in respect of enrolments. The enrolment period is published in a leaflet entitled *General Information to Students* and in the public press early in each year. The university also publishes annually a leaflet entitled *Instructions for Enrolment*. This leaflet, which gives details about enrolment procedure and periods, devotes to late enrolments a section that concludes with the following paragraph:

No entry will be accepted after the first day of term (in 1963, March 11) except for technology and applied science students (for whom it is February 18) save in very exceptional circumstances and with the consent of the dean of the faculty concerned and of the chairman of the education committee. An application for such acceptance must be in writing and must explain why the enrolment was not made earlier.

I understand that Mr. Hewitson applied for enrolment in Educational Psychology II by letter dated March 30, 1963, which was three weeks after the first day of term (March 11) and a fortnight after lectures had begun (March 18). The reason he gave for his late enrolment was:

Until last Wednesday I was not aware of the existence of the Master of Education degree at the Adelaide University.

The regulations establishing the degree of Master of Education had been submitted to members of the senate—and it is very important to know that Mr. Hewitson was a member of the senate—in November 1960. They were allowed on March 16, 1961. The establishment of the degree was well known throughout the teaching profession, of which Mr. Hewitson was a respected member. The dean of the faculty of arts and the chairman of the education committee agreed that no "very exceptional circumstances" had been established by Mr. Hewitson and therefore decided that his enrolment for 1963 should not be accepted.

Mr. Millhouse: Why did they let him start lectures?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Barossa.

Mr. LAUCKE: Mr. Hewitson will be able to enrol at the appropriate time in February next, and will not have to wait for two years, as has been stated by the honourable member.

Mr. Clark: But he has lost one year.

Mr. LAUCKE: My whole purpose in speaking is to show that, unless there is an orderly approach to enrolment, chaos can result. I have the highest regard for the administration of the university, and I am concerned for Mr. Hewitson and sorry for him that he has overlooked the necessary regulations in respect of the subject. I assure the House that every consideration was given within the regulation to admit him to this subject, but the authorities cannot make fish of one and flesh of another. I agree with the administration in having to say reluctantly, "No, you have not complied with the regulations, so you cannot this year do this particular subject."

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood): In this matter I am speaking personally and not on behalf of the University Council, which to my knowledge has not considered this case; I am speaking only as a member appointed by this House to that council. I am grateful to the member for Mitcham for raising this matter here. True, the university was constrained to make fairly rigid rules regarding enrolments because many late enrolments were being received in courses and causing much inconvenience to the university; but my view was always that those rules would be construed with the over-riding consideration that courses were to be provided for students, because that was what the university was there for.

Mr. Clark: And after all, there was a £5 penalty.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Quite so. I believe that, when somebody has been grossly careless and where some inconvenience to the university will result through its having to shift courses around or to make provision for students only with some considerable difficulty, then there is a case for refusing a student's application for late enrolment; but where a student could be enrolled in a course without difficulty, I cannot see any reason for his being refused entry.

Unfortunately, it has been apparent—and I have seen two previous cases of this with which I was unable to deal until it was too late to do anything for the students concerned—that the attitude of the then dean and the

then chairman of the education committee was that an application for late enrolment should be refused for disciplinary purposes, that is, to discourage other people from applying for late enrolments, no matter how great the hardship to the particular student and despite the fact that he could have been enrolled without difficulty to the university. I personally do not agree with that view, Mr. Speaker, and now that the honourable member has raised this matter here I believe it behoves the members appointed to the University Council to raise the matter in the council itself. I will personally undertake, in co-operation with my colleagues, if they will agree, to raise the matter before the University Council.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): Several things strike me as being fundamental. Firstly, the dean of the faculty had agreed to the enrolment; secondly, he had applied the £5 penalty for late enrolment; and thirdly, as the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) explained to members, the gentleman concerned had attended lectures. Those three factors need explaining away. I can tell the member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke) frankly that I am not content that the council now sees fit, through its mouthpiece (Mr. Edgeloe), to reject the dean's recommendation. The man actually started his lectures. The £5 penalty is really only a bagatelle to this gentleman, who seeks to find a higher rung in the ladder that he is now climbing; but a year's delay in his scholastic career is a vital matter.

Mr. Clark: I think you will find he could not take this course until 1965.

Mr. SHANNON: It could mean, if he were lucky enough to qualify in this course, some hundreds of pounds in additional salary as a result of taking this higher degree.

Mr. Clark: I don't think that is his chief concern.

Mr. SHANNON: That is the material side of it. After all, this House finds quite a considerable sum of money for our university. I do not complain about that for one moment, but I believe—and here I agree with both the members for Norwood and Mitcham—that the intention of Parliament is that we should provide the opportunity for people to achieve higher qualifications and, if there is no valid reason why a person should not do so, he should not be prevented from so qualifying. I should like to know whether there is any valid reason in this case. The member for Barossa did not tell us whether there was a real reason why this man should be denied the right to take this course. It cannot be a question of numbers; if

it were medicine or law or any of the faculties that might have numbers embarrassing to the university, I could understand the dean's being over-ridden. However, the contrary is the case. I agree with the member for Mitcham that an extra person would be an advantage rather than a disadvantage in such a small team as three. Further, I agree with the member for Norwood that it is a good thing to have these things aired when they arise. I hope it might have some effect in the council, where I believe the matter will finally be resolved.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River): As the third of the appointed members of the University Council I support the member for Mitcham in his remarks. Frankly, I have been disappointed, since being appointed to the council, in what I can do. As members of that council, we are rubber stamps. We vote money from this Parliament for the education of people who will serve the State better by being educated, and here we have an opportunity to educate another man and obtain £29 extra revenue. The education of that man would mean much to the State, yet he is refused a chance to obtain it. I think it is all wrong that these matters never come before us. I think the member for Norwood will agree with me in that respect. These things are all cut and dried long before they come to the council.

Mr. Laucke: You can debate it in the council.

Mr. HEASLIP: If we know about it we can. The member for Mitcham has raised this matter, otherwise we would not know anything about it. The various committees below the council resolve these things, and when they come to the council they are cut and dried. As a member of the council, I can say that we do not really know anything about such things as this or have any say on them.

Mr. Laucke: We can have our research into the matter.

Mr. HEASLIP: If we can inquire into something we will do so, but I still say that, as appointees of Parliament to that council, we are absolutely in the dark.

Mr. Nankivell: In a minority, too.

Mr. HEASLIP: If we know about something we can convince other people and get the majority, but my point is we do not know what is going on. Committees meet once a month or even fortnightly, and before anything goes to the council it is cut and dried.

Frankly, I am disappointed that we as members of the council do not get an opportunity to know what is going on. The member for Mitcham brought this matter to me and to the member for Barossa. The latter inquired into it but did not get anywhere. The rule was made and the rule was obeyed.

Mr. Ryan: Haven't you had the opportunity to discuss this on the council since you knew about it?

Mr. HEASLIP: No; the member for Barossa did not bring it before the council, either.

Mr. Ryan: Why wasn't it brought before the council?

Mr. HEASLIP: It could have been brought before council and there could have been an issue made of it.

Mr. Ryan: How long has the member for Barossa known about this?

Mr. HEASLIP: That is not the point: the point is that this Parliament is providing large sums of money to the university to educate people to a standard at which they will be an asset to benefit the State. If we exclude the man who is willing to work but happens to be late in applying—and there is a rule stating that he may be excluded—something should be done about it. I agree with the member for Mitcham that it is wrong, but we, as members of the council, cannot get results.

Mr. CLARK (Gawler): It seems singularly unusual that, when I speak for the first time this session, I should agree with the member for Mitcham. As I do not find myself doing it often, this could be a good or a bad sign. I protest against what appears to be a technicality that denies Mr. Hewitson the right to increase his qualifications. When one is attempting to obtain a Master's degree in any subject, some consideration should be shown. We were told by the member for Barossa that this person could take the course again within 12 months, but I doubt that and believe that he will not be able to take it again until 1965.

Mr. Laucke: I think I am right when I say 1964.

Mr. CLARK: Who made this decision? It appears ridiculous to most members of this House, particularly after the person was granted permission to attend lectures and was in the course of preparing a thesis. Mr. Hewitson was prepared to pay the £5 fine. I have been informed that the decision was made by the chairman of the education committee.

Mr. Laucke: And the dean of the faculty.

Mr. CLARK: I should like to see that confirmed. I believe that when a man is trying

to obtain higher qualifications, particularly in the field of education, no obstacles should be placed in his path unless they are those of his own creation. We have been told that Mr. Hewitson was a member of the senate. This does not necessarily mean that he knows everything that is going on. Things happen in this House and by a slip of memory we forget about them in the multitude of other things that are discussed. Although I have little knowledge of this case, I believe that such a procedure is not in the best interests of a man trying to obtain higher qualifications in a calling in which those qualifications are most necessary.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): The Government, as such, has no direct representation on the University Council or senate. I believe the University of Adelaide is probably the freest university in the world as far as Government control is concerned. Since the Government became a major factor in financing the university, it has never requested representation on the council or senate because it believes that, fundamentally, a university should control its own affairs as far as possible. I do not say that as an excuse or by way of answering the remarks made by honourable members, because I have no knowledge of the circumstances or the facts of this case. The Government, through the Minister of Education, will refer to the University Council the remarks made today and in due course I shall receive a report which will be made available to members.

Fundamentally, the Government is providing money, but I must say that in 20 years the budgets of the university have been accepted *in toto* by the Treasury. The university has not had any limits placed on it regarding its expenses or the service it gives. The university has been consulted regarding details of finances from time to time, but no limitations have been placed on it. That condition dates back to the time when the State was under the Commonwealth Grants Commission, and before the Commonwealth was financing education at all. The university submitted a budget and I informed it that such budgets would be accepted and it could rely on the fact that they would be accepted provided no trouble was caused with the Grants Commission. No favourable adjustment was made by the Grants Commission concerning this, but the budget of the university has complied with the general Australian standard and has not been interfered with by this State. That has been the position, so it is not a question of

a State limitation on either control or finance. There must be some rules governing entrance to the university and those rules must be maintained, although I do not believe that they should be so rigid as to be unable to be stretched to meet a case where obvious good would result. I am not saying that to express an opinion on this case, because I do not know the circumstances governing it. I will have the report of this debate referred to the University Council and in due course we will have the council's report. I thank honourable members for giving attention to the matter.

Motion carried.

In Committee of Supply.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): This year, as was the case in 1961-62, the Government's main reason for asking the House to consider Supplementary Estimates is the necessity to have the authority to disburse part of the additional funds which South Australia secured at the Loan Council meeting and Premiers' Conference held in February last to work out further measures to increase employment. The additional funds secured by the State for 1962-63 were a special non-repayable grant of £691,000; Loan moneys for the works and housing programme, £691,000; and authority for borrowing by semi-government and larger local government bodies, £277,000.

The purpose of the special non-repayable grant was to step up employment-giving activities beyond the level being financed currently by the normal State works and housing programmes. The Government believed that the best and quickest way to put this money to good effect was to increase the tempo of certain works already in progress rather than to start new works which often do not provide very much employment in their early stages. Therefore the grant of £691,000 was allocated entirely to the Engineering and Water Supply Department so that activity could be increased on a number of country water supply projects, particularly for Kangaroo Island, Strathalbyn, and Lenswood. As the special grant is not sufficient to cover the total cost of these works they are being financed partly from Loan, and it is not practicable to draw a firm line and to say just what part of each job is being financed from each source of funds. In general terms, however, it may be said that about half of the grant will be spent by the end of this month and that the remaining half, though fully committed for work in progress, will actually be disbursed early in 1963-64.

To achieve the purpose of the grant it was, of course, essential for the Government to act quickly, and to anticipate Parliamentary approval for the expenditures. In accordance with usual procedures the grant as received has been credited to Consolidated Revenue Account, and it is now necessary for me to ask Parliament to authorize its transfer to a deposit account to reimburse expenditure to date and to meet further payments yet to be made. The authority sought is the first item in the Supplementary Estimates.

Immediate steps were also taken in February last to make the best use of the additional loan moneys of £691,000. An amount of £200,000 was allocated to the Electricity Trust of South Australia, whose annual capital outlay is increasing as work goes ahead with the planning, investigation and development of the Torrens Island site. The remaining £491,000 was allocated for housing purposes, and arrangements were made for this sum to be borrowed under the terms of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. Of the £491,000, the South Australian Housing Trust was allocated £100,000, the State Bank of South Australia £370,000, and building societies £21,000. The £370,000 made available to the State Bank was possibly the most effective step in providing employment, as the bank was enabled to maintain a rate of lending which was rather higher than its previous allocations could support for the full year. The actual cash from housing loans flows out very quickly to the building industry and thence to other sectors of the community. It is not necessary for me to ask Parliament to specially authorize the disbursement of the £691,000 of Loan moneys, as a general appropriation for Commonwealth-State Housing funds is already contained in legislation, and the Public Purposes Loan Bill of 1962 has sufficient authority to cover the £200,000 advance to the Electricity Trust.

Borrowings of semi-government and local government bodies are subject to limits determined by the Australian Loan Council but do not, of course, come before Parliament for appropriation. Of the £277,000 additional borrowing authority secured in February last, by far the larger part—£200,000—was made available to the larger local government bodies. Total borrowing by local authorities increased very sharply in 1961-62 from the previous year's figure of less than £1,000,000 up to £1,930,000. In 1962-63 there has been a further increase and the final figure for the year will be about £2,100,000.

While asking the House to consider Supplementary Estimates to authorize the transfer of the special grant, the Government considered it desirable to take the opportunity to include provision for three other rather large commitments which could not be foreseen when I presented my Budget in September last. They are, first, the expenses of conversion and public loans, for which provision of a further £150,000 is now proposed. It is impossible at the beginning of the financial year to estimate accurately the requirements for a line which takes debit among other things for discounts on conversion loans. The requirement depends on the terms and conditions on which loans are issued during the year, and naturally decisions on the terms and conditions must be taken having regard to market conditions prevailing at the time of issue. For the conversion of securities which matured on April 15 last it was decided to issue new short-term and medium-term securities, and the appropriate yield of £4 8s. 4d. on the medium-term securities was arranged by offering 4½ per cent securities at £98 15s.—that is, a discount of £1 5s. This was a fairly large operation and, while the final details are not yet known, it appears that South Australia's share of the discount, together with some smaller commitments, will require a further provision of about £150,000. This expenditure will be effectively compensated in due course by lower interest commitments made possible by the issue of the conversion loans at a discount.

Secondly, for the University of Adelaide an additional general purpose grant of £135,000 is sought. Members are already aware of plans to have a new branch of the University of Adelaide functioning at Bedford Park in time to take first year enrolments in the Faculties of Arts and Science at the beginning of 1966. Realizing the need for the university to be able to make certain appointments and to undertake preliminary work during 1963, if the target of 1966 operation is to be achieved, I took up with the Prime Minister and the Australian Universities Commission the question of Government grants to the university for Bedford Park development. I am pleased to be able to tell the House that my approaches were successful and that arrangements have been made for State and Commonwealth grants totalling £150,000 to be paid to the university in 1963 for expenditure in connection with Bedford Park. The Government desires to pay £75,000 of this amount to the university immediately upon receipt of the Commonwealth's share, and sufficient appropriation is therefore required.

The remaining £60,000 of further appropriation is proposed to cover additional payments to the university on account of teaching hospitals, in particular the Adelaide Children's Hospital. Progress on the new major building at the hospital is such that grants totalling almost £100,000 are now justified in 1962-63 towards special facilities for training university medical students. The facilities for which the Australian Universities Commission recommended special assistance included a clinical teaching unit, locker rooms, lecture rooms, observation room, conference and tutorial rooms, and museum. Under the terms of the Commonwealth legislation the Government must, upon receipt of the Commonwealth share of half, pay the combined State and Commonwealth grants to the university in the first instance. The university then passes on the grants to the hospital concerned.

Thirdly, for the Railways Department's salaries and wages a provision of £88,000 is proposed. Prior to November, 1962, negotiations had been carried on for some time on the matter of increased wage rates for daily paid employees of the Railways Department, and both the Railways Commissioner and I met several deputations from representatives of employees. The Railways Commissioner was prepared to agree to an increase of 15s. a week for tradesmen as from May 14, 1962, but not to an increase for non-tradesmen as well. The matter was then taken to the Commonwealth Court of Conciliation and Arbitration, and on November 23, 1962, the Conciliation Commissioner gave his decision that the rates for tradesmen under Commonwealth awards should be increased by 15s. a week—which honourable members will remember is the amount to which we were prepared to agree voluntarily, subject to the agreement of the Conciliation Commissioner—and that rates for other groups should be increased, some by 7s. 6d. a week and some by 5s. a week, all increases to be operative from November 19, 1962. The increases were then adopted as the basis for variations to State awards. The Government was under no obligation to grant retrospectively to a date previous to that determined by the Conciliation Commissioner but, having regard to the earlier offer of the Railways Commissioner of increases to tradesmen from May 14, 1962, Cabinet agreed to the increased award rates for all daily paid employees, with only minor exceptions, being back-dated to May 14, 1962. The Railways Commissioner has no power to make payments other than as provided by awards, and therefore it is necessary now to seek Parliament's approval of the

proposed appropriation of £88,000 to cover the period prior to that laid down in the Conciliation Commissioner's decision.

The presentation of Supplementary Estimates totalling £1,064,000 does not mean that a deficit much greater than the original forecast of £603,000 will now result. The appropriation of the special grant will exactly match increased receipts as the grant is credited to Consolidated Revenue, and also there have been variations in many items of receipts and payments.

The State economy has continued to improve steadily during the year, largely as a result of the Government's financial and employment policy in 1961-62 and subsequently. The commitment of Loan and other funds to the limit of available resources throughout 1961-62 was successful in reducing the downward movement of economic activity in this State, so that the level of activity in South Australia was always higher than elsewhere in Australia. The subsequent steady recovery is very pleasing and it is having favourable effects on the revenue Budget in the form of increased receipts. Receipts from land tax, motor vehicle registration fees, stamp duties and succession duties are all improving and will exceed the original estimate.

At the same time, recoveries to the Budget on account of interest and sinking fund will be greater than anticipated. Despite the relatively poor 1962 agricultural season, railway receipts are likely to reach the estimate, while continued firm control of railway expenditure will result in some saving against the estimate. The difficulty of getting suitably qualified staff will mean some savings against Budget for the Police Department and the Hospitals Department. As a result of the late spring rains, a cool summer, and the early break to the 1963 season, costs of water pumping have been below estimate.

No one of these items is large taken in isolation, but together their effect is quite marked and, taking all factors into account, I anticipate at this stage that the original estimated deficit of £603,000 will be eliminated entirely and a surplus of about £500,000 may well occur. If this should occur, it will be available to help meet the considerably increased costs which will fall on the 1963-64 Budget, particularly for increased wage and salary awards and increased costs of social services. I do not intend to canvass next year's Budget at this stage, as it is before the Loan Council and it would be impossible to do so, but I do not wish members to

think that, because there will be a surplus this year, we are on easy street. This is not so, because alterations that have taken place in awards and in Public Service salaries and the levelling out that occurs when there is a major adjustment in industrial conditions will probably cost about £1,000,000, and an additional £1,000,000 will be needed to meet the expansion in this State. Honourable members know that every year we have to have more school teachers, police officers and hospital employees, and the employment of these people will necessitate spending another £1,000,000 in salaries and wages. Also, services generally next year will cost at least an additional £1,000,000 in other directions, so that on present indications next year we shall have to meet an additional expenditure of about £3,000,000 over this year's expenditure. From this it can be seen that we are not likely to have an easy Budget. I believe it will be possible to bring in a Budget which, from the point of view of the economics of the State, will be entirely satisfactory to honourable members, but I do not want members to think that £500,000 is already available for some easy distribution. Unfortunately, that is not the position.

Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of the first line of the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): Members would be likely to think, particularly when they heard the Treasurer say that the estimated deficit of £603,000 would be eliminated and that a surplus of £500,000 was likely, that he had done a good job. However, in the next breath it is mortgaged even before it has become a surplus. Not having had the experience of the Treasurer, I find it a little difficult to appreciate how £500,000 can disappear so quickly!

I do not intend to delay members long on this matter. The Treasurer said that the State Bank was able to increase the number and the size of loans, but I would be interested to know whether the Housing Trust was consulted about whether it could increase its labour force on the building of houses. It seems to me that the present system under which contractors take the work and then allocate it on a piece-work basis has not met with the expected success. The system that operates today, with Government backing, through the Housing Trust's activities, is not in the best interests of workmanship generally in house building. When contractors were willing to take the work and to abide by the conditions provided

by the arbitration system of this country, conditions were satisfactory.

Another matter that concerns me is the future of the former sanatorium at Bedford Park. What is to become of the people who are there under the care and attention of the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department? Is any demolition work contemplated, or is the sum allocated merely to start building for the university? Will the building programme for the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department to accommodate children at Magill and Campbelltown be completed prior to demolition taking place at Bedford Park?

I have not been able to discover what the university has in mind, but I understand that it is necessary to demolish almost every building at Bedford Park. Probably the only building there of any use to the university is the building originally erected for nurses' quarters and since converted into accommodation for girls. Although I understand that those girls have since been returned to Vaughan House, some sort of security arrangement still exists at Bedford Park. Will the Treasurer obtain information about the demolition of these buildings?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The University Council submitted proposals to the Australian Universities Grants Commission for the appointment of certain staff, and I understand that the commission approved a staff of three as a preliminary to staffing the university. As far as I know, there is no capital money involved in this work at all.

I will obtain for the Leader the information he desires regarding the present occupation of Bedford Park and what is planned for the future. Speaking from memory, the present £135,000 is simply for the enlistment of staff and the commencing of the organization, so that the university will be able to operate at Bedford Park by 1966.

First line (Treasurer and Minister of Immigration, Miscellaneous, £841,000)—passed.

MINISTER OF EDUCATION.

Miscellaneous, £135,000—passed.

MINISTER OF RAILWAYS.

Railways Department, £88,000.

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

That this item be reduced by £1. My amendment results from increases in the rents of Government-owned houses. I point out that this amendment is not to be construed in any way—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Leader of the Opposition would be out of order in moving to reduce this line by only £1: it would have to be a substantial sum.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Very well, Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to make it £100. My amendment to reduce this item by £100 is not in any way to be construed that Labor members would deny the marginal increases to railway personnel or any others who may be affected, but this amendment is to be accepted as opposed to the very savage increases in rents of railway cottages. The *Weekly Notice* (No. 22/63) of the South Australian Railways states:

The Railways Commissioner desires to advise the staff generally that, in accordance with the policy recently forecast by the Government and applicable to other State Government departments, the rents of all houses belonging to the Railways Department have been reviewed following upon rental assessments made by the South Australian Housing Trust. As is the present practice, basic rents do not include charges for electric current, gas or excess water consumed. New rents will apply from and including June 30, 1963. Occupants of departmental residences will be individually notified of the revised rates prior to June 30. Thus the amendment particularly affects those who may be engaged in railway services and whose rents are going to be increased on and after June 30.

I am aware that there have been certain marginal increases to award rates for various organizations. An examination of these, however, reveals that the increases in margins range from 2s. a week to the maximum of 10s. for tradesmen, and many of the cases I will mention this afternoon are in the group that comprises employees who are on the low margins for skill. Consequently, these savage increases in rents of railway cottages are out of all proportion to the marginal increases in wages awarded to the employees.

I have information which indicates that in country areas railway cottage rents are to be increased by as much as 86 per cent. Incidentally, this huge increase applies to a cottage where the tenant was paying 25s. 6d. a week whereas now he will be charged 47s. 6d. a week or an increase of 22s. a week. In a list of 23 cottages submitted to me the rents of five are to be increased by more than 80 per cent; six are to be increased by between 70 per cent and 80 per cent; eight between 60 per cent and 70 per cent; and three between 50 per cent and 60 per cent, and there is only one cottage rent that is to be increased by less than 50 per cent. I have also had a list of

metropolitan cottages submitted to me where the increases are all between 30 per cent and 40 per cent.

There is, of course, a further burden of hardship where many tenants in the metropolitan area are paying an added amount for the hire-purchase of certain equipment that has been installed in their houses. This particularly applies in the all-electric houses. One further point in this matter concerns the payment of small charges for extra power points. One instance has been brought to my notice of a tenant who has been paying an extra 2d. a week for the last 10 years because an extra power point was installed. I admit that this is only a small amount each week but the tenant has probably paid 86s. for the use of one power point during the last 10 years, and I am sure that all members must admit that the power point has been more than paid for in that period.

Another feature of hardship that is associated with the steep increases in rents is that if the employees in the railways service who are tenants in railway cottages leave the service or retire at the ordinary retiring age, they must vacate their tenancy. In addition, even if they are transferred to another department in the service, they must vacate. A further criticism applies to sections of the service where positions become vacant and are advertised in the *Weekly Notice*. It is stated that accommodation is available in a railway cottage at a particular rental but, of course, the increases which are to take effect from June 30 need to be added. Therefore, the jobs are being presented in a better light than is the actual fact.

If it is a question that the Railways Commissioner is trying to abolish the railways system, I think that this Government can claim that the stage has been reached, under its administration, where the railways service is declining and becoming a utility that is almost part of the forgotten legion. Must the people be denied the use of the railways system? Recently, various sections of railway track have been closed. For example, the Grange to Henley Beach and the Balhannah to Mount Pleasant lines have been closed and there is an indication now that the Angaston line is to be closed or to have reduced services. When I asked for an extension of the Northfield line to proceed to Modbury and Tea Tree Gully areas, I was informed that it was not intended to extend this system. It would appear that the Highways Department will be responsible for

acquiring land to widen roads to try to make provision for the ever-increasing traffic whilst the Railways Department, as I have already mentioned, desires to close down the system.

Why attempt to build with completely new material while leaving idle much of the rolling stock that could be reconditioned for this purpose and converted even though such work might require some new materials? This applies to matters I have mentioned previously, particularly sleeping vans for tradesmen. Such reconditioning and converting would have increased revenue and created employment within the industry. As I have just mentioned, if it is a question of revenue, either from the instruction of the Commissioner to the Government or *vice versa*, the Railways Department must provide a service if it is to increase its revenue. Let it be understood that in one of the recent deputations to the Minister of Railways regarding the provision of sufficient seating accommodation for those who may desire to travel by rail or find it necessary to do so to their place of employment at Islington and return home in the evening, the Chief Mechanical Engineer, who was also at the deputation, indicated that no further provision by way of extra coaches could be provided because of the type of diesel known as the "red hen" which was in use. This applies not only on the North line and the Marino line: it applies on almost every line.

The diesel known as "red hen" is used in duplicate, but when an extra coach, namely the old type suburban brakevan, is used to make a triplicate, there is a "red hen" diesel at the front and rear and the brakevan in the middle. At the deputation I purposely asked "Why cannot some of the existing suburban coaches that are lying idle in so many different places be used?", and I was informed that the load would be too heavy for the class of equipment. Now, here is a Government, untroubled in its power of authority in this State for 30 years, approving a rehabilitation of the railways services and purchasing equipment that is not meeting the needs of the people, namely, reasonable seating accommodation. Is it fair that people should pay to travel by train and not enjoy adequate seating accommodation?

Whilst speaking of the conversion of rolling stock, I am concerned with the point that is linked with the revenue of the Railways Department and must be taken into consideration with the increases in rents of railway cottages. Another deputation that waited on the Premier was concerned about 75 sleeping vans that were to be used by the Railways Department for

certain personnel. Thirty sleeping vans that were to be constructed on the underframes of the existing caboose-type of coach were to be done in all-steel body work. The Premier then indicated that of the remaining 45, 15 would be used in accordance with the plans submitted by the employees from the works. This would have resulted in considerable savings but none of this work has been introduced at the Islington workshops.

Now the plan that was introduced by the tradesmen from the workshops—and which was originally rejected by the Chief Mechanical Engineer—has been used by the Chief Mechanical Engineer on the conversion of the suburban coaches for sleeping vans, but any existing timber in these vans is to be discarded, and steel construction entirely is the order of the day. Therefore, the Chief Mechanical Engineer, with the approval of the Commissioner, is now prepared to say that the Railways Department will use the suggestions by the tradesmen concerned at Islington, but that the department will ignore the use of timber and commit itself to using all-steel material.

At the same deputation I mentioned the question of the conversion of joint rolling stock. Members who travel to the South-East are conversant with the type of rolling stock under consideration, because I have heard them mention here that it is most difficult to remain in the bunks that are provided for sleeping accommodation. I understood that the Premier gave an assurance that this matter would be taken up. This particular rolling stock should be remodelled so that it could be used on the South-Eastern and Port Pirie lines, and a cafeteria car should be included in each train.

Whilst one must take some notice of the advocacy, per medium of the press, of the need to provide parking over the Adelaide station yard property, the administration of this Government in railway matters seems to indicate that there will be no need to provide for overhead parking as it is certainly not catering for the continuance of the railways. The station yard itself may yet be used for parking, with no need for providing for overhead parking.

Even with the proposed standardization from Port Pirie to Cockburn, is the same standardization to take place between Adelaide and Port Pirie, or is a third rail to be introduced so that the broad-gauge rolling stock may be used in addition to what may be needed on the standard gauge?

Let me assure members that as the constitutional authority—namely, the Arbitration Court—is set up for the purpose of hearing evidence in support of an application for and on behalf of the respective unions that are concerned in industry, particularly that in railways, and the judiciary of that court provides that there should be an increase in certain rates (in this case known as marginal increases), why then should this Government usurp the whole of that increase and much more besides in increased rents for its railway cottages? I have evidence of many more rent increases, but I do not think it is necessary for me to mention them now. I merely seek justice for those affected by these increases.

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray): I support the amendment, which seeks to combat the iniquitous rentals on Government cottages, particularly railway cottages, in country areas. My telephone line has run hot during the last few days, and I have had frequent visits from people who are concerned about the increases in rentals. To say that they were astounded would be putting it mildly: they were stunned, and they are still trying to work out the reason for the increases. As I see it, there is no rhyme or reason for these increases. About 18 months ago a Housing Trust officer examined the various houses. Most of the railway employees expected a slight rent increase. When they received their assessments a day or two ago they were dismayed. What has concerned them is not only the big increases but the way those increases have been allocated.

About 60 years ago four houses were built close to the railway line and adjacent to the river at Murray Bridge on a road that I have heard described as Mosquito Road, so called because it has swampy land near it. Although these houses were identical, the rents for two of them were 35s. 6d., and, for the other two, 34s. 6d. There was no complaint about the difference; perhaps there was some justification for it, although I could not see it. However, I would not know how the new assessment was arrived at, and nobody else would. One of the houses previously rented for 35s. 6d. will now cost 44s. and the other will cost 53s. 6d.; one of the houses previously rented at 34s. 6d. will now cost 49s. 6d., and the other will cost 57s. 6d. I do not think any tribunal or person assessing rentals could justify these differences.

As the Leader said, the rentals of many of these houses will affect those in the lower

income bracket. This applies to houses known as the "stable" type—an apt name, considering that some of them were constructed almost a century ago and look exactly like stables, with two houses in the one building. These houses are far from being up to modern standards, and I think they should have been condemned years ago. A packer employed by the Railways Department, and receiving probably the lowest income, who was previously paying 22s. 6d. a week rent has had his rental increased to 49s., which is an increase of about 120 per cent. Neither he nor I nor anyone could see how this could be justified. Adjacent to his house is a house that was once known as the loco foreman's office. A few years ago, because of the acute housing shortage, this two-roomed building had a sleepout attached to it, and it made a home for a man and his wife who could not find any other accommodation. However, it was considered to be only temporary accommodation until something better could be found for him. This house is still in use, and the rental has been increased from 17s. 3d. to 34s., which is an increase of almost 100 per cent. The man occupying it is receiving one of the lower incomes.

The rentals of many houses have been increased by about 80 per cent. I have a list that I can show members, but I do not propose to read the whole of it. This list shows that many people have been severely penalized by the big increases. An interesting case is that of a large house at Murray Bridge that was erected 80 years ago, the rent for which has been increased from 46s. 6d. to 82s. 3d.

Mr. Ryan: Is the occupier receiving ordinary wages?

Mr. BYWATERS: No, he is in a higher income bracket. Nevertheless, the increase is wrong in principle.

Mr. Loveday: That is nearly as much as he would pay for a new trust house.

Mr. BYWATERS: Yes, and the house is not up to modern standards. Admittedly, it is a solid house, but it has none of the modern touches that new houses have.

Mr. Loveday: Is he buying it or renting it?

Mr. BYWATERS: He is only renting it, but in view of the amount he is paying he might as well be buying it. Close to this house is a weatherboard cottage that should have been removed years ago; the rental for this has been increased from 15s. 3d. to 32s. 6d. Behind the railway station are other houses, one of which

is divided and forms part of the barracks, and the occupiers have little privacy. The rental of this house has been increased from 29s. to 42s. 6d., and that of another similar house from 25s. 6d. to 41s. It can be seen that the increases are not in isolated cases but are general throughout the district.

As members are aware, there are many railway houses at Tailem Bend, so the upset caused in that town by these increases can well be imagined. I should like to know how those who assessed the rents came to their decision. In Tailem Bend there is a street called Webb Street. If I asked a local resident where it was he would not know, but if I called it Gunn Alley he would know. It is low-lying and it abuts the railway line, and when steam trains pass—and there are still some in use—washing cannot be left on the line without being covered with soot. The occupants of a house in this street are subjected to every noise that railwaymen have to suffer in order to live close to their jobs. The rent of a house in this street has been increased from 29s. 9d. to 53s. The occupier has lived in this house for about 30 years and has paid for it over and over again, but, because he is a railwayman, he has to live in it. When a job is offered, it is offered with a house, and if a railwayman does not wish to live in the house provided he can be held responsible for the rent. As I had visited another house that is much nicer, I was interested to learn that the rent on this type of house had increased from 29s. 3d. to 43s. 6d. There is no comparison between the two houses—one is certainly substandard and the other is reasonable. However, 43s. 6d. for even the better house is more than enough in view of the conditions that railwaymen have to suffer.

I could give other instances of similar increases that are totally unjustified, as these houses have been amortized over and over again. There is no need to increase rents because of rising costs, as very little has been done to the houses. Perhaps a coat of paint has been put on some, but some of the painting has been done by the occupiers, and little money has been spent on them. Some railwaymen have lived in these houses for many years, which they have done because they have had their jobs there and the houses went with the jobs. The provision of a house has been an incentive for men to go to country areas. This has been recognized by the Government, by people in trade union circles, and by all associated with this employment. The provision of a house has been

to some extent offset against the low wages they have been receiving.

Mr. Ryan: They are not cheap any longer.

Mr. BYWATERS: No, they are not. They have now gone into the dearer type of house, as recognized by other people who let houses. It has been an advantage to the department to have the houses close to the places of work of the men, and that is why they are situated close to stations and lines. A railway man is on call day and night and it is helpful for the messenger calling him to work if he lives nearby. In ordinary circumstances this would to some extent be an offset against the rent, because the conditions of living are not as good as when people can pick the localities in which to build their houses. A railway man has to put up with much by living close to his work, and perhaps he would like to live further away from where he does. Because he is part of the railway system he has accepted the position and that is why the rents are cheaper than elsewhere. Now that cheapness has gone, so there must be a recognition of the reaction of the people concerned. Most of the railway cottages are substandard. They should have been razed and something better put in their places. Some of the weatherboard cottages have been there for years and practically nothing has been done to them in the way of repairs. They provide bad accommodation and are poor to look at, and not really suitable for the entertainment of visitors. In some of the places where the cottages are located the soil makes it almost impossible to effect improvements by way of gardens.

We believe there is a just case to present to the Government in this matter, so that the action proposed for June 30 will not take place. The railway men expected a rent increase of a few shillings to cover increased costs of repairs, but to double the rent was totally and morally wrong. I believe it was done to offset the wage increases mentioned by the Treasurer today. Immediately there is an increase in wages there is an increase in taxation, and rent increases offset any benefit from wage increases. Also, whenever there is a wage increase the cost of living rises. The Government should give a lead in this matter. I think that there will be some snowballing and that private landlords will accept the Government's action as a precedent and increase their rents. They will use the substandard cottages as a yardstick to justify increases in the rents of their better type houses.

I support the Leader of the Opposition's remarks and hope that we shall not have this

imposition. The Railways Commissioner must have some misgivings about the matter. I have always found him to be fair and interested in the welfare of his employees. He must see a retarding effect and not an advantage, because he will not be able to get men to go to the country to work. When a man is discontented he does not put his heart and soul into his work. All railway men are conscious of their responsibility to the Government, the Commissioner and the people to whom the railways belong. A railway man is wedded to his job. It is not only a job to him but a career, because he plays such an important part in the railway system. All railway men are dedicated to their work and if anything goes wrong with the system they are soon up in arms because they do not want the department to lose business. They have done well by the Government, the Commissioner and the people whom they transport and who provide the goods carried by the department. I do not know whose decision it was to increase the rents, but it was an unwise decision. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Lobethal Sewerage System,
Gumeracha Sewerage System (Revised Scheme),
Bahannah to Mount Pleasant Railway,
Port Pirie-Cockburn Railway Line Regrading,
Nangwarry Sawmill Log Bandmill Machinery,
Thevenard to Kevin Railway,
Gawler Adult Education Centre,
Port Paterson Bulk Loading Facilities,
Augmentation of LeFevre Peninsula Water Supply (Trunk Water Main from Port Adelaide to Glanville),
LeFevre Peninsula Sewerage Scheme (Draper South, Draper North, Taperoo and Osborne),
Largs Bay-Birkenhead Trunk Sewers Reconstruction,
Walleroo Harbour Improvements.
Ordered that reports be printed.

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH-WESTERN SUBURBS DRAINAGE.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Probably my question should be addressed to the Minister of

Works, who represents in this place the Minister of Roads, but in view of the importance of the matter, and as Government expenditure is involved, I address it to the Premier. It concerns that important work known as the south-western suburbs drainage scheme. As we all know, much damage and inconvenience has been caused and hardships imposed. According to the press, a tender has been let for the holding dam in the hills area. However, for the scheme to be anything like efficient it is necessary that that work be completed. In particular, a big drain is needed from Goodwood Road along Daw Road westerly to the Sturt River, and another is needed to handle the floodwaters at the rear of the Morphettville Racecourse. Those two extra drains are necessary to give relief. Will the Premier ascertain whether all these works can be proceeded with and completed so that they may function simultaneously with the holding reservoir in the hills area?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I cannot deal with all the features of the scheme because I am not familiar with them. I doubt whether any honourable member, except perhaps the members of the Public Works Committee, would know all the features of the proposals. This matter was inquired into by the Public Works Committee and certain proposals were reported upon favourably; they have been accepted by the Government, a constructing authority has been set up and provided with the necessary finance, and work is proceeding. I cannot add much more except to say that, anticipating that the Leader might be interested in this matter, I have obtained a specific report from the department, which states:

The South-Western Suburbs Drainage Act was passed in December 1959. The Highways and Local Government Department was made the constructing authority, and the constructing authority committee was formed in 1960.

Incidentally, the constructing authority committee comprises one representative of the Highways Department, one representative of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, and one representative of each of the local government bodies of the areas concerned—Mitcham, Marion and Brighton. The Government has not a majority on the constructing authority. However, I believe the authority is working well and that no problems have arisen. The report continues:

The department obtained some staff for this work in 1961, but additional staff is still being sought. The following table sets out the allocation of funds and expenditure:

Year.	Treasury	Expenditure.
	Allocation.	£
1959-60	£ 15,000	12,572
1960-61	150,000	44,906
1961-62	250,000	127,372
1962-63	300,000	250,000
		(estimated)
1963-64	460,000	460,000
	(proposed)	(estimated)

It is hoped that the £460,000 will be spent. Hitherto, however, the constructing authority has not been able to get sufficient trained staff and has not in any one year been able to spend the allocation the Treasury has made available to it. The report continues:

The constructing authority committee considered that the construction of further large drains discharging into the Sturt River before the control dam was operative and the river channel improved, would cause serious overflowing of the river, and this was borne out by the results of the recent heavy rains. For this reason, it has been and will be necessary to concentrate on the construction of drains west of the Sturt and which drain into the sea, until the capacity of the Sturt has been increased.

I shall have to examine the Leader's question in detail to see whether I can provide him with any supplementary information.

TELEVISION PANEL.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question does not deal directly with any function of the State Government, but it relates so directly to a matter affecting the well-being of the State that I desire to direct it to the Premier. On Tuesday, June 4, 1963, Channel 2, the A.B.C. television channel, showed a programme entitled "Any Questions". On that programme four people discuss questions submitted to them by members of an audience. On this occasion, one of the four people engaged in the discussions was Mr. Leslie McLean Wright, a South Australian, although I believe the programme originated in another State. I did not see the programme, but I understand that one question raised dealt with the problem of teenage or high-school pregnancies. The speakers are reported to me to have dealt with the subject flippantly and to have concluded that the best solution was for girls to have, and know how to use, contraceptives. None of the speakers, I understand, suggested self-control and chastity as the best solution to the problem and, indeed, the moral aspect was dismissed out of hand.

I do not want to go into that matter, because to vent my indignation would be against Standing Orders; but I ask the Premier whether

he will ask the Postmaster-General or, preferably, the Chairman of the Australian Broadcasting Commission direct to make sure that, when such subjects are discussed in future (if such is necessary), the panel of speakers is a representative one, so that the views of those who accept immorality will at least be balanced by those of speakers who do not.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I know the honourable member realizes that this matter is not directly under the control of this Government, but I must confess that no question on any matter that has been put over the air has brought so many protests to me as has this particular programme. I have asked for a copy of the script, because I did not hear or see this programme and cannot comment upon it until I have seen a copy of the script. When I have seen it, I will take the matter up with the Chairman of the commission if it appears necessary to do so, and will refer the honourable member's question to the commission for consideration.

FLUORIDATION.

Mrs. STEELE: I had intended asking a question concerning the replies given by the panel on the "Any Questions" session on Channel 2, but that question has already been asked by the member for Mitcham and replied to by the Premier. I merely say that I wholeheartedly endorse the honourable member's request. I now ask the Minister of Works whether consideration has been given to the fluoridation of this State's water supply, in view of the fact that medical and dental authorities in general consider such action to be in the best interests of the community's dental health?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes. The Government is constantly considering the representations made, although there have been no direct representations in recent months; but the flow of representations made through the press and in other ways is constant. The matter appears still to be in a most inconclusive stage. If one takes cognizance of the action taken or not taken by other authorities, there seems to be just as much doubt as ever concerning the disabilities—taking everything into account—consequent on introducing this system. The Engineer-in-Chief has stated that fluoridation of water is possible technically, but the Government has not recently given any detailed consideration to its introduction. I think it is largely a

matter for the health authorities of this State, rather than for the Engineer-in-Chief, to determine and recommend.

TRAFFIC RADAR.

Mr. TAPPING: My question, which I address through the Premier to the Chief Secretary, refers to what is commonly known as traffic radar. Some months ago members of both Houses of Parliament witnessed a demonstration of this at the police driving section. As a layman I was convinced it was a good idea. Since then, over the last two and a half to three months, thousands of people have been apprehended under this system but no action has been taken. We read in the press now that a new system is being introduced in South Australia to combat radar by placing something on the dashboard of a car to nullify the effects of the radar. First, would the use of traffic radar be legal or would an amendment of the Road Traffic Act be required? Secondly, is the Premier aware of a device that might be used to nullify radar?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The offence under the Road Traffic Act that the radar would be used to detect is speeding and, providing a court was prepared to accept the evidence of speeding provided by radar, in my opinion no amendment of the Road Traffic Act would be required to enable this device to be brought into operation. In fact, it is accepted in other States as being reliable and it has been accepted as evidence in court. I think that means that it would undoubtedly be accepted as evidence in a court in South Australia.

I do not think there is any problem of a further amendment of the Act. The position was that the police considered that it would be advisable, in the interests of getting the co-operation of the travelling public, to give the public fair warning of the new device being brought into operation, so they used it for a period before they undertook to take any legal action in respect of it. That probationary period has now been declared up but, if anyone exceeds the speed limit and is detected by this means in future, he will be subject to consideration for action in the courts.

In answer to the second question, I know of no such device and have not had it reported to me that it exists but, if anybody is considering a substantial expenditure upon putting this sort of device into his car, I advise against it, because it will soon be made an offence to have such a device that can be used only to try to evade the law. It would not be long before Parliament considered any steps taken

systematically to flout the law. So, if anyone is considering inventing such a machine and putting it into his car, I seriously advise him to refrain from expenditure in that direction.

RESERVOIR INTAKES.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Will the Minister of Works say to what extent the major reservoirs of this State have benefited as a result of the recent heavy rains, with particular reference to the Warren and South Para reservoirs?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Anticipating that this matter would be of interest to the House, I had a report prepared by the Engineer for Water Supply, which shows that the metropolitan reservoirs are now almost half full. The total capacity is about 25,000,000,000 gallons and at present the reservoirs hold nearly 12,000,000,000 gallons. The Warren reservoir

is full and any further intake into it will proceed downstream to the South Para reservoir, which at present is a long way from full: it has only 3,000,000,000 gallons against its capacity of 11,000,000,000 gallons.

The other country reservoirs have some way to go, too, before they are filled, except for Bundaleer, which is holding 1,014,000,000 gallons and which has a capacity of 1,402,000,000 gallons. No doubt this report will interest members but it is too long for me to read now, so I ask leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it. Leave granted.

RESERVOIR STORAGES.

Heavy rains over the last few weeks in the catchment areas have given excellent run-off into the majority of the metropolitan and country reservoirs. An indication of the benefits to the reservoirs is given in the following figures:

Metropolitan Reservoirs.—

Name.	Capacity.	Present Storage.	Increase in storage due to recent rains.
	m.g.	m.g.	m.g.
Mount Bold	10,440	3,270	2,687
Happy Valley	2,804	1,624	386
Millbrook	3,647	3,304	1,746
Hope Valley	765	456	183
Thorndon Park	142	123	—
Myponga	5,905	2,465	2,214

The total increase in storage for the metropolitan reservoirs has been 7,216,000,000 gallons.

Country Reservoirs.—

Name.	Capacity.	Present Storage.	Increase in storage due to recent rains.
	m.g.	m.g.	m.g.
Barossa	993	480	—
South Para	11,300	3,031	1,665
Warren	1,401	1,401	1,135
Beetaloo	819	113	58
Bundaleer	1,402	1,014	713
Baroota	1,371	307	148
Tod River	2,495	581	61

Some of the smaller country reservoirs received excellent intakes and the reservoirs at Strathalbyn, Encounter Bay, Yeldulknie, Urbana, Ullabidine, Hawker and Kimba all filled.

A total quantity of 8,743,000,000 gallons of water was pumped from the River Murray to the metropolitan area and to the Warren reservoir. Pumping from the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline commenced with three units off-peak on 3/8/62. This continued until 1/3/63 when the pumping was reduced to two units off-peak. This was again increased to three units off-peak on 26/4/63 and was then reduced to one unit off-peak on 15/5/63 until 26/5/63 when pumping was discontinued.

GREENHILL RESERVE.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I have been approached by certain people in my district who are in the habit of resorting to various public reserves. The reserve about which they are concerned at the moment is in the district of the honourable member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele) and has, I understand, caused her some concern as well. It is the Greenhill reserve. I understand that some complaints have been made by local residents and others in the habit of using that reserve about the fact that the roadway through it is used by lorries from the local quarry

and from industries associated with the local quarry.

I believe that, following representations made through the honourable member and by local residents, the Director of the Tourist Bureau stated that the road would be closed to commercial vehicles from June 7 of this year. A letter dated May 29, which I have seen, was sent out. However, on June 4 Mr. Pollnitz wrote again and I think the member for Burnside has a copy of this letter, which states:

Further to my letter of 29th ult., I wish to advise that I have been instructed that no action is to be taken to close the Greenhill national pleasure resort to vehicular traffic on June 7 next pending consideration of a proposal to be submitted by the company.

On inquiry at the department, it appeared that the instruction had come from the Premier, as Minister in charge of the department. As I understand the position, after having looked at the gazettes, this is a national pleasure resort and there is no power to grant an easement over it for commercial purposes. It appears from the complaints made to me that the commercial use of this roadway considerably disturbs the reserve. Some accidents have occurred on the roadway itself. Vehicles thunder through there from early morning until late at night six days a week, and sometimes on Sundays. A considerable dust nuisance is created and the use of the reserve is interfered with, apart from the nuisance to local residents. Will the Premier immediately reconsider this matter to ensure that the reserve be maintained as a reserve, that the commercial use of it cease, and that the quarries be forced to use other roadways for access?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The matter that the honourable member has somewhat debated is one of which I have some personal knowledge and contact with because the reserves come under the Tourist Bureau, and I happen to be the Minister in charge of that department. The position is that certain quarrying interests have established a crushing plant and ready-mix concrete works in an inaccessible area. The local council took steps to close the public road to them by putting a weight limit upon it. The quarry interests then asked whether they could use an unmade road going through the reserve. There was much objection by local people to their having to use the unmade road. It was dusty and there had been one accident. Last week a representative of the company asked me whether I would reconsider my previous decision that I would not grant a lease for a road over the reserve. I told him I could not consider his request because I did not believe I had the

authority to do so. A considerable amount of employment is directly involved, and I would hesitate to close down an important work where there is considerable employment.

The extension of time for closing the road has been granted to enable the company to place a proposition before the Government. The company has stated that it is prepared to make a full-width bituminized road to the order of the Highways Department without any permanent rights of lease if the company can use it. That proposition is being examined. I assure the members for Burnside and Norwood that the Government is most anxious to see that the convenience of residents in the area is fully recognized. On the other hand, if possible the Government would be loath to cause the unemployment of a considerable number of people doing urgent work for the State, because the materials coming from the quarries are a vital necessity at present.

I assure the honourable member that I am conversant with the problem and that I am anxious that it should be solved. One method that could be considered is for the Government to request the council to reopen the road that has a weight limit on it at present. That would give the quarry company direct access to the made road. However, I think that that would be a mistake. It would be much more dangerous than having a properly constructed road on a proper gradient. The council road is extremely steep and not a good road for heavy traffic. A proper gradient road would be preferable to a right of way which these people can demand for the purposes of transport.

The type of arrangement I am considering is not new. Only last session Parliament debated the question of a speed limit on a road, which is not a public road, through a Government reserve where, if that road were closed, many people would not have access to their properties. That arrangement is not new: it is something that has been considered as necessary over a period. However, I shall inform honourable members when a decision has been made.

FULHAM GARDENS SEWERAGE.

Mr. FRED WALSH: I have often raised the question of the sewerage of the area east of Grange and Henley Beach, and including Fulham Gardens and parts of Seaton Park. The last time I raised it was last session. In recent weeks I have been inundated with letters, telephone calls and a petition, and have been requested to inspect certain areas and houses, which I have done. I was astounded at the conditions under which people are living. Last session the Minister of Works informed me

that plans were being drafted to sewer an extended area, that those plans would be submitted to the Public Works Committee within three months, and that the estimated cost of the project would be about £1,000,000. In view of the deplorable and insanitary conditions under which these people are at present living, and particularly in view of the heavy rains we have had in recent weeks which have aggravated the position, can the Minister say when these plans for the sewerage of the Fulham Gardens and Seaton Park areas are to be submitted to the Public Works Committee for inquiry and report?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The honourable member with his usual courtesy told me yesterday that he intended to raise this matter. Indeed, I had the matter well in mind because not many weeks ago I received a deputation from the people concerned to discuss this matter. The honourable member was, unfortunately, not able to attend and an apology was tendered for him. On that occasion I had a full and, I am glad to say, friendly discussion with the representatives of local government in that area. I informed them fully of the position and told them what we hoped to do about it. The area is low-lying resulting in acute difficulties of septic effluent disposal, particularly in wet weather. That problem is appreciated by the department and by me but, on the other hand, the cost of providing sewerage is extremely high. The Engineer-in-Chief told me, and I informed the deputation, that sewerage could be provided for probably three and in some cases five houses in a more favourably located area for the same expenditure as would provide sewerage for one or two houses in the area the honourable member mentioned. In this area the water table is only three to four feet below the surface and every trench that is dug would have to be close-timbered and dewatered. The sewers would have to be laid with impervious piping surrounded by concrete to prevent the entry of ground water. It would be an extremely costly job. The Engineer-in-Chief believes that with the funds he has available he should provide sewerage for the greatest number of people.

Furthermore, as I explained to the deputation, as planning for this area proceeded we found that it would be essential to provide large trunk sewerage works and pumping stations that would not be directly required to serve the area, but which would take the sewage from the area into a treatment works. The further we went in planning, the more

involved and more costly the proposal became. I told the deputation that it would be impossible for work to be done in that area during the coming financial year, but that we would finalize the plans and submit them to Cabinet for consideration as soon as the volume of work for next year permitted us to do so. We hope—and I hope I do not have to eat my words again—to have plans ready for Cabinet by the end of this calendar year so that the Public Works Committee can examine them early in the 1964 calendar year and bring down a recommendation for the following year's Estimates. The deputation is already aware that we are unable to provide funds for this work in next year's Estimates. I know the problem that exists in the area, but that is the present position.

MILK TANKERS.

Mr. JENKINS: The Jervois Co-operative Dairying Society Limited deals in bulk milk and its deliveries to Adelaide are made in tankers that have a capacity of 2,060 gallons each. The company has applied to the Warden of Standards for a calibration of the tankers so that milk can be measured by dipstick rather than by selling bulk loads to the city milk people, which is not satisfactory to the producer or to the seller. The Warden has replied that he is not able to authorize this method of measurement and he has referred the company to Victoria. Bulk handling of milk is increasing, and two other companies are involved. I have letters from the Warden of Standards and from the Jervois Co-operative Dairying Society Limited which I shall hand to the Minister of Lands. Will he undertake to try to bring about a calibration of these tankers in South Australia in order to facilitate the better handling of milk, thus giving more satisfaction to vendors and purchasers?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: If the honourable member will supply me with the information I will endeavour to obtain a report on how this is to be achieved. It is not an over-difficult proposition, because in the wine industry all tankers are calibrated by one of two methods.

Mr. Jenkins: So are petrol tankers.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: Yes. I do not think it would be impossible to do the same with milk tankers.

PORT PIRIE WEST PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. McKEE: Last April I wrote to the Minister of Works concerning the unsatisfactory drainage conditions at the Port Pirie

West Primary School. He answered that a firm of private surveyors had been approached to supply a price for surveying the grounds. Can he indicate whether progress has been made on this work?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am not able to answer this question offhand, but if I cannot get a reply by tomorrow I will inform the honourable member by correspondence.

STOCKPORT BRIDGE.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The bridge over the River Light at Stockport is in a dangerous condition. Will the Minister of Works obtain from the Minister of Roads his plans for this bridge?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will ask for a report.

PETERBOROUGH RAIL SERVICE.

Mr. CASEY: It has been the policy of the Railways Department for the passenger train from Peterborough and surrounding areas to depart late in the afternoon on Sundays, but this morning I received a letter signed by residents of the district that on holiday weekends—on Mondays—the train leaves at 11 a.m., which is not acceptable to the travelling public because it means they have to leave the area early on the Monday morning whereas they would prefer to leave at about 4 p.m. If their suggestion were adopted an alteration to the bus service for Spalding, Clare and Jamestown would be necessary. Will the Minister of Works hand this letter, which is in the form of a petition, to the Minister of Railways and ascertain whether an alteration can be made to the time table on holiday weekends to meet with the public's requirements?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I shall be pleased to do so.

FLOOD INSURANCE.

Mr. CUMBE: During the heavy downpours in the last month many houses in the Prospect area were flooded and carpets, furnishings and floors were seriously damaged. Although steps are being taken to improve drainage, many of the householders affected are upset because they find that they cannot receive an insurance cover for this type of damage. It is claimed that this is an act of Providence. However, if the insurance cover related to storm and tempest and roofs collapsed and similar damage were caused, it would have been covered. Many people have suffered damage to the extent of almost £400. I realize it is impossible for the Government to direct insurance companies to provide specific covers and that, to meet this

situation, premiums would be excessive, but will the Premier confer with underwriters and insurance companies to ascertain whether policies to cater for this problem could be introduced? Will he ascertain whether the companies will issue policies to those people who are prepared to pay the necessary premiums?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If the honourable member considers what he has said, he will realize that he has partly answered the question himself. Insurance of this type would be taken out by people likely to be flooded but would not be taken out by people who were on any elevation. For instance, I reside in the Adelaide hills, and I would not take out this type of insurance because I know I am not likely to be flooded. This is much like insurance against frost. Honourable members know that frost insurance has always been a problem because it is taken out only by people in areas likely to be affected by frost. The capital cost of flood insurance would be abnormally high, and that is the problem associated with it. There would be no difficulty in getting this type of insurance. I am informed that insurance can be obtained even against having twins.

BETTERMENT ASSESSMENT.

Mr. CORCORAN: The betterment assessment recently issued by the South-Eastern Drainage Board in respect of the Western Division of the South-Eastern Drainage Scheme has met with strong opposition from people affected, many of whom consider it is too high. I am aware that there is a right of appeal, but will the Minister of Lands indicate how many people have appealed against the assessment and when and where the appeals are likely to be heard?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: The betterment rate is a rate charged consequential on the improvement to the land due to drainage, and with it also goes a drainage rate. In some cases these have been quite heavy. There is a right of appeal, and 150 appeals have been lodged against the rate fixed. These appeals will be heard by the South-Eastern Drainage Board, but the time has not yet been fixed. The board will visit the South-East to hear all these appeals when the time has been fixed.

SOUTH-EAST PULP MILL.

Mr. HARDING: Although my question concerns afforestation, it is directed to the Premier because it involves large sums of money. Over 50 per cent of the *pinus*

radiata forests of this State are in my electorate. The Premier is aware that last year a Select Committee was appointed to take evidence on the proposal to establish a paper pulp mill in the South-East. Will he indicate whether the negotiations now taking place are with the same company and whether they are proceeding satisfactorily?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Honourable members will remember that legislation was passed to ratify an agreement between the Government and a company called *Harmac* for the establishment of a paper pulp industry in the South-East. The American principals of the company advised the Government that they would not proceed with the undertaking, and, as a consequence, at the first opportunity I went to Vancouver to discuss the matter with them. I found that what appeared to be the main problem with the company arose because it was negotiating its timber contracts with four different companies and that the terms of those contracts gave the company a good deal of difficulty, and in the circumstances it would not go on with the proposal. One of the companies, owing to its particular financial formation, was not able to underwrite the supply of timber for more than 20 years ahead, but, of course, an industry of this description that involves a capital expenditure of about £15,500,000 is a long-term industry.

We have been able to secure a resumption of negotiations, and I believe that the points at issue have been reduced to a comparatively small number. The Government itself undertook to underwrite timber supplies to the company that depended upon bond issue for planting, and agreed that it would plant extra timber. The Government agreed that, if there was at any time a shortage, it would make up the balance by additional Government loan. The terms of the new contract for timber have been worked out by negotiation between the private company and the Government, and most of the issues have been cleared up. One or two points still remain, but I sent some suggestions to the company about them recently and I hope that the company will accept the new conditions as satisfactory. In the interests of getting this industry established in South Australia, I have also offered that the Government will, subject to the approval of Parliament, provide public utilities which are normally provided to industry and which were not asked for in the first agreement.

Honourable members will remember that a water supply and power station were to be provided by the company. Subject to Parliament's

approval and under the normal conditions, I have offered that the Government will put in the utilities that are normally supplied by the Government. This will assist the company materially in reducing its capital indebtedness. I have agreed, again with the concurrence of Parliament, that the Government will assist the undertaking financially in relation to some of the capital to be provided in Australia. The specific answer is that the negotiations are proceeding, and, although it is too early to give a definite answer, I am confident that the industry will be established in the South-East, which has the only areas in the whole of Australia where timber is available for paper pulp production. Australia is importing large quantities of pulp every year, and I have no doubt that satisfactory arrangements will ultimately be worked out.

Mr. BYWATERS: I understood the Premier to say that the Government would provide financial assistance for the establishment of the pulp mill. Can he say whether it is intended that the State of South Australia shall have shares in the company?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: We have not got around to the details of this matter, but the original proposals were that the company would provide from American sources about £7,000,000, Australian shareholders about £7,000,000 from Australian sources, and that there would be working capital of £1,500,000 provided by the State Bank. Of the money provided by American and Australian shareholders about 50 per cent would be debenture money. There would be 50 per cent equity money and 50 per cent debenture money. This was the original set-up. The assistance the Government has been asked to consider through the State Bank would be to provide some of the debenture money, which would be returned progressively over a period of years.

It would be a normal financial proposal, much the same as is provided for co-operatives and similar undertakings in this State. As I have said, we have not got down to the precise details. To enable the State Bank to provide this assistance it may be necessary for the Government to increase the capital of the bank by several million pounds, and for the bank to be able to receive the additional support from the State Government to enable it to have funds available for the proposal. We have not gone beyond the point where these matters have been canvassed and discussed. I have discussed them with the Governor of the Commonwealth Bank, who, of course, is the State's banker,

and I have no doubt that he would be prepared to concur in the arrangements we have under consideration.

MEDALLIONS.

Mr. LAWN: My question is directed to you, Mr. Speaker. Would you be good enough to have it noted in the record for the benefit of the member for Mitcham that today, the opening day of this session, the member for Adelaide in all his glory wore all his medallions, together with his "Queen suit", while the member for Mitcham did not wear his medallions?

The SPEAKER: Does the Premier desire to reply?

BERRI AND KINGSTON FERRIES.

Mr. CURREN: On the last day of last session I asked the Premier, representing the Minister of Roads, a question relating to the ferries at Berri and Kingston, and sought information whether the approaches for additional ferries would be installed in time to take the ferries that would become available on completion of the Blanchetown bridge. Paragraph 10 of the Governor's Speech states that the work is in hand, but I crossed the Kingston ferry the night before last and saw no work in progress, nor did I observe any at Berri yesterday. Can the Minister of Works say when the work will commence and be completed in order to take the ferries that will be available when the Blanchetown bridge is completed?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will ask for a report from my colleague on this matter.

WHYALLA TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. LOVEDAY: The Whyalla Technical High School has an enrolment of 830 in the secondary section only, and it is anticipated that the enrolment in February, 1964, will be 950. In addition to the permanent buildings there are the following portable buildings for the secondary, apprentice and diploma sections—one single unit, six dual units, three triple units and one quadruple unit. This matter of a new comprehensive high school has been under consideration for some years, but there is little room for further building on the present site as the area behind the existing building goes up a steep hillside. In view of the urgency of the matter, owing to the rapid increase in development at Whyalla, will the Minister of Education have the matter investigated with a view to having a new comprehensive high school built as quickly as possible on land already available in Whyalla West?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Yes.

GEPPS CROSS HOSTEL.

Mr. JENNINGS: I frequently ask questions about the hostel at Gepps Cross and have criticized the conditions there on numerous occasions. On the last occasion when I asked the Premier a question he replied that this was the type of accommodation that South Australia did not want, and that it was hoped the hostel would not again have to be used as a temporary housing place. From my own observations I know that about 40 flats, or what are euphemistically described as flats, are empty in the hostel owing to the uncertainty of the hostel's future. I have been asked many questions by businessmen in close proximity to the hostel, and by some people who are actually conducting their businesses inside the hostel area, whether the Government can make a public statement now as to what the future holds because they have considerable investments there.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If my memory serves me correctly, the land to which the honourable member refers belongs to the State and was leased to the Commonwealth on a 20-year term to enable it to establish a camp. The position now is that the Housing Trust leases the premises from the Commonwealth and sublets them to migrants who have no other accommodation. I think the honourable member appreciates that the Government could not out of hand take steps to demolish the premises and dispossess people of the roofs over their heads. I think he realizes that would be impossible. I do not say this as a definite proposition, but my desire in the matter would be that when the Commonwealth ceases to hold the lease the State should change the place to normal housing in due course, as we are doing with emergency houses, of which we have now only about 150 left. The Government would be anxious to try to protect any people who have invested money in order to serve this area. I shall be pleased to consider the aspect raised by the honourable member.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES.

Sessional Committees were appointed as follows:

Standing Orders: The Speaker, the Hons. P. H. Quirke and B. H. Teusner, and Mr. Frank Walsh.

Library: The Speaker, Messrs. Clark, Nankivell and Ryan.

Printing: Messrs. Corcoran, Hall, Harding and McKee, and Mrs. Steele.

The Legislative Council notified its appointment of Sessional Committees.

**JOINT COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE
LEGISLATION.**

The Legislative Council intimated that it had appointed the Hon. F. J. Potter to be one of its representatives on the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation in place of the Hon. A. C. Hookings (deceased).

JOINT HOUSE COMMITTEE.

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

That it be an order of this House that, in view of the creation of the Joint House Committee under the Joint House Committee Act, 1941, a Sessional House Committee be not appointed under Standing Order No. 404.

Motion carried.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

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

That a committee consisting of Messrs. Ferguson, Heaslip and Laucke, Mrs. Steele, and the mover be appointed to prepare a draft address to His Excellency the Governor in reply to his Speech on opening Parliament, and to report on June 13.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.41 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, June 13, at 2 p.m.