

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, July 24, 1963.

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

QUESTIONS.**TOTALIZATOR AGENCY BOARD.**

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I have received much correspondence—and assume that other honourable members have also received similar correspondence—relating to the introduction in this State of a system of off-course betting. This correspondence has come from Mr. Parham, secretary of the South Australian Off-Course Totalizator Committee, and includes a circular to ministers of religion and a pamphlet explaining the working of the Totalizator Agency Board system that was established in Victoria. I noticed in the press that trotting people in Victoria are reverting to a manual totalizator, which is to be installed by South Australians. I have also received many letters from other interested people almost in the proportion of fan mail. The latest (without any reflection on any electorate) is from the Burra Methodist Circuit. Can the Premier say whether the Government intends to introduce legislation to amend the Lottery and Gaming Act or to establish the T.A.B., which would lead to other amendments to the Lottery and Gaming Act?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I, like other honourable members, have had a considerable amount of correspondence in this matter. I received a deputation from racing clubs and associated authorities, and I have had communications from other interested and disinterested parties. The Government has considered this matter and has decided that it is not prepared to introduce legislation at this stage. The position is that the T.A.B. was introduced in Victoria and has been claimed to be a great success. The Government made inquiries and sent independent officers to closely examine the operations of the T.A.B. in Victoria. The reports that came back from those investigations did not display half the enthusiasm shown by the propounders of this system. In fact, some of the investigations revealed undesirable features. South Australia had a sore experience with off-course betting in betting shops at one stage, and I do not think any member would want legislation introduced that would result in our reverting to the position that obtained when betting shops were rife. The Government examined

the proposal and informed the racing clubs that it did not intend to introduce legislation. The clubs asked us to consider the proposal, but at present there is no evidence available that would lead us to change the attitude we have expressed. This matter is not finally determined and if factors arise in future—and I do not mean this session—to prompt us to re-examine the proposal, we will do so. Our present intention is not to introduce legislation this year.

EDITHBURGH FACILITIES.

Mr. FERGUSON: Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether plans have been approved for the establishment of fishermen's breakwater and landing facilities at Edithburgh? If they have, when is that work expected to commence?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: This matter is being considered. I will obtain a full report as soon as possible for the honourable member.

WATER RATES.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Works considered the petition I handed to the Premier on June 13 from market gardeners of Nelshaby and Napperby protesting against proposed water rates?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Premier handed to me for attention the petition the honourable member presented to him. I have a report from the Engineer-in-Chief which I will make available to the honourable member if he desires it. The text of that report, which deals with this matter fully, is that market gardeners throughout the State generally do not enjoy any special concessions in the use of water. Water is extremely costly in any event, and is provided below cost to the general consumer, particularly in country districts. The Engineer-in-Chief states that he is unable to agree that in this case, as distinct from any other similar cases, a special concession is justified.

SCHOOL OF ART.

Mr. CUMBE: Now that the new South Australian School of Art has been opened in North Adelaide and the Minister of Education has visited it in his official capacity on an inspection, can he say whether he agrees with a recent comment by a visiting authority that this school, which was erected at considerable cost, is one of the finest of its type in Australia? Further, can he say whether later this year it will be officially opened?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I would go further and say that on the best

advice available to me it is one of the best of its kind in the world. Answering the second part of the question—and although this may sound like a Dorothy Dixier it is not—by a strange coincidence this morning I received a letter from the personal secretary of His Excellency the Governor stating that the Governor had accepted my invitation for him, accompanied by Lady Bastyan, to officially open this school, I think on Friday, November 15.

MEMBERS' INSURANCE.

Mr. LOVEDAY: In the absence of the Treasurer, the Acting Treasurer wrote to the Leader of the Opposition recently about workmen's compensation cover for members of this House. This letter has been circulated to members on this side of the House, but I do not know if members opposite have had the information, which is that members are not covered by workmen's compensation in the course of their duties, but that, to meet the situation, the Government some years ago arranged a special insurance policy to cover members injured in motor vehicle accidents whilst travelling on business connected with their Parliamentary duties. The letter explains that the policy provides for the payment of £4,000 in respect of bodily injury resulting in death, and for other benefits. Some time ago I was involved in an accident while engaged on Parliamentary duties and, on inquiry, I found that nobody knew of any cover for members of this House. The Treasurer will remember that he was good enough to visit me while I was in Whyalla Hospital, and I am sure that if he had known of this he would have said something about it. The Acting Treasurer said he knew nothing of this proposal and all members appear to have been ignorant of the situation. Since my accident I have taken out a personal accident policy, the premium for which is £16 10s. a year. This policy provides for payment of £10,000 in the event of death, and for other benefits. Will the Treasurer say whether the Government will consider providing suitable and adequate insurance cover to meet all circumstances of members travelling on any form of transport while performing Parliamentary duties?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I shall look at this matter and give the honourable member and other members a report when I have had it examined. This will take the form of a letter to the leader of each Party, and I presume that each leader will circulate this among their members.

STOCKPORT BRIDGE.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Will the Minister of Works ask his colleague, the Minister of Roads, when the new bridge at Stockport will be commenced?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes.

ENGINEERING TRADE SCHOOL.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Will the Minister of Education say whether any moves are being made to purchase a property for use as an engineering trade school? If such moves are being made, will the proposed school be entirely of new buildings or will existing buildings be remodelled? If such new school is contemplated, where will it be?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Without notice, I cannot reply on all aspects of the question except to say that an engineering trade school is contemplated. I understand that an existing building will be purchased and that new buildings will be added. I, personally, am not happy about purchasing existing buildings. I would much rather start with a piece of bare land, but purchasing an existing property has at least one benefit, that of probably procuring a school perhaps a couple of years earlier than would ordinarily happen. I am not familiar with the full position and, after looking at the matter to refresh my memory, I will reply to the honourable member in detail.

FAULTY BUILDING.

Mr. LAUCKE: Recently, I was asked to inspect some houses at Hope Valley that had been purchased by migrants in good faith after initial inspections. Financial arrangements were entered into with the builders and, soon after occupation, these migrant families found that the walls were cracking and the floors were coming away from the walls. These things were evidently due to recession of the foundations.

Mr. Hutchens: Were the houses on reclaimed land?

Mr. LAUCKE: No, but they may have been on Bay of Biscay land. These migrants, having committed themselves deeply in respect of these houses, have been unable to meet the cost of bringing their houses back into reasonable condition and have sought of the people who built them compensation or assistance in this matter. My concern is that people should come here and in good faith buy an asset and then find that they have been taken in. Will the Premier say whether there is any background legislation or protection to assist them in such circumstances?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I do not think it would be advisable for me to answer the question specifically without knowing the full details of the case. If the honourable member will give me the full details so that I can have a close examination made of the facts, I shall be pleased to see what possible remedies can be applied. Unfortunately, certain areas in the metropolitan area are unsuitable for buildings with ordinary foundations, and if people build in those areas they must have special foundations if the houses are to be satisfactory. It is conceivable that the fault has occurred not because of any neglect by the builder, who may have carried out the specifications honestly, but because of the nature of the ground. If the honourable member will give me the name and address of one person concerned and permission to have the matter examined, I will see what can be done.

GAWLER SCHOOLS.

Mr. CLARK: At a recent Liberal and Country League meeting at Gawler, at which, of course, I was not privileged to be present, the Minister of Education was reported as saying that the present Gawler High School would become a primary school after the completion of the new Gawler High School, which is almost completed. Will the Minister say what area is to be served by this school (about which I am happy) and whether it is intended to zone children attending it?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I was disappointed to miss the shining countenance of my honourable friend at the good and well-attended meeting. Indeed, I thought that without the wintry conditions we would have had an overflow of people attending. It is intended to use the premises as a primary school, but there is no question of zoning for primary schools. The only schools that are zoned at present are high schools and technical high schools, and I do not want to continue zoning those for any longer than is absolutely necessary.

SCHOOL BUSES.

Mr. CORCORAN: Can the Minister of Education say what steps are taken by his department to ensure that the drivers of school buses are in fact skilled in driving and are of suitable character to care for children, and what precautions are taken to ensure that school buses are safe and roadworthy?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Some years ago I established a School Bus Committee consisting of the Deputy Director of Education,

the Secretary of the department and the Accountant, together with the Transport Officer as the executive officer. I think the honourable member will agree that they are four of the most able and experienced officers of the department. One of their several duties is to ensure that only the most reputable people are drivers of school buses and that they are competent to drive those buses. I consider that the Education Department (and the Minister of Education in particular) has a very special responsibility to the children transported by these services. I think that this year more than 20,000 children in the country are being transported to and from those schools daily, and I am most anxious that none of them should incur the risk of accident. I shall be only too pleased to supply the honourable member with any more detailed information that he might desire.

MILK TANKERS.

Mr. JENKINS: Yesterday I asked the Minister of Lands, in the interests of the Jervois Dairying Co-operative factory and others, when the new standards for the calibration of milk tankers would be available, and I understand the Minister now has a reply.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: As I indicated yesterday, it is the intention of the Warden of Standards to calibrate milk tankers if requested but, because of the amount of bulk transport now operating, the Warden of Standards considers that it is necessary to have containers of an increased size which, by multiple use, will be able to give an accurate gauge of a particular vessel. However, they take some time to make and to be calibrated, and this additional equipment is not expected to be available for at least 15 months from now. The Warden of Standards intends to obtain such equipment.

ABORIGINES.

Mr. HUGHES: Yesterday the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs made some remarks concerning the Federal Council of Aboriginal Advancement. I believe the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) was formerly the president of that body, and I now ask him whether he would give the House any information on the matter.

The SPEAKER: Does the member for Norwood desire to reply?

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I was very much concerned to read the Minister's remarks in the newspaper concerning the Federal Council for Aboriginal Advancement and its Field Officer (Pastor Nicholls). I have

not been associated with the council now for some two years, but it is the case that the Minister's remarks were quite inaccurate and I think they should be corrected. I have taken out what the Minister had to say about this matter, and the relevant passages from the newspaper read as follows:

"The Federal Council for Aboriginal Advancement was under Communist front influences to promote and perpetuate racial tensions," the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs (Mr. Pearson) said yesterday.

That was the heading. The Minister went on to say:

"While using his title as a churchman, Pastor Nicholls appeared to engage himself in affairs somewhat remote from the sphere of clerical activities. He has become a professional critic of aboriginal administrations in this country and chief executive of the Federal Council for Aboriginal Advancement. This council, according to information given to the Ministers' conference, was so organized that at its last meeting in Canberra earlier this year a clear majority of the organizations from all parts of Australia who sent delegates to the council were either Communist-front organizations or organizations in which Communist office holders were able to direct views and influence policies. From our common knowledge of Communist activity, one may surely infer that the primary purpose of such organizations is to promote and perpetuate racial tensions rather than to help Aborigines."

It appeared to me that there were some very clear innuendoes about Pastor Nicholls in that matter, but apparently the Minister has had second thoughts and he said something about that yesterday. Regarding the council itself, that statement in the newspaper is untrue. The council is not so organized that delegations were sent to a meeting of the council in Canberra. The council is organized with constituent bodies, being Aboriginal Advancement Associations, in the various States. Those associations nominate members of the council. The council calls conferences—and the meeting in Canberra was such a conference—of any persons or organizations interested in the advancement of Aborigines, for the purpose of discussing Aborigines' advancement in this country. The conferences and the resolutions passed at them do not bind the council and do not form its policy. The Canberra meeting was not a meeting of the council binding the policy of that body, and if it were the case that there were a majority of Communist-front organizations at that conference it is certainly not the case that they determined the policy of the council or the activities of Pastor Nicholls. It is unfair and untrue to suggest that this reputable body of citizens from all over Australia representing Aboriginal

Advancement Associations directly is in any way a Communist-front or Communist-influenced organization.

Mr. HEASLIP: In view of the statement made by the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) about Aborigines, has the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs anything to add to or detract from that statement?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: In his reply to the member for Wallaroo, the member for Norwood quoted extracts from the press concerning statements I am reported to have made to the press. If my memory is correct I think he indicated that they were extracts. I do not think they were all in context, but I am not sure of that. In any case, I do not think they were in sequence. However, the main point at issue is the standing of the Federal Council for Aboriginal Advancement. I have nothing to detract from my comments on that matter. If the honourable member desires to be the spokesman for that body then I shall be pleased to hear him comment on any occasion about it. However, I would go further and say that long before this matter was raised at the Ministers' conference in Darwin, I had received private and confidential letters from people, some of whom were members of the Aboriginal Advancement League in South Australia who had become so concerned at the trend of developments within that organization that they had thought it advisable and proper to write to me to inform me of what was happening within the organization in South Australia. I found, when I got to Darwin, that Ministers from other States had somewhat similar stories to recount. Therefore it came as no surprise when the Minister for Territories, who was the chairman of the conference, came forward with a statement on this matter. I have repeated his statement as nearly as my memory can be correct. It was to the effect that of the bodies who sent representatives to the council, a clear majority were either Communist-front organizations or were organizations in which Communists, by virtue of their offices within the organizations concerned, gained control of policy.

Mr. Dunstan: But the conference is not the council!

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The honourable member was at pains to choose his words carefully to give the impression that the conference is entirely voluntary, is not an assembly of the Federal Council as such, and does not control the policy of the Federal Council. If it does not control the policy of the Federal Council, who does?

Mr. Dunstan: The constituent organizations.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: If it is an organization, what is its standing in its own right?

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot allow debate on a reply to a question.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: These are the questions that exercise not only my mind but the minds of all people.

Mr. Dunstan: It is obvious that you have not bothered to find out what the organization is.

The SPEAKER: Order! This is not debating time.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The facts are that unfortunately I know too much about the organization.

Mr. Dunstan: You don't know anything, yet you shoot your mouth off just the same!

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Commonwealth Minister is proposing to make a statement on this matter and I hope the honourable member will read it when he sees it, because the Commonwealth Minister would be much better informed on this matter as it applies to the whole Commonwealth than I would be. However, I am glad of the opportunity to speak now. I am glad that the honourable member has made himself the spokesman for this organization because it has afforded me the opportunity to repeat for the benefit of many well-meaning and warm-hearted people of this State that they should beware and examine the *bona fides* of various organizations before they lend their support to them.

Mr. Dunstan: McCarthy rides again!

LEAVING HONOURS CLASS.

Mrs. STEELE: Earlier this session I addressed a question to the Minister of Education regarding the provision of a Leaving Honours class in Darwin in the Northern Territory. Following the Minister's reply, the Director of Education made a statement, which apparently received much publicity in the Territory, to the effect that, provided 20 students were available to take the course, a Leaving Honours class would be considered for them in 1964. A letter I have just received states:

At present this guarantee can be given, and the Darwin High School Parents' and Citizens' Association wrote to the Director asking for an immediate decision, explaining that the movement of whole families hinged on this vexed question, and that some parents were planning to leave the Territory at the end of the year because nothing definite had come from the department. The reply from the Director was a severe blow to our hopes and

expectations, as a definite "No" was implied in the letter received from the Superintendent of High Schools.

It goes on to say:

We are bitterly disappointed that the Darwin High School is being given no consideration from the points of view of distance, expense and divided families. We are treated as though it is easier for us to get our children home for weekends than it was for Whyalla and Nuriootpa parents who now have Honours classes. We need this Honours class very much, and we need to know definitely now that it will be established to prevent known students and their families from leaving the Territory. Will the Minister of Education say what are the latest developments in this matter?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I have not seen a copy of any letter alleged to have been written by the Director of Education, but I should be surprised if a definite "No" were stated or implied in the letter. But, at any rate, what I said in reply to the honourable member some weeks ago still stands. Since then, I have received a letter from either the president or the secretary of the parents' association, which I referred to the Director for report and recommendation (as I am obliged by law to do) and I have had some discussions with him and have received an optimistic interim report from him. I am quietly confident that a Leaving Honours class will be established at Darwin at the beginning of next year. Personally, I shall be bitterly disappointed if one is not. I think that not only is it highly desirable: it is absolutely necessary.

SEMAPHORE PARK SEWERAGE.

Mr. TAPPING: Last Friday I telephoned the Secretary of the Minister of Works regarding a meeting I had been invited to attend at Semaphore Park next Sunday afternoon where the people will urge me to press for the provision of sewerage in the Semaphore South area. This area has grown quickly and, because of the planned housing construction, I think the case for sewerage is a strong one. I understand that the Minister has some information for me that I may transmit to the meeting next Sunday afternoon.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As the honourable member was good enough to advise me of this question, I have obtained a report from the Engineer-in-Chief, which states:

The portions of Semaphore Park not yet provided with sewers comprise:

- (a) A large area bounded by Recreation Parade, Dunstone Road, Sansom Road and on the west by sandhills and the Esplanade.

- (b) A second area east of Sansom Road between Beaumont Street and Gordon Street.
- (c) A short length of sewer in Sutherland Avenue south of Bower Road.
- (d) A short section in Military Road between Bower Road and Ozone Avenue.

Plans and estimates have been prepared to cover this work which would provide sewerage for the whole of the privately developed areas in Semaphore Park. The total length of new sewers would be $4\frac{1}{2}$ miles and the estimated cost is £137,400. Sewer construction in this locality is very costly and the financial aspects are now being examined.

OIL EXPLORATION SUBSIDY.

Mr. HARDING: I understand that for the month of June about £550,000 was paid by the Commonwealth Government for subsidies for oil drilling, but I notice with alarm that the amount received by South Australia was only £3,000. Can the Premier say whether this indicates that boring for oil in South Australia is practically at a standstill, or is oil exploration in this State still being carried out extensively?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Commonwealth subsidies are granted from time to time on application, and the sum approved for any month may not necessarily indicate the scope of the exploration work in any State. For the previous month nearly the whole of the sum granted for subsidies was for South Australian exploration. It depends entirely on when the approval is given. There has been no lessening in this State of the scale of exploration. The firms previously undertaking surveys, particularly seismic surveys, are still operating. The Government's two plants are also operating, although they do not receive the Commonwealth Government subsidy. The boring plants that have been working are still working in this State. I do not believe there is any reduction in confidence in the prospect of finding oil in South Australia. It is a problem that will take considerable time to resolve. In my opinion, the amount of the oil subsidy does not indicate the amount of work being done.

RAILWAY STANDARDIZATION.

Mr. CASEY: It was agreed under the Railways Standardization Agreement of 1949 that, in the event of the Broken Hill to Port Pirie railway line's conversion to 4ft. 8½in., the line linking Broken Hill with Cockburn, which is owned and operated by the Silverton Tramways Company, would be purchased and placed under the control of the South Australian Railways. Can the Premier say whether the Government anticipates the purchase of the Silverton Tram-

ways Company's existing line and placing it under the jurisdiction of the South Australian Railways Department?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am sorry I cannot give the honourable member a direct answer. The matter has been discussed by me with the Prime Minister on a couple of occasions, but at present I do not know what the Commonwealth decision is. The Commonwealth's power to purchase the line would depend, first, upon whether the New South Wales Government was prepared to acquire the line compulsorily or not; and secondly, it would involve the question of what the Commonwealth Government's policy was at the time with regard to financial assistance.

I point out that the High Court case rather showed that the Commonwealth Government could bide its time as to the programme of work. I am sure that I am correct in saying—and this would be the view of my colleagues in Cabinet—that we would prefer that the standardization of the line should be undertaken by the Silverton Tramways Company, and the money that would be spent on that work should be spent in bringing the standard gauge line into Adelaide. The standardization work would involve an expenditure in compensation and in changeover of more than £8,000,000. I have been informed that the Silverton Tramways Company would be willing, at its own expense and without obligation, to standardize the line, and that would avoid the payment of probably £4,000,000 for compensation and another £4,000,000 for the work. In the interests of this State the £4,000,000 would be better spent in providing the standard gauge railway into Adelaide. Another suggestion would be for the money to be spent on connecting Whyalla with Port Augusta, which will obviously be essential soon.

KIMBA AREA SCHOOL.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Early this year a new area school was opened at Kimba, but because of a breakdown no heating has been available there. Can the Minister of Works comment on this situation?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: When the honourable member referred this matter to me it was the first knowledge I had of it, but then the Minister of Education mentioned it and simultaneously I had a letter from a correspondent at Kimba. I have a report from the Director of Public Buildings, as follows:

This department's specifications have set out basic requirements to enable all manufacturers to tender for this class of work and to submit their own detailed designs. In most

cases the results have been satisfactory but in a few cases weaknesses have been found in the plants provided by some contractors. This was the case in this instance. Similar difficulties were found with this contractor's installation at another school, which have now been corrected. It is anticipated that the heating system at Kimba Area School will be placed in commission within the next week.

HARBORS BOARD OFFICES.

Mr. RYAN: The Harbors Board has a valuable area of vacant land in St. Vincent Street, Port Adelaide, at the rear of No. 6 berth. Recently I read that it was the Government's intention to erect a building on this land to provide consolidated office accommodation for all Government departments in Port Adelaide. Can the Minister of Marine indicate whether this proposal is for the far distant future or whether it will be implemented soon? Will consideration be given to consolidating the Harbors Board's administration in one office at Port Adelaide instead of in offices at Port Adelaide and Adelaide?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The board has considered this matter over a long period and about 18 months ago considered it further. No decision has been reached or, if it has, it has not been conveyed to me. I do not know whether the board proposes to proceed with the erection of consolidated offices at Port Adelaide. I do not think it has made any decision, so the matter is not one under urgent consideration. The merits and demerits of consolidating at Port Adelaide were discussed and, although on the face of it there appeared to be some advantages, there also appeared to be disadvantages. The board has not put any firm proposition to me as Minister, so it has not been considered at Government level. As far as I know, the board has no immediate intention of proceeding with the proposal.

LOW-DEPOSIT HOUSING.

Mr. CURREN: I am constantly being approached by residents of Berri and Barmera for assistance in overcoming housing difficulties. I understand that there is a 12-month waiting period for Housing Trust houses. Can the Premier indicate whether it is intended soon to extend to country districts—particularly to Renmark, Berri and Barmera—the £50 deposit Housing Trust scheme?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If the honourable member will ask that question tomorrow, I hope I shall have a reply.

AIR POLLUTION.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Early last session I asked the Premier whether the Government

proposed to take action on the serious problem of the pollution of air over the Adelaide Plains and the metropolitan area, and he said that legislation was being prepared. It was not introduced last session, and it was not mentioned in His Excellency's Speech this session. I am still perturbed about the problem and I judge from the notice given yesterday by the member for Hindmarsh that he, too, is perturbed. Will the Premier say whether the Government intends this session to introduce the Bill originally expected last session or any other legislation on this subject?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Government has given considerable attention to this matter, not because at present there is any serious problem of air pollution in this country compared with that in the big cities elsewhere in the world, but because we wish to see that this condition does not arise here. However, when it comes to legislation, the terms of that legislation are difficult to design so as to be effective. Members will appreciate that the problem of air pollution arises not from one plant but from a combination of plants, and it is not easy to frame legislation, designed to keep the air clean, which may not at some time or another have a seriously detrimental effect upon the development of industry generally. Setting up technical committees has not always necessarily been the answer to a problem of this description, because technical committees can in some circumstances ultimately become arbitrary in their decisions, and nobody has any appeal against them. Although I will not make a definite promise, I hope that legislation can be introduced this session.

WATER CHARGES.

Mr. LANGLEY: As the heavy beneficial rains this year have, I understand, filled the reservoirs, will the Premier say whether the Government will review the increased charges for water that it recently decided upon?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The charges for water in this State are, I believe, significantly low compared with those in other States. That applies particularly to country areas. In most cases there will be no additional charge to the person concerned. The increased charges have some bearing only when the person is using excess water above the rebate quantity; to a moderate user, there is no additional charge. Quite apart from the fact that there have been heavy losses in supplying water in this State, the Government has been concerned that, due to the alterations made in valuations and the rating on properties,

increased quantities of water are supplied, often more than is necessary for the reasonable use of the area concerned. This position has arisen because, although the rates have increased, the price of water has not risen correspondingly. In these circumstances, the answer to the question is definitely "No".

SNOWTOWN ELECTRICITY SUPPLY.

Mr. HALL: My question concerns electricity extensions north-east from and surrounding the township of Snowtown. A group of about 70 prospective consumers in an extension known as Snowtown 1 are becoming worried about being connected to the single wire earth return system. This is one of the older groups, and it has been waiting for many years. Will the Premier say whether his Budget forecast will allow for the programme of the Electricity Trust to go ahead as planned and, particularly, will he inquire about the prospects of this scheme being commenced during this financial year?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The budget of the trust has not been curtailed in any way and, as far as I know, it is in keeping with the amount of work it is able to undertake. I hope to have a reply tomorrow about the extension mentioned.

PULP MILL.

Mr. BURDON: In reply to a question yesterday about the establishment of a paper pulp mill near Mount Gambier, the Premier said that it had been narrowed down to two items—the proposal made concerning the assurance given to the Canadian company of the Government's intention to tie together the private and Government timber supplies in one contract, and the earlier belief that adequate timber supplies were available to the pulp mill. Will the Premier indicate the approximate tonnage or super footage of timber that will be required annually if this industry is established, as I hope it will be?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member has read into the statements I made yesterday certain meanings that were not intended. The present discussion is not over the adequacy of the supply or the proposal to have a common timber agreement. The problem is not one of the adequacy of the timber. Before the contracts were even negotiated, surveys had been made to see if the timber would be available. It is only a question of the conditions that can arise over a contract which, of necessity, will extend over a period of 40 years.

TRAFFIC INTERSECTION.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I have been concerned about many intersections in my district, particularly the intersection of Payneham Road, Walkerville Road and Nelson Street. At this intersection much traffic banks up and it is nearly all through traffic; that is, the cars do not belong to people who live in the vicinity or in the St. Peters council area but mostly travel through to other areas. The council approached the Commissioner of Highways for assistance in placing traffic lights at the intersection. The reply given to the council was that it was not the policy of the department to assist, except at exceptionally difficult intersections, even where the roads involved were the Highways Department's responsibility. The council is rather upset about this position. Will the Minister of Works ask his colleague to take up with Cabinet the question of a review of the existing policy in this matter, and to see whether the Highways Department's assistance cannot be given at intersections where there is a build-up of traffic and where for the most part that traffic is through traffic and not the traffic of residents of the district involved?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Does the honourable member refer to the Norwood council area?

Mr. Dunstan: No, the St. Peters council.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will take up the matter with my colleague and bring down a report.

EGG MARKETING.

Mr. BYWATERS: A newspaper called *Poultry*, published in New South Wales but read widely by poultry farmers in South Australia, recently carried a headline, "South Australia still stalls on Commonwealth Egg Marketing Association scheme." The report goes on to say:

All State Governments except South Australia agreed to the Commonwealth Egg Marketing Association stabilization plan at the Agricultural Council meeting in Brisbane this month. A spokesman for the New South Wales Department of Agriculture said this last week. He said the reason why the South Australian Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Brookman), who was meeting with other agricultural Ministers, did not agree to the plan was not given.

Just prior to the Minister's going to Queensland, meetings were held at Adelaide, Murray Bridge and somewhere in the Barossa Valley. I understand these meetings were well attended and that it was the almost unanimous decision that South Australia should support the Commonwealth Egg Marketing Association

plan because of the circumstances. Subsequently a deputation from those various meetings, together with representatives of the various bodies interested in egg marketing in South Australia, met the Minister. I believe the request to the Minister was that he support this plan. In view of what appears to be the overwhelming support of poultry farmers and those associated with the poultry industry in South Australia for the adoption of the Commonwealth Egg Marketing Association plan, does the Minister consider that he is a one-man authority on this matter, or has he some other information available to him which is not available to the poultry industry generally and which should be given to this House?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I am not prepared to, nor should I, indicate the attitude of other State Governments in relation to statements made at the Agricultural Council. However, I can comment regarding two Governments. Outside of the Agricultural Council, the Commonwealth Government has stated definitely that no proposal will be considered by the Commonwealth Cabinet unless all the States ask for it. It has not undertaken to bring in a scheme, but it will consider a submission if everybody wants it. On behalf of South Australia, I have some reservations about the plan. I am well aware of the meetings that were held. In fact, it might almost be said, although perhaps not in so many words, that those meetings were held at my instigation. I undertook to take every step possible to let the poultry farmers' organizations know what I knew of the plan, sketchy as the details were. The result of that was a number of meetings, the results of which had been communicated to me in the form of a deputation. It was stated to me that these meetings reached an almost unanimous decision. I need only say that the details of the scheme are not yet completed; in fact, they have varied since the Agricultural Council meeting, and it is still not clear exactly what they are. The machinery of collecting this tax or levy, or whatever it might be, is most obscure. It appears to be a scheme whereby it is the responsibility of each poultry farmer to forward the amount of a specified levy, based on the number of birds that he owns, once a fortnight throughout the year. The estimate of the amount of the levy has varied from as low as 3s. 4d. to as high as at least 10s. per bird per annum. Those are matters that should be sorted out before a scheme is begun, and no-one should enter a stabilization scheme without having a clear idea as to items which may be termed

details by some people but which I think are important to everybody. It is by no means the unanimous wish in South Australia to enter such a scheme, as my correspondence will testify, nor is it a unanimous wish in other States. I am receiving correspondence from the other States, and am aware of the position there.

GEPPTS CROSS HOSTEL.

Mr. JENNINGS: On June 12 this year I asked the Premier about the Government's intentions regarding the Gepps Cross hostel. As is not peculiarly unknown to this House, the Premier proceeded to answer a question I had not asked. However, in his final paragraph he did promise that he would have a report prepared. Has he that report?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member was good enough yesterday to indicate his continued interest in this matter, and I have inquired this morning. The Chairman of the Housing Trust is preparing a report, but it is not yet to hand. As soon as I receive it I will inform the honourable member and see that a copy of the report is placed in *Hansard* so that general knowledge of the position will be available. I regret that the report is not yet to hand.

FREE RAIL PASSES.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question relates to free rail passes. Originally I wrote to the Minister of Education about the withdrawal of this concession to children, among others, using the main hills railway line. I wrote that letter on March 21. Not having received a reply, I asked the Minister of Education a question on June 13, and the Minister concluded his reply by saying:

It is not a matter in which I can give a decision because it involves an amendment to the regulations, and that can only be done by Cabinet. It is a matter of policy that will be decided by Cabinet in due course.

I now ask the Minister whether the matter has been considered by Cabinet and, if so, whether the present policy is to be altered to provide again for free rail passes?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Subsequent to the honourable member's question to me and my reply, the honourable member wrote to the Premier concerning this matter. The Premier referred that letter to me, and I submitted it to the Director of Education for report and recommendation, both of which I received. I then submitted it, together with the whole docket, to Cabinet, and Cabinet in turn on Monday referred it to the Premier.

I have no doubt that the Premier in due course will examine the matter and will then reply to the honourable member's letter.

ELECTION PAMPHLET.

Mr. HUTCHENS: During the recent by-election campaign in the Commonwealth division of Grey, a particularly unfortunate person by the name of Clark, who paraded as an A.L.P. candidate but who was in no way associated with the Australian Labor Party, issued a pamphlet in which he made some extraordinary statements that reflected upon people, not only those in this House but others in public office who have a high reputation for honesty and fair dealing. I refer to the pamphlet authorized by the gentleman, which stated:

The South Australian Housing Trust has misappropriated enough public money to have completely replaced the slums of Port Pirie with modern tenements. Many present members of Parliament in addition to architects and builders are involved in this corruption. I am led to believe from a press statement that, when the Chairman of the Housing Trust said that such statements were libellous, this man said "Yes, I know they are," thereby inferring that nothing would be done about them because they were true.

Mr. Jennings: He said he meant them to be libellous.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Yes. Will the Premier discuss with his colleagues any possible action not only to correct these statements, but to protect honourable and decent citizens from such reflections made in such infamous statements?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will refer the question to the Crown Solicitor and let the honourable member have a reply.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I have been informed that you, Mr. Speaker, have some right of action in this matter. I am prepared to supply you with the pamphlet from which I quoted. As the passage I read refers to present members of Parliament have you, as Speaker, authority to take action and, if so, will you consider doing so?

The SPEAKER: I think that the statement the honourable member read from the pamphlet does in fact infringe Standing Orders and is really a breach of the privilege of members of Parliament. Parliament has the right, under Standing Orders, to take the necessary action, but before recommending it I will have the matter examined and let the honourable member know.

FOXES.

Mr. LAUCKE: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my question of yesterday concerning scalp money for foxes destroyed?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: The Government has considered this question from time to time but has decided not to pay such a bonus. Under the Vermin Act foxes are classed as vermin, and each landholder is responsible for the destruction of foxes on his land. District councils also have full power to enforce the requirements of the Act. The Government does not intend to consider again the question of paying a bonus on fox scalps.

RAL RAL IRRIGATION CHANNELS.

Mr. CURREN: Has the Minister of Irrigation a reply to my question yesterday about the lining of irrigation channels in the Ral Ral Division?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: Provision has been made on the Estimates for this work to be undertaken. The department is at present awaiting definite plans from the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

INTEREST RATES.

Mr. HEASLIP: Last week an announcement was made regarding the reduction of interest on Government loans for houses. This is a desirable trend and one that will be readily acceptable to the public. Can the Premier say whether any adjustments will be made for any other sections of the community, such as primary producers?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: As from August 1, new loans approved through the State Bank under the Loans to Producers Act and the Advances to Settlers Act will be at the rate of 5½ per cent instead of 5¼ per cent as at present. These rates were reduced from 6 per cent to 5¼ per cent from June 1 last on loans made during that period. The new rate of 5½ per cent will also apply to new loans through the bank and State departments for soldier settlement, irrigation, fencing and the like. The rate of interest on new loans approved by the State Bank in accordance with the Student Hostels Act will be at 5 per cent per annum which is the same rate as that applying to housing loans.

WHYALLA TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. LOVEDAY: On April 29 I wrote to the Minister of Education regarding the question of the development of a recreation area for the Whyalla Technical High School, adjacent to the existing recreation area. This area is to be developed and soil added

and graded, and it was suggested in the reply that steps would be taken to complete the grading in time for spring planting. Time is passing rapidly, and so far this work has not been started. I understand that the school council is anxious that the seeding should be completed this spring. Will the Minister ascertain whether this work can be proceeded with as soon as possible so that seeding will be completed this spring?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Yes.

ADELAIDE TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL.

Mrs. STEELE: I have received inquiries from parents regarding the zone to be served by the new Adelaide Technical High School, which will open soon in the Burnside electorate. As this matter is being considered by officers of the department, can the Minister of Education say whether any boundaries have been fixed for the zoning of students at this school?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: They have not been finally fixed. I have had some discussion with the Superintendent of Technical Schools (Mr. Bone) and also with the Director of Education. There are one or two complications in the matter as it does not conform with our ordinary zoning by-laws. Apart from the Whyalla Technical High School, all our technical schools are either for girls or for boys, whereas our high schools are for both boys and girls. This will be the first school of its kind in the metropolitan area, therefore there will probably have to be a different zone between the Adelaide Technical High School and adjacent high schools and technical high schools. The department is taking over this technical high school from the Institute of Technology where special conditions have applied for some years, and we are anxious—and I feel we are obliged—to continue those conditions regarding brothers and sisters of existing scholars. I hope that soon we will be able to finally fix some formula which, while not ideal and perhaps causing some disappointment, will bring about what we in Cabinet often refer to as rough justice: that is, it will please the largest number of people possible.

SUBDIVISIONS.

Mr. FRED WALSH: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on June 13 concerning the Town Planner's powers regarding land subdivisions?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes. I have obtained a report from the Acting Government Town Planner, as follows:

Section 12a(2) of the Town Planning Act 1929-1957 provides that the Town Planner shall not approve a plan of subdivision in the metropolitan area, as defined in the Act, if the Engineer-in-Chief does not certify that the land can be advantageously and economically sewered and reticulated with water, unless the Minister consents to the giving of the approval. This power does not extend to council areas like Tea Tree Gully, Noarlunga and parts of Meadows, which are outside the metropolitan area as defined in the Town Planning Act. A large amount of land subdivision has and is taking place in these areas.

The powers under which the Town Planner can withhold approval outside the metropolitan area in respect of sewage disposal are not clearly defined. Section 12a(1)(d) of the Act gives the Town Planner the power to refuse a subdivision if the land or any part thereof is unsuitable for the purposes intended. Mr. Justice Reed in his judgment in the case of *R. v. the Town Planning Committee, ex parte Skye Estate Ltd.*, 1958, S.A.S.R.1 stated that in his opinion the factors which could be taken into account include whether sewage can be disposed of without risk to health. Consequently, the Town Planner has established the practice of seeking advice from the Departments of Mines and Health regarding the disposal of effluents in areas where the possibility of sewerage is remote and disposal of effluent from septic tanks could present difficulties. Acting upon this advice, the Town Planner may require allotment sizes to be increased or refuse the subdivision.

COUNTY BOARD LICENCES.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Some time ago I received a letter from Mr. J. G. Stone who lives in my district but who conducts a business under the name of Stone's Meat Store on Unley Road, Unley. He communicated with me after he was refused a licence by the Metropolitan County Board to sell fresh cream in factory-dated and sealed bottles. Mr. Stone pointed out that many other shops on the Unley Road—one a few doors from his shop—and in the city—including large departmental stores—sell the same, or substantially the same, wares as he does, including meat, yet they are licensed to sell fresh bottled cream. I have received a letter signed by Mr. Isbell, from the Under-Secretary, in which he states, in part:

I am directed by the honourable the Chief Secretary to advise that the issue of such licences in the metropolitan area is the responsibility of the Metropolitan County Board. The Director-General of Public Health reports that as Mr. Stone is conducting a butcher's shop, on the Metropolitan County Board's interpretation of the regulations, he is not eligible for a licence to sell cream.

If what Mr. Stone has told me is accurate, something is wrong somewhere because other shops have been granted licences. Will the

Premier, in his own capacity or as representing the Minister of Health in the House, have the matter re-examined to see whether what is apparently at least an anomaly can be ironed out?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This matter has been examined by Cabinet and while it is true that other shops have been able to sell meat and cream, they do not necessarily do so in the circumstances under which Mr. Stone would sell them. In a big departmental store, for instance, meat may be sold on one floor and cream on another. The real problem is that this matter comes under the control of a local authority and the only way that the Government could properly interfere would be to amend the legislation to take away from the local authority—the Metropolitan County Board—this particular function that it has had for many years. As this is essentially a matter that should be controlled by local authorities, Cabinet does not think it proper to remove those functions which Parliament has properly placed under the control of local authorities. Whilst this question is related to whether a cream licence should be granted in a particular circumstance, it does involve the important problem that Parliament would have to completely override a local authority, and the Government does not believe the circumstances warrant that. I have no doubt that if the person concerned proposed to sell cream under the same circumstances as other people sell cream and meat, he would be considered as they have been, but the circumstances are not precisely similar. Under the circumstances the Government has no power to intervene.

PORT PIRIE SCHOOLS.

Mr. McKEE: Is the Minister of Education in a position to supply details of his department's immediate plans for all new school buildings in Port Pirie?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: No, not the detailed plans. The Treasurer will be introducing the Loan Estimates, possibly within the next two months, and he will supply full details concerning Port Pirie and many other localities.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on the motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 23. Page 110.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): It is with regret that I note the passing of several former members of the State

Parliament. I have already paid tributes to the late Hon. L. L. Hill (a former Premier of this State), the Hon. Sir Cecil Hincks (a member of this House and Minister of the Crown for many years), Mr. R. R. Ralston (member for Mount Gambier), and the Hons. A. J. Melrose and A. C. Hookings, who were members of the Legislative Council. The most recent death was that of Mr. Edgar Russell, who was the Labor representative in the Commonwealth Parliament for the district of Grey. I join with His Excellency in his expressions of sympathy.

The Speech with which His Excellency opened this session of Parliament was in keeping with the general broad principles of the Government, particularly in relation to its many and varied promises. I wish to direct attention to matters where the Government has failed in its promises to the people of this State. In the past the propaganda machine has been well-organized and protected, and it has tended to mislead the people into thinking that the Government is infallible, but the promises have been pushed to the limit of their usefulness and are rebounding on the originators. It is all very well for some projects to be viewed from the best possible angle, for this is evidence of confidence in the future of this State, but it is useless for a Government to make certain of these promises with little or no intention of keeping them. This type of Government activity breaks down the business confidence in this community.

I join with the member for Rocky River in his references to the most prosperous opening of the season, particularly for primary production, although he could have mentioned that the vegetable growers in particular in this State would be having a lean period for some time on account of the bountiful rains we have had. It appears to me that his remarks chiefly concern primary production, but let me hasten to assure him that, whilst I am not an authority concerning primary production, I am a supporter of orderly marketing with reasonable returns to the producer. However, I cannot agree with the member for Yorke Peninsula that the mover was heard to advantage, because there is not much advantage to be gained from his contribution, which has been much better on earlier occasions.

I congratulate the member for Yorke Peninsula on the quality of his submissions in seconding the motion. One must commend him for his effort for the district he represents, but it reminds me of one important phase of Parliamentary life. A member must represent

the electorate under the Constitution before he becomes a Minister in a Cabinet, but, on becoming a Cabinet Minister, the member finds that matters associated with the department that he administers call for most of his time and energy. Consequently, the late member for Yorke Peninsula was not heard on matters affecting his district to the extent that probably his successor will be heard, and was heard yesterday.

The member for Yorke Peninsula paid a high tribute to the scientists of today, particularly to the scientific methods used by the primary producer, when he said:

Through scientific research and field experiments, farmers today are engaged in production which our fathers never dreamed of.

I endorse this praise, and no doubt primary producers are able to farm smaller acreages yet receive much better results because of the advances of science. The honourable member went on to say:

I believe that if more people engaged in agricultural production were more inquiring about the success of research, and the help available to them through the officers of the Agriculture Department, even greater achievements and success would be in store for them. Undoubtedly he would shudder if it were suggested that some of the large holdings held by some of his constituents on Yorke Peninsula were to be reduced in acreage so that more people could be engaged in primary production, but I hasten to assure him that, if he advocates for more persons to be engaged in primary production and for all productive land to be used to the fullest extent possible by holding land on a leasehold basis with reasonable opportunity of making a living, he can count on my support, and I certainly will not shudder at the opportunity of offering that assistance.

Without any reflection upon you, Mr. Speaker, or, for that matter, upon the member for Onkaparinga, I trust that the remarks and the compliment that the member for Yorke Peninsula paid to you in your capacity as Secretary of the Wheatgrowers Federation and your connection with bulk handling meet with the approval of the member for Onkaparinga. If the member for Yorke Peninsula were to refresh his memory from the debates of 1955, he probably would not link these two members.

I regret that the people on Yorke Peninsula find it necessary to use road transport almost entirely for cartage instead of ketches, as they did in the past. Whilst I can assure the honourable member that there is a need for

a deep sea port at the lower end of the peninsula, I am also mindful that if he is desirous of the ketch trade being encouraged (I personally would like to see it resumed) it will be necessary for the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. to provide for the unloading of ketches in Port Adelaide by installing exhaust suction equipment to unload the ketches that have accepted the grain under the bulk handling system. However, I congratulate the honourable member on his contribution. I understand that some provisions are to be made in the Port Adelaide area for bulk installations already in progress, and, from information I received recently when on Yorke Peninsula taking part in the by-election campaign, I believe that ketch owners desire to resume their trade, but they have the problem of unloading the grain at Port Adelaide. I think this matter should be investigated, and I commend it to the honourable member for his consideration.

I have already broadly stated my objections about the promises and propaganda of this Government. For many years five major works have been spoken about—the Torrens Island Power Station, the standardization of railways, the Chowilla dam, the construction of a reform school for juveniles, and the provision of new Government office accommodation. Regarding electricity, the Governor's Speech states:

Work has commenced on the construction of the important Torrens Island power station, the biggest single project in the history of the State.

I should be pleased to know what investigation, if any, has taken place amongst the various industrial establishments in this State and in other States regarding our ability to do the work which appears to be so readily forwarded to overseas concerns. The latest figures available indicate that 1,900,000 migrants have entered Australia, and the greatest percentage of these are English migrants. We know full well that in many of the trade capacities in this State, had it not been for the migration of these people there would have been serious shortages in skilled labour. I consider now that it was this Government's obligation to have ascertained the potential of the skilled labour in this State of the type that would be involved in the construction of the generators. Is the position to be likened to that of the railways? There seems to be a big similarity between these two major concerns in that they move within their own scope of great freedom. Although I do not condemn the efforts of the Electricity Trust, I desire to know what it

has done in obtaining any assistance to ascertain the potential that may exist in this country today for the type of work that I have mentioned. In case there is any doubt in members' minds, I emphasize that my information is derived mostly from the press and from what is said on a certain television programme on Wednesday evenings. The Government takes upon itself the responsibility of rushing in to have certain generators constructed overseas, but surely this Government, with the assistance of others engaged in industry, should ascertain the potential of skilled labour here for the construction of generators for this type of work.

I have taken part in discussions with people who have migrated to this country, and I know that these people are amazed to find that there are no opportunities here for their skills. Those people have asked why we are not able to carry out work in this country instead of having it done elsewhere. I maintain that this Government is not making the serious attempts that it should be making to use the capabilities of many of the migrants who have entered this country.

Mr. Heaslip: Don't you know there is a shortage of skilled labour here?

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Many types of skilled labour are required today. I can only assume that the honourable member would agree with me that the railways generally are under this Government's administration, but he has not pulled his weight in endeavouring to encourage the Government to take on apprentices at the Islington workshops in order to train competent tradesmen within Government circles. The responsibility for the training of apprenticeship labour is entirely the responsibility of those engaged in industry, and those people have not taken anywhere near their complement of indenture labour in order to train people as tradesmen. That is mainly why we do not have the skilled tradesmen required. Many people from Holland, in particular, before coming to this country, were associated with the type of work to which I have already referred, yet they have had no opportunities to engage in that skilled work here. The Government has not given sufficient attention to inquiring whether it has sufficient labour that would be competent to carry out the work on the construction of the generators, the orders for which have been sent overseas.

I hold the Government responsible for the present position because it is responsible for the system under which the Housing Trust is

working. Under that system, which it advocates and encourages, no apprentices will be engaged in the building industry. That is not a creditable position for this Government to be in, for it knows the shortages that exist, yet it is doing nothing to relieve the position. Until the Government measures up to its responsibilities and gives the Housing Trust the opportunity to say that its contractors must abide by the constitutional authorities of this State and engage labour under the terms of the arbitration system set up by this Government, there will be no opportunity for these lads to be trained as tradesmen. I repeat that it is the responsibility of this Government to alter its policy in the interests of the people of this State, so that tradesmen can be trained by apprenticeship methods.

Mr. Heaslip: You mean there is no reasonable opportunity?

Mr. FRANK WALSH: While the Government permits the system that has been continued by the South Australian Housing Trust, no operatives will be trained. The Government is responsible for this position.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: Will the Leader explain why apprentices cannot be trained under the methods that operate in the Housing Trust?

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I suggest to the Minister that at the first opportunity he ask the Leader of the Government at a Cabinet meeting what system operates in the letting of Housing Trust contracts. I believe that the Minister will be told that tenders are called and that the contractors obtain the work with the approval of this Government through the Housing Trust. The people who are given the work are unable to train apprentices. By work I mean foundations and brick work, first fixings and carpentering, second fixings, solid plastering and painting. In most cases the prices tendered are so thin that builders have neither the time nor the obligation to train and, generally speaking, the rule is self first, second and third. They are working under a piece-work system of subcontracting or labour only.

I do not think houses are being erected more cheaply today than they were when Brimblecombe, Wood, Combe and Kramer, and a few others were building for the Housing Trust. Maintenance costs were not so great then as they are today and as they will be in the future under the present system.

I believe the Government should carry out its obligations and do what it advocates. It does not believe in paying over the award rates; but the Government abides by the court's

decision only when the decision suits it in a particular industry. The Government should insist that that method should apply with all contracts. In earlier days when the big contractors concentrated the whole of their activities on building houses and paid the appropriate award rates, there was a continuity of employment and contractors could engage a labour force and have their trainees. Today there is a need for more competent training facilities in the building industry. The main trouble is caused by the present system.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: Isn't the trade school effective?

Mr. FRANK WALSH: The trade school is almost non-existent. It was only during the post-war reconstruction period that any semblance of training was offered. Some work was conducted in the Frome Road section, where trainees were taught how to lay bricks, how to mix and gauge mortar, and how to set bricks and stone. I do not know what the plumbing school provides. I understand that there are certain carpentry classes, but I am no authority on that.

In the overall picture, it is not much good trying to re-form a trade school to the extent that we would desire, because we do not have the personnel to use it or to be trained. If we could get them for training that would be a solution. If a contractor desires to sub-contract, he is still considered a contractor and must pay his employees at least the award rates. In a painting contract for 100 houses, the subcontractor who does the work for the main contractor is still a painting contractor, and should be obliged to carry out the conditions that have been determined by the law. He should pay the appropriate award rates, work the normal hours, and make a reasonable attempt to engage the quota of apprentices he is permitted to engage under any trade union award.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: They will not do it if they are not doing it now.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I put it another way. If I had to make a firm proposition, I would let the work under contract. I would sign up the builder for 10 or 20 houses and ensure that he had a quota of indentured labour. If he was not prepared to make a reasonable contribution to the training of personnel he would get no further contract. I think that is fair and just. If a contractor was not prepared to pull his weight, then until such time as he was prepared to do so in the interests of the economy of the State, there

would be no further work for him. I have not been able to persuade the Minister of Works to agree with me about some of the contracts let by his department. I would not let such contracts unless the main contractor was obliged to ensure that his subcontractors employed a reasonable proportion of indentured labourers. Such a requirement would assist in overcoming the shortage of such labour.

As at the end of June, 1962, the funds employed in the Electricity Trust amounted to £92,000,000 and they have been increasing at approximately £6,000,000 a year for the last five years. This increase has had to meet the needs of buildings, transmission and distribution lines and only approximately one-half has been allocated to power station expansion. As I have already said, I believe the need for the power station on Torrens Island was accepted as being necessary in about 1950, but 12 years elapsed before any legislation was submitted to Parliament, and even now I notice that His Excellency is very reticent about how much the Government has accomplished with this scheme in the last 12 months, for, in his Speech, it is merely stated that the work has commenced on this project. This is exactly the same as we were told last year, and apparently the Government is not making any startling progress with this project.

Admittedly, we were told by the Premier that £150,000,000 was involved in this project, but this figure was subsequently corrected by the Assistant Manager of the Electricity Trust, Mr. S. E. Huddleston, who pointed out that only one-tenth of this figure, or about £15,000,000, was estimated to be spent in the next five years. I believe the output from the station is designed to meet the power requirements in this State for the next 30 years, whereas at the present rate of expenditure it will be 50 years before the station is completed. When the Bill for the granting of the Torrens Island site to the Electricity Trust was before Parliament last year, members on this side were very critical that insufficient consideration had been given to whether a decentralized site should have been chosen for the next power station, but the Government was adamant that only one site was suitable and that it was Torrens Island.

The Electricity Trust has now commenced the scheme on Torrens Island, but I believe the work is still in the preliminary stages. The Premier decided that it was necessary

for him to personally inspect the nuclear power stations overseas in order to verify whether the conventional power station was still suitable for this State's requirements. According to what he said yesterday, nuclear power generation would be an economic proposition provided the plant were sufficiently large. He said:

The trust is confronted with planning beyond 1969. If the trust is to use nuclear energy it will be able to avoid the heavy capital expense in providing harbour and coal handling equipment on Torrens Island, but if it is not, it will have to consider this as a matter of close urgency.

Is the Government to decide the future of Torrens Island or is the Electricity Trust to continue with what was authorized by Parliament last year? Has the Premier made any recommendation, will the work proceed, or will it be deferred pending Mr. Huddleston's return? This is a matter of major importance. We cannot afford to proceed with a conventional plant if it is to be discarded soon for nuclear power. I understand that the Government is importing large tonnages of coal from Newcastle for conventional power. Apparently the Premier does not know what is intended, because he indicated it could be more economic to use nuclear power provided the plant were sufficiently large to enable it to function economically compared with conventional power. Is the Government going to continue with the plan approved by Parliament last year, or will it wait? We cannot afford to be left in doubt. I understand that the Premier will be making further inquiries next week and that these may indicate what will happen at Torrens Island.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: You can be assured that South Australia has never been short of generating capacity, nor will it be.

Mr. Heaslip: We have managed pretty well: what are you worrying about?

Mr. FRANK WALSH: It is not a question of worrying. It is only common sense to inquire about what is to happen. What is the use of undertaking a lot of work if a different system is to be used? I am seeking information in the interests of the people I represent. The Governor's Speech indicates that agreement has been reached with the Commonwealth Government for the standardization of the gauge on the Port Pirie to Broken Hill line. I was under the impression that agreement between the Commonwealth and State Governments was reached in 1949 and that there has been negligible action from either Government ever since to press forward for this necessary scheme. It is not gratifying to be informed that, after

13 years have elapsed, the Governments have again reached agreement and that the important work will commence as soon as possible. After such a lapse of time, this is certainly a nebulous statement for the Government to make about this major project. What else is to be contained in the agreement? Does it mean that standardization will also be introduced between Adelaide and Port Pirie or does it mean that a third rail will be introduced between these two points, particularly in relation to the cartage of goods by rail? Because of the importance of this project, I should have considered that more information would be contained in His Excellency's Speech.

Concerning our State railways, I make no apology for having had plenty to say regarding this important matter. I have on many occasions drawn the attention of this House to the need for providing more rolling stock and for more attention to be given to the repair and reconditioning of the permanent way. I understand that representations have already been made to the Railways Commissioner about the installation of a steel furnace at Islington, about which moulders, engineers and pattern makers are particularly concerned. Probably colossal tonnages of steel at Islington could be used for rolling stock, and I should be pleased if the Minister of Works would ascertain from his colleague whether this could be provided.

At one of the more recent delegations that I introduced to the Minister of Railways, the desirability was stressed of giving major consideration to the plans that had been developed by some of the tradesmen at Islington workshops for the conversion of the existing rolling stock. I know now that they will at last receive some benefit even though they were told originally that it was not practicable to adopt their plans. I recall having asked a question of the Chief Mechanical Engineer on that occasion, when I desired an extra coach to be used to provide more seating accommodation; I refer to what are known amongst railwaymen in particular as the "red hens". I was informed that, if an additional coach was used between the "red hens" to provide extra seating, the "red hens" had insufficient power to draw an additional coach between them. On that occasion I asked how we could expect to retain and rehabilitate a railway service if we were not providing adequate rolling stock for this purpose. I again say that the losses being incurred, in railway passenger services in particular, are not creditable to the Government or to the Commissioner. Recent

information that I received from the Railways Commissioner as a result of the deputation is as follows:

In the past 10 years the number of passengers carried on suburban trains in Adelaide has fallen from 16,600,000 per annum to 14,200,000 per annum, and the average number of passengers per car from 25 to 22.

He went on to say:

In the event of the downward trend being reversed, thus leading to excessive overcrowding in peak hour trains, then the department will seek funds to build more suburban cars.

My contention is that, unless there is an improved service and a reasonable provision of seating accommodation, there will not be any reversal of the trend indicated by the Commissioner, and it certainly appears that, if the same system of administration is carried on, there will be less opportunities of a railway system continuing to function in the interests of the community generally.

Surely I do not need to remind this House again that some of the railway system has been closed down and, if we are going to double the population of this State before the end of this century, will all the development have to be done by mobile road transport service? If this is the trend, why worry about the diesel fumes that may exist in the Adelaide railway station? Instead, we should grant sufficient money to the Railways Commissioner to erect parking facilities over the railway station yards, where he could charge a parking fee to assist to compensate him for the losses that he seems to continue to incur under his railways administration.

The development that has taken place, both industrially and residentially, beyond O'Halloran Hill all depends on road transport. If the gradient on the existing railway track to Willunga was too steep, why was not an alternative gradient provided so that a railway system could be used for transportation purposes? Why close down the railway system to Willunga, where all the development is taking place? Will people in that area have to depend entirely on road transport? If people who travel by road service from those areas to Adelaide are stranded here at night (for instance, after attending an adult education class), they must take taxis home if they do not have their own transport.

This is brought about by the short-sightedness of the Railways Commissioner, in the first instance, and he is backed by the Government. How much longer is this Government going to leave the complete freedom of

the railways to the Commissioner? Have members ever taken a deputation to the Commissioner, and tried to persuade him of the desirability of anything? I have never met anyone who can say "No" as often as he can, and I have taken many deputations to many people. In desperation a member may make an appointment for and on behalf of those people engaged in the railway services; he keeps that appointment with the Minister of Railways, and then he probably has to send along a letter to ask why there has been no reply to the deputation. The member will then get another long screed from the Commissioner. It is just running around in circles, and getting nowhere. While we have a Commissioner with all these unlimited powers, how can we expect to have a good transportation system for the future? Must we wait forever for the Government to make amendments to the legislation to enable us to get on and do something in the interests of the railways?

I have been interested in the question of a rail service to the member for Barossa's district, but what is the result? The rail service is all right as far as Pooraka. I know that some members of the Government—some of the back-benchers, at any rate—will agree with what I am saying. We are not making the progress that we should be making with our railway system in this State. We are leaving it to one person who has the authority under an Act of Parliament to continue closing down railway services. I have lost count of the number of times that I have endeavoured to have railway services used for tourist purposes. An unlimited number of children have never ridden in a railway coach, and many would be only too pleased to do so. I hope my words today will not fall on deaf ears.

Regarding water supply, the latest information I have regarding the Chowilla dam now places the estimated cost at £14,000,000, and it will be interesting to ascertain from the Government as this debate proceeds just what has become of this important project. Some firm indication could have been given as to whether the soundings that have already been made on the dam site have been completed and whether they are nearly ready for submission to the Public Works Standing Committee. Another most important factor associated with this work concerns the intention of the Government regarding the clearing of the dam catchment area of trees and other growth. My information from the Upper Murray areas gives a firm indication that the people there desire these clearings to be undertaken prior to the

damming of the water in this particular area. I should also like to know what designing engineers, if any, have been engaged for this project. It is evident that this is another project of the Government's where promises are no longer adequate, and it is necessary for it to get down to the task of actual construction if we are not to suffer severe water shortages in the near future. I still contend that when the Chowilla dam is completed plans will be needed for another project for further conservation on the River Murray.

Mention of a new dam on the River Murray brings me to the point that these projects cost colossal sums of money, with consequential heavy interest charges. Last year interest charges absorbed 59 per cent of the earnings of the Engineering and Water Supply Department. The Auditor-General predicted at that time:

The rising interest charges which accompany the increase in annual capital expenditures will necessitate frequent increases in rates if greater deficits are to be avoided.

This substantiates what I have been saying for years: no matter how grand the Playford projects sound, the people of this State eventually have to pay for them, and because of extravagant expenditure by the Government in the past there will have to be frequent increases in rates if deficits are to be avoided.

In April this year two press reports of remarks attributed to two members of the Cabinet regarding charges for water were somewhat conflicting. The Premier stated that the loss this year on water supply would be about £3,000,000 and therefore it would be necessary to increase assessments and rates, but the Minister of Works, who is responsible for water supply and who should have had the facts at his finger tips, was on the old theme that the new water prices would have little or no effect on most householders. These conflicting announcements emanating from the Playford Government Ministry give a clear indication that executive and bureaucratic control is completely wrong. The losses are most apparent in the districts of Beetaloo and Tod, as well as in the Adelaide water district, and an immediate and special inquiry should be conducted into the methods of assessment and rating in the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the findings presented to Parliament.

Paragraph 18 in the Governor's Speech states:

The work of the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department has continued to increase. To cope with this work more staff will be provided for field work, and an expanded staff training programme will be undertaken.

In view of this increased activity, what was the reason for the large number of resignations in this department? Has the Government appointed successors, particularly in the Prosecutions Branch, or is the department still short of qualified solicitors for prosecution purposes? I can say that this department has no qualified solicitor, so how are we to keep pace with maintenance matters? A conference of Attorneys-General of the States and the Commonwealth was held in Adelaide recently and, according to the press, the Commonwealth Attorney-General is to consider the question of uniformity in maintenance matters. Where a maintenance order is made, there should be unlimited scope offered in the event of any arrears, particularly where children are concerned. If honourable members thought about this matter, I have no doubt that there would be no disagreement with what I am saying. These people should be protected to the fullest extent. It is a serious position when there is no solicitor in the department.

Last month a report appeared in the press that the Chairman of the Public Works Standing Committee said that the committee recommended the building of a senior boys reformatory at Magill at an estimated cost of £459,380 and a junior boys reformatory at Lochiel Park. The report also indicated that the committee did not regard the Magill site as ideal, but it had recommended it to Parliament because it had advantages over a site farther from the city. The committee also said that the Magill site was opposed by a number of witnesses. I recall the honourable member for Burnside being very perturbed over this matter and I would say rightly so. I also mentioned during the last State election campaign in 1962 that "when returned as a Government we would abolish the existing reformatory at Magill, and the land that became available would be properly planned and subdivided for residential purposes, and any of the existing buildings that were suitable would be fully utilized for the purposes of a community centre to serve the surrounding areas."

However, the important fact is that the Chairman admits that the committee considers that this location is not ideal but nevertheless is recommending it to Parliament. I hope that Parliament will not accept this as the best site for that particular accommodation. I say very deliberately that it is not the appropriate site even though it is suggested that there are certain advantages to be gained by building this reform school at Magill.

On Thursday, April 18, two important announcements were made in the *Advertiser* concerning Government activities. One related to the estimated expenditure of £2,600,000 on a 16-storey Government office block which is planned for the eastern side of Victoria Square. In his weekly talk on ADS7 the Premier said that Cabinet had decided "to proceed immediately to get Parliamentary approval for the erection of a building." This is the Playford Government's propaganda carried to extreme limits. In the first instance, I have not found any reference to this building in the Governor's Speech, but I have advocated consistently for the erection of Government offices in Victoria Square and the need to get away from the existing warrens that are not fit to be used as places of employment for the Public Service or for any other service. I assure the Premier and his Government that the erection of new Government offices in this State has been advocated almost every year for the past 30 years, but nothing was done, and therefore they need not have any doubts as far as approval from this side of the House is concerned. Therefore, unless there is any opposition from the Government side of the House against this proposed building, it appears that it will be a unanimous decision of the House that this building should be erected and, as a matter of fact, it must be erected. In addition, the sentimental values of architecture on some of the other Government-owned buildings must be considered in the interests of this State. Need I refer to the warren accommodation that exists in the Land Tax Department or the beautification scheme that took place in the Foy and Gibson building?

The following is a comment which Mr. Mitchell, Secretary of the Public Service Association, made regarding Foy's building and which was reported in the press of July 10:

We consider this building to be a potential death trap because of its fire hazard. The building was originally designed to hold 500 to 600 people . . . but it was housing something like 800 public servants.

Dealing with the matter of Parliamentary approval, let us examine the article in the same press, which quoted the Premier as saying that Cabinet had decided to call immediate tenders for equipment for a £1,000,000 central laundry. The article stated that the Royal Adelaide Hospital rebuilding programme had reached the stage where the establishment of a central laundry was becoming urgent. Where does the Premier and his Cabinet obtain the

necessary authority to attempt to usurp the functions of the Public Works Standing Committee which is inquiring into the establishment of a central laundry and has rejected several sites as being unsuitable, but no report has been made to the Government or to Parliament? The Premier has indicated to the people of this State that the laundry is going to cost £1,000,000 irrespective of the report from the Public Works Standing Committee. He and his Cabinet have usurped the authority of the Public Works Standing Committee by stating that his Government intends placing orders overseas for certain equipment.

The Act governing these matters indicates very clearly that it is unlawful for the Government to present a Bill to Parliament authorizing the expenditure of money on any public work costing £100,000 or more if the Public Works Standing Committee has not submitted its report to Parliament on the particular public work. I have heard it mentioned that the dictatorial attitude of the Premier has become so blatant that the Government is becoming completely a one-man-band show, and I had hoped that I would have heard a much more favourable comment than what I have already mentioned. The Premier is aware of the details associated with the £1,000,000 laundry proposition and I believe that he originally intended it to be sited at the Yatala Labour Prison, but this met with so much opposition that another site had to be selected and, without any reflection on the Public Works Standing Committee, it would appear that it was not able to recommend a site which was acceptable to the Government, although a site has now been recommended. Under the decision of the Premier and his Cabinet, the Public Works Standing Committee is being used as a rubber stamp to recommend some site to house the equipment that is being ordered and undoubtedly costing over £1,000,000.

With further reference to the proposed Government office block in Victoria Square, the Party I have the honour to lead has always advocated high-standard working conditions. It is to be hoped that whatever plan is envisaged for the construction of the new building, it should provide for suitable and reasonable amenities and should result in a complete re-organization and re-building programme for the other antiquated existing building on the corner of Victoria Square and Wakefield Street. If it is intended to preserve the outer walls of this building, at least much of the interior should be demolished and

reconstructed to modern standards. Antiquated conditions are particularly apparent in this building to those who are engaged in the Lands Titles Office and who have to search for titles in the storerooms in the basement. I believe the same could be said of the conditions imposed on officers who are engaged in the preparation of the important plans and documents for the Engineering and Water Supply Department, particularly those for sewers. Instead of erecting a timber frame building in Wakefield Street to house a section of this department, a permanent building should have been erected many years ago. It would not now be necessary for the Premier to make belated announcements that he and his Government are proceeding immediately to obtain Parliamentary approval for the erection of the building, as reported in the press of April 18.

I assume that the Premier and his Cabinet were correctly reported, because there has been no Government retraction of the statement. Existing accommodation proves that the State Public Service has been sadly neglected by this Government, even though we have had some of the most prosperous times that this State has experienced. If we expect to obtain a high standard of service, working conditions and amenities should be of the highest possible standard.

On April 27, further reference was made in the press to the establishment of the central laundry under the heading, "Decision Soon on Five Large Projects". The Chairman of the Public Works Standing Committee, apparently having failed to convince the Premier that he should wait until such time as the committee had made a decision on the laundry, attempted to save face for the Premier by drawing attention to five large projects for the future—namely stages 2 and 3 of the Royal Adelaide Hospital building programme, the new boys reformatory at Magill, the extension of the sewers system on LeFevre Peninsula, improvements to Whyalla shipping facilities, and the building of a new port at Port Paterson. This window-dressing may sound good, when aided by the clever penmanship of some of our press reporters, but, when closely examined, promises relating to the rebuilding of the Royal Adelaide Hospital have been issued periodically for about 20 years, and progress with the actual rebuilding programme has been tardy indeed. The new boys reformatory at Magill is a project that has been investigated so often that it is another old perennial. I have already expressed my views strongly and publicly on numerous occasions about this project.

However, I believe that they bear repetition. The existing building should have been demolished, the land subdivided and a new reformatory established in an area where the boys could be given useful training, under the tutoring of experienced personnel, to reinstate them as useful citizens in our community.

The other three matters I leave to my colleagues, and I am sure the member for Semaphore is well informed about the needs of his district, and, similarly, are the members for Whyalla and Stuart. The point I am making is that it is about time the present Government stopped using these important projects as publicity props for its Party and got down to the task of actually accomplishing something in the interests of the people.

The Governor's Speech stated that it was expected that £12,000,000 would be spent on roads during the current financial year, and that the amount was expected to increase during the coming year. With the rapid increase in motor transport, there is plenty of opportunity for the Government to engage in major road construction. The Port Stanvac area has developed considerably in the last couple of years, and much time has been spent by the Highways Department on reconstruction work on the South Road in attempts to rectify congested traffic conditions. However, in places the South Road still contains bottlenecks that hinder the free movement of traffic. One of the worst places is in the Tonsley Park area. I have mentioned this frequently before, but the Government has not seen fit to act upon my suggestions. However, I am sure the Government is fully aware that a highway is only as good as the worst bottleneck in it. Therefore, I earnestly entreat the Government to satisfactorily resolve the unsatisfactory conditions in the Tonsley Park area this year. In addition, the bridge over the Sturt River on the South Road, as traffic proceeds to Darlington, needs widening and I am most disappointed that no provision is made for residents in the Burbank area bounded by the river, the Bedford Park property and the South Road to proceed to shopping centres with some degree of safety because of the need for the widening of both this bridge and the South Road in this area.

One item of promised legislation in which I was particularly interested was that aimed at a contribution by road users towards the maintenance of our highways similar to that in the other States. I have reminded the Government repeatedly that road transport is continuing to develop rapidly and that it is the Government's responsibility to see that

road transport is not allowed to compete unfairly with the already established railway system. The main part of the unfair advantage is gained by road hauliers not making some contribution towards the actual upkeep costs of our highways. I still believe that the established railway system provides a most efficient method, particularly for long distance hauling between States, but I also believe that there is room for the South Australian railways system to reorganize for a "pick-a-back" system under which loaded trailers are placed on railway equipment and moved to another capital where they can be attached to a prime mover for door to door delivery. If the Railways Commissioner believes that the "pick-a-back" system would not be possible because of insufficient clearance under bridges and in tunnels, surely we have the equipment to enable excavation or rebuilding. I cannot understand why we have not developed more in accordance with the needs of modern transport.

Our main highways, as well as suburban side streets, all show an urgent need for an extensive programme of construction and reconstruction that is so necessary to meet the needs of the rapidly increasing traffic. However, I note that local councils are finding it increasingly difficult to obtain sufficient finance for road construction and I believe it is about time that this Government, and its counterpart in Canberra, got down to the task of considering our road requirements on a national basis. The reference to the road tax legislation is vague, and is only a further indication that the Government is slow and hesitant in recognizing the necessity of a national plan for road construction.

Paragraph 25 of the Governor's Speech states:

My Ministers are considering legislation to provide for a contribution by road users towards the maintenance of our highways along lines somewhat similar to those in other States.

Members on this side of the House will be greatly interested in what is to be provided in this particular legislation, particularly where road transport is used by primary producers. Any revenue obtained through this legislation should be earmarked entirely for road purposes. Other matters mentioned in the Governor's Speech—such as the Industrial Code, prices legislation, grants to local governing bodies that contribute towards the establishment of clubs for aged citizens—will receive appropriate attention as this session proceeds.

Without doubt, public works, together with the necessary legislation, are important fields of Government activity, but the prime need of a Government must surely be the provision of full employment in conjunction with adequate housing and education. For the past two to three years this Government and its counterpart in Canberra have been saying there is nothing wrong with the economy, but all the time a hard core of unemployed, ranging between 80,000 and 130,000 people, has remained with us. At the end of June, 81,000 people were still unemployed throughout Australia, and 6,500 of these resided in South Australia. Full employment is a requirement of good government, so it is no use this Government's offering us the alternative of a permanent pool of unemployed as well as some propaganda.

While dealing with unemployment, I inform this House that I attended the opening of a seminar held on May 13 that considered the problem of physically handicapped persons and the need for sheltered workshops. This seminar was attended also by the Chief Secretary. Whilst the Commonwealth Government provides for training at St. Margaret's to rehabilitate physically handicapped persons, after they have received this particular training their anxieties are increased because they are then confronted with re-absorption in industry. I realize that the Government, the Electricity Trust, and industry itself have all assisted in engaging disabled workmen in industry, but I believe that, either by conference with the Commonwealth representatives or between the Government itself and industry, a more objective approach must be made concerning the financial matters that may be involved. For instance, a person physically handicapped either from birth or as a result of accident or sickness would not be able in most cases to compete effectively with those who enjoyed normal good health. Consequently, this becomes one of the main matters that must be considered at top level.

I am confident that this Parliament, the same as all others, desires that the physically handicapped be employed where it is humanly possible to find them useful occupation in some type of industry. I have spoken to disabled persons, as undoubtedly other members have. These persons do not desire to be employed in large groups of disabled persons because this tends to create a mutual sympathy, which is not altogether in their best interests. This is frankly admitted by the people who are

affected through physical disabilities. Consequently, I believe that this Parliament will appreciate that there is a need to approach this matter in a more determined way so that the outlook for these persons may become a little brighter during their lifetime. Realizing that the Commonwealth Government provides for rehabilitation training, will this Government, in the first instance, discuss this matter with the appropriate bodies, such as the Chamber of Manufactures and the Employers Federation, to ascertain whether there are some matters that need special attention from the point of view of their earning capacities, and then place this information before the Commonwealth Government so that the earlier training provided under Commonwealth assistance can be fully utilized in the interests of the physically handicapped?

There would appear to be a certain amount of guessing about the finance required to meet our housing needs. On numerous occasions, I have pointed out how the Government in this State is losing ground with the housing problem. Consequently, it must become a responsibility of the Commonwealth Government to set up a Commonwealth financial Housing Commission whose obligation would be to collate relevant housing information from the various States through the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics. The Commission would be able to advise the Government on the amount of money required for housing in the various States, and we could have a methodical programme instead of the haphazard handouts with appropriate propaganda from time to time, which has not solved the problem.

A matter closely associated with housing is adequate drainage. Government policy has been directed towards the centralization of industry, which has necessitated a colossal amount of clearing and subdivision of land, together with subsequent building of houses, in the metropolitan area. However, sufficient attention was not paid to adequate drainage of subdivided areas, and in my electorate this was recognized as a major problem and a Government responsibility, for in 1959 special legislation was passed. For the nine months ended March this year, the Government accomplished about 50 per cent of the programme for that period. Since the commencement of the scheme four years ago, it has accomplished 61 per cent of its promised programme on this vital work in the southern suburbs. I emphasize that this problem is not confined to the southern suburbs; there has been serious flooding in the northern and western suburbs as well as in the newly developed areas of Para Hills and Salisbury.

I searched diligently for some reference to these matters in His Excellency's Speech, but apparently it was not considered by the Government to be of sufficient importance to warrant a mention. This problem has been greatly aggravated by rapid subdivision, and the provision of adequate drains to carry the floodwaters away must be accepted by the Government as one of the costs of fostering a congested metropolitan area for political purposes instead of having a balanced and effective plan of decentralization for the whole of the State. Flooding occurs particularly in the districts represented by the Minister of Education and by me, and to a lesser degree in the Mitcham electoral district. Clearing the river from the Patawalonga area almost through to the Anzac Highway and deepening and straightening in other places, the work that must be done in the catchment area to hold back the water in case of flooding, and the major drain that must be placed from Goodwood Road to the Sturt River, are the three major projects that must be completed if a reasonable attempt is to be made to solve this problem. I have no doubts about the interest and support that I get from the Minister. I understand from the Town Clerk of Mitcham that once the three major works are completed he will be able to solve the remainder of the drainage problems in his district, and that he has sufficient money to do it. I believe the Minister agrees that where land has already been provided, and no further acquisition is necessary, most of the straightening could be done immediately, because the department already has the levels required for the deepening and the plans for the straightening.

His Excellency said that in 1962 expenditure on buildings for educational purposes amounted to about £7,000,000. What does that figure represent? When I hear the phrase "buildings for educational purposes" a doubt comes into my mind. Last year I doubted whether £3,000,000 could be spent on buildings in one year, because of the lack of manpower and materials. Was there a carry-over from previous years, how much of the work was let prior to 1962, and how many of the projects included in the £7,000,000 were not completed? I desire more information on this matter of £7,000,000 and I hope that the Minister will soon have it for me. I intend to have this matter fully investigated. I do not doubt the proposal in its entirety but there is a doubt in my mind and I think it should be cleared up, particularly following on my attitude of last year.

The Hon. Sir Baden Pattinson: It includes all educational buildings, not only school buildings.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: That is what I am trying to ascertain. I am seeking information. Mention has been made of work in Kintore Avenue. A long story could be told about Kintore Avenue, but I do not want to develop it. The member for Thebarton could tell some good stories about Kintore Avenue. In the field of education, as with most other endeavours by the Government, we have had much boasting over the years of what has been accomplished. A recent example was the report in the press on July 13 that the Minister of Education said that more than 60 new schools and buildings were scheduled for South Australia. Similar statements have been made by the Minister in recent years, but we are still waiting for the permanent school buildings to be erected.

After years of propaganda and heavy expenditure we still have over-crowded classrooms and acres of temporary classrooms with little hope under the present administration of erecting permanent buildings in some of the schools. Need I mention again two important ones, the Forbes and the South Road Primary Schools? Let me remind the Minister that I am disappointed about these schools. I said earlier that when the headmaster of the Forbes school visited the most distant classroom from his office he had to cover a quarter of a mile. That could also be said about the children in the classroom when they go to the toilet. I am not here to advocate the interests of free enterprise, but I said earlier that if the headmaster had a mechanical aid he could get around the school more quickly. I understand that Lightburn has developed a run-about, with which much time and energy is saved. One of the vehicles would be useful at the Forbes school for the headmaster, but would not be appreciated so much by the school committee. That would also apply to the committee at the South Road school. Its members have done much good work but they are dissatisfied with the number of portable buildings. Visitors to the hills can see the new buildings placed at the Blackwood High School and the Blackwood Primary School. It is not good enough to have so many acres of portable buildings. If the Minister of Education is to retain the confidence of the teaching profession and the school committees he must do better than he is doing at present. This is not a personal reference, but I am directing the Minister's attention to a position that could exist if something more definite is not done. I submit the matter for the Minister's consideration.

Another important problem associated with education is the number of Commonwealth scholarships. Under the administration of the Government the sons and daughters of persons in the lower income groups are being denied the opportunity of getting tertiary education because of the heavy financial charges involved. It has now reached the stage where it is necessary for a student to obtain three or more credits at the Leaving examination to ensure that he will be eligible for a Commonwealth scholarship. It is pleasing to note that in connection with Leaving and Intermediate examinations students will not in future be herded together in buildings at the Wayville Showgrounds. However, another matter must be considered. No charges should be made to the students entering for these examinations, and I believe it is this Government's obligation to see that such charges for the Intermediate and any other examinations are discontinued.

In 1950, a Leaving student had a 50/50 chance of obtaining a scholarship, whereas now comparable students have only about one chance in six, and the prospect is getting worse all the time. Therefore many potential professional men are being lost to our community, and we cannot afford this when a young nation such as ours requires an adequate proportion of highly trained men for its continued advancement. In my view, the Education Department has failed in this responsibility, for it has been a party to the neglect and collapse of the scholarship system.

I have illustrated today how the Government has failed in many cases in meeting its responsibilities to the people of this State, and it is certainly very heartening to be aware of the rising resentment against the Government propaganda.

I wish to conclude on an important point, and I believe that all members will agree with the sentiments I am about to express. I realize that the Royal Adelaide Hospital is to be rebuilt. It will be built up, I hope, to modern standards. I wish to say a few words about the conditions at the Magill Wards of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and about the patients there who are suffering from cancer and who have little or no hope of ever resuming their former places in life. These people are more or less left to their own resources, and little hope is held for their recovery from this disease.

At Magill the nursing staff, which includes people who are migrants to this country, is

doing a most useful job. We know that the patients there suffer certain pain, and that they are unable to move about very much. We should encourage the people engaged in the nursing service to be a little more generous and charitable in their approach to these patients, to ascertain at what time they should deliver food and drink and so on, and to place these in such a position that they can be reached. Instead of somebody saying that, because a hot water bag has burst, water bags will no longer be provided for these people in this bitterly cold weather, let us try to make the lives of these people as pleasant as we can. I know that if a person goes to the sister in

charge she will be only too happy to see that something is done to help. The buildings at Magill are not modern by any stretch of the imagination, but while they are there and have to be used for this purpose, I appeal to the Government to see that more inducement is given to people to extend this humanity to these patients.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.16 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, July 25, at 2 p.m.