

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, October 1, 1963.

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

NEW MEMBER FOR STIRLING.

Mr. WILLIAM PATRICK McANANEY, to whom the Oath of Allegiance was administered by the Speaker, took his seat in the House as member for the district of Stirling, in place of Mr. W. W. Jenkins (deceased).

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL.

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the Bill.

DEATH OF SIR SHIRLEY JEFFRIES.

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

That the House of Assembly express its deep regret at the death of the Hon. Sir Shirley William Jeffries, former Minister of the Crown and member for North Adelaide and Torrens, and place on record its appreciation of his public services, and that, as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased gentleman, the sitting of the House be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

Many members of this House had an active association with the late gentleman, and I think they all appreciated his fine personal character. He was a man of the utmost integrity, a man who served the State well over a long period of years, and a man who took responsibility. He had the deep mortification of having to control provision of relief for unemployed during the great depression. I think everyone here who was associated with him will remember him for the worth of his work in the interests of this State. I believe that future generations will remember him particularly on account of his work as Minister of Education. It was during his period as Minister that so many reforms in our education system, since carried on with so much advantage, were initiated: for instance, area schools and school buses. Further, the considerable assistance to education in the form of bursaries resulted from his initiative. Sir Shirley was Minister of Industry and Employment and also Attorney-General over a long period. Everyone here esteemed him for his work, and by my motion I place on record our appreciation.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I join with the Premier in placing on record our appreciation for the services rendered by Sir Shirley, and I convey

the sympathy of my Party to his widow and family. The depression period, which was mentioned by the Premier, is best forgotten because I doubt whether the Australian people would ever again tolerate what happened during that period. Regarding Sir Shirley's activities and his services to this Parliament, I, like certain other members, was a member while he was a Minister. I recall his being greatly interested in the Education Department, and I pay a tribute to him for his efforts in the interests of the administration of education. During his term as Attorney-General, I believe he was most consistent in his efforts. On behalf of my Party, I second the motion and join with the Premier in asking that condolences be extended to Sir Shirley's widow and family.

THE SPEAKER: I add my personal sentiments to those already expressed regarding the passing of the late Cabinet Minister and member of this honourable House of Assembly. I remember well the late Sir Shirley Jeffries when I first became a member of this House in 1933. For some years he was Minister of Education and carried out his duties with much credit to himself and to the services of this State. It was his idea to visit every country school possible throughout the State, and I believe he did that. He endeared himself to pupils and the whole staff of the Education Department throughout the State during his distinguished career as Minister of Education. We regret his passing, and our sympathies are extended to his widow and family. I ask honourable members to stand and carry the motion in silence.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

(*Sitting suspended from 2.14 p.m. to 2.26 p.m.*)

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the Auditor-General's Report for the financial year ended June 30, 1963.

Ordered to be printed.

QUESTIONS.**BANK LOANS.**

Mr. FRANK WALSH: My information discloses that certain independent private banks, and particularly those with savings accounts, are reducing the normal repayment period in respect of loans to house purchasers. Has this matter been brought to the Premier's notice and has he information on it?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Speaking subject to correction, I believe that when the Commonwealth Government licensed private savings banks it provided that a certain percentage of the available savings banks' money should be allocated for house building. I personally welcome any additional funds that can be made available for house building. However, there is one feature of these particular loans that requires attention. During the last two or three days I have been told of two instances of housing loans having been made and, although the rate of interest was appropriate, the term in one instance was for 10 years and in the other, speaking from memory, for 15 years. Every honourable member knows that the success of the schemes of housing loans that we have approved in this Parliament has resulted from the long term over which the principal may be repaid with the consequent satisfactory weekly instalment. A short-term loan for housing will result in difficulties because it must be renewed or the borrower will not be able to meet his commitments. However, in response to the Leader's question, I will have this matter investigated to find out whether credit foncier loans have been arranged and, if so, whether such loans will be for a suitable long term.

THEVENARD-KEVIN RAILWAY.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Will the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Railways, ascertain when work is to commence on the Thevenard-Kevin railway line?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will endeavour to get the information for the honourable member from my colleague, the Minister of Railways.

GAWLER SEWERAGE.

Mr. CLARK: Has the Minister of Works any information further to my question of August 13 about the proposal to sewer Gawler?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Engineer-in-Chief has reported that a sewerage scheme has been designed for Gawler and that estimates of costs have been taken out. Financial statements are in the course of preparation and when these are completed a report will be forwarded for the consideration of the Minister. As the estimates of the cost exceed £100,000 the scheme will have to be submitted to the Public Works Committee if Cabinet thinks fit.

JET PLANES.

Mr. HEASLIP: On August 20 I asked the Premier a question about the unnecessary noise made by a Vulcan jet aircraft over suburban areas and he promised to refer this matter to the Commonwealth Minister for Air. Has he anything to report?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have received the following letter from the Minister for Civil Aviation:

My colleague, the Minister for Air, has forwarded to me your letter of August 22 concerning the flight over Adelaide airport of an R.A.F. Vulcan aircraft on August 19, 1963. The matter has been closely investigated and I am pleased to be able to tell you that the particular flights of this aircraft on that day were a little out of the normal and the high noise levels on the ground are not likely to be repeated in similar movements in the future.

It is necessary for both military and civil pilots to have regular practice in instrument landing procedures and to make practice approaches using the instrument landing system which assists aircraft to approach and land at airports in low visibility conditions. Vulcan and Victor aircraft from the R.A.F. and flying from Edinburgh, make practice approaches using the Adelaide airport instrument landing system. They do not land at the airport but make their landing approach to a relatively low altitude and then climb away. It is, I think, significant that this type of activity has been carried out in the past from Adelaide without complaints from people living near the airport. One of the reasons is that in the climb out phase of this operation these large jet bombers normally use something less than their full power so as to keep the noise on the ground as low as possible. We have an understanding with the R.A.F. to operate in this manner.

On August 19 the pilot forgot the procedures in force and as a consequence, during the first and second practice approaches, he climbed away using full power and this led to the complaints which were made. The pilot corrected his error after being reminded of the correct procedure by the Air Traffic Controller.

FIREWORKS.

Mr. LOVEDAY: On the front page of today's *Advertiser* is a report about the misuse of fireworks which led to a fire. In Whyalla there has been indiscriminate throwing of fireworks in the streets and in at least two picture theatres. Despite the presence of police during the performance at one theatre the offenders were not located. In view of this will the Premier examine the position to see whether some immediate control can be applied on the sale of fireworks in view of the danger to the public of burns and damage to eyesight?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will take up the question immediately with the Commissioner of Police and will inform the honourable member towards the end of this week whether some action can be taken.

CAMBRAI WATER SUPPLY.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Has the Minister of Works any further information about the proposed water scheme for the Cambrai-Sedan area?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: It would be correct to say that I have further information, but that information is not of a very conclusive nature. I have today addressed letters to the members for Angas and Murray to the effect that the alternative proposal is still being examined to ascertain whether it would be advantageous economically and still serve the landholders who want the service. The first reports I have had on the investigations are not encouraging. It does not appear possible to reduce the cost of the scheme without also curtailing the area served. The matter has not been finalized and I have not yet had the Engineer-in-Chief's final report. The member for Murray did suggest that in lieu of the larger scheme a smaller scheme might be investigated. The Engineer-in-Chief believes it would be premature to commence a design for or investigation into a smaller scheme until such time as the results of the investigation of the larger scheme have been completed. As soon as I get the final report from the Engineer-in-Chief I will notify both honourable members concerned and discuss future action.

PORT PIRIE DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. McKEE: Earlier this session the Premier informed the House that he had placed before the Commonwealth Government a proposal that would indirectly result in big development taking place in Port Pirie. Has the Premier had a reply from the Prime Minister and has he anything further to report?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Actually, I am not expecting the reply until the end of this week, but as soon as it comes to hand I will inform the honourable member.

FLUORIDATION.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: During the Address in Reply debate I raised the question of adding fluoride to our water supplies to reduce tooth decay, and I expressed the hope that the Government would come to a conclusion on the matter. Since then I understand that two officers of the Government have attended a

conference on this subject. I assume that they have reported to the Government. I also understand that a decision has been made to add fluoride to Canberra's water supply. I notice that a Gallup poll reveals that almost seven out of every 10 Australians favour fluoridation. Can the Premier say whether the matter has been considered recently by Cabinet, and, if so, whether any decision has been reached?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Cabinet has not yet reached a decision on this matter. The two officers who were instructed by the Government to attend a conference in Tasmania have reported to the Chief Secretary, and I believe that their report favours some action being taken. On the other hand, only today I received a sheaf of papers quoting eminent medical authorities who do not favour fluoridation. This seems to be a controversial question, with most medical opinion favouring fluoridation but some medical opinion obviously strongly opposing it. I will try to get a decision for the honourable member as soon as possible.

WALLAROO WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. HUGHES: Last week I received several complaints from residents of Wallaroo about the very bad colour and quality of the water being reticulated within the area. I understand from some of the women that the water is leaving clothing, after it has been washed, a dirty brown colour, and that a discolouration is adhering to the sides of baths. Will the Minister of Works call for a report and, if possible, have the quality of the water improved?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes, I will do that. I think the trouble at Wallaroo probably emanates from the same problem as beset householders in other parts of the State earlier this year; it has taken longer to reach Wallaroo because of the longer travel from the Bundaleer reservoir to that site. I think the trouble has resulted from rather heavy intakes following heavy rains early in the winter. I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

JURORS.

Mr. TAPPING: On September 3 I asked the Minister of Education a question concerning the appointment of jurors in South Australia and suggested that he confer with his colleague, the Attorney-General, to see whether jurors' names could not be taken from the House of Assembly roll rather than from the Legislative Council roll. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: As promised, I conferred with the Attorney-General on the remarks made by the honourable member, but as his question involved Government policy my colleague referred it to Cabinet for decision and, after discussion, Cabinet decided to take no action.

AIR COOLING IN SCHOOLS.

Mr. FREEAIRN: Last year I applied on behalf of the Manoora, Saddleworth and Hamley Bridge primary schools for subsidies for air coolers to be installed in those schools. Can the Minister of Education say what his future policy will be on such subsidies?

The Hon. Sir. BADEN PATTINSON: The policy concerning the granting of subsidies on the provision of air coolers in schools is that each application is considered on its merits, having regard to climatic conditions, availability of electric power, and other matters. It applies only in areas selected by the Minister of Education. Recently the policy was extended to include the provision of oscillating electric fans under similar conditions. The whole question is at present under review, and this is the reason why no decision has been made in the cases mentioned by the honourable member. I shall be pleased to advise him when the matter has been decided, I hope soon.

EGG MARKETING.

Mr. BYWATERS: On September 3, in answer to my question regarding the Commonwealth egg marketing authority, the Minister of Agriculture said he had written to the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry and was awaiting a reply on suggestions he had made regarding legislation being introduced in the Commonwealth Parliament. Has the Minister yet had a reply from the Commonwealth Minister and can he say whether any progress has been made towards South Australia's joining with other States in this very important scheme?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I did write to the Commonwealth Minister some time ago saying that if any Commonwealth legislation was contemplated this Government would like to see the proposed Bill as soon as possible. I received a reply from the Minister, I think to the effect that the matter was being considered and would be referred to the Government. I make it clear that there is no suggestion that this State is trying to block the Commonwealth Government from taking action: the South Australian Government simply wishes to see any proposed legislation that may affect this Parliament.

WARREN RESERVOIR.

Mr. LAUCKE: In a recent question of the Minister of Works I asked whether the Government would consider raising the weir at the Warren reservoir by 10ft., which would treble the capacity of that reservoir. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have a report from the Engineer for Planning and Development (Mr. Beaney) which is too long for me to read fully to the House. I think the honourable member would be interested to read the whole report, and I will hand him the docket for that purpose later on. Summarizing, the position is that the Warren reservoir was built in 1916 and by 1926 had been raised by 3ft. 6in. to give the present capacity of 1,400,000,000 gallons. In the years 1941 to 1946 the further raising of that dam was seriously considered, and the value of further storage on the South Para was shown to be worthwhile. A scheme to increase the Warren reservoir capacity to 2,900,000,000 gallons was developed but was abandoned in favour of the larger South Para dam project. Under the present demand on the Warren the value of raising to the 1940's scheme would give a benefit of an average of about 200,000,000 gallons a year, but the yield from South Para and Barossa reservoirs would be reduced, so the net benefit would be only 75,000,000 gallons. There is no possibility that pumping from the Mannum-Adelaide main to relieve Warren can be avoided, and some pumping to feed water from Warren to South Para has already been done and will undoubtedly be required in the future. The honourable member will see, without my reading further, that the matter has received much consideration and that, although this year (which is rather an outstanding year for catchment in the metropolitan and Adelaide Hills areas) the water which could have been impounded has exceeded the capacity of all the reservoirs to take it, that circumstance is very rare, and according to statistics is likely to be rare. Therefore, with the physical difficulties of enlarging the Warren reservoir, together with the almost certain knowledge that only very rarely will the total capacity be exceeded, the project does not have much appeal.

PULP MILL.

Mr. CORCORAN: I address my question to the Minister of Forests and quote from an article that appeared in the *Advertiser* on Tuesday, September 24, which is headed "Apel Plans Hinge on Government Supplies" and which states:

The plans of Australian Paper Manufacturers Ltd. to expand the Apcel plant near Mount Gambier depend on the necessary pulp-wood supplies being made available by the South Australian Government from its State forests. The chairman of A.P.M. (Mr. C. S. Booth) says this in his annual review, released after yesterday's annual meeting. The recently concluded agreement with Kimberly Clark Corporation envisages major immediate and subsequent expansion of manufacturing at the Apcel mill. However, unless these supplies are made available, the additional capacity will have to be installed in another State.

Because of the importance of this matter to the district, will the Minister of Forests say whether any approach has been made to his department on this matter and, if it has not, will he say what his department's policy will be when an approach is made?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I ask the honourable member to put that question on notice.

SALT INDUSTRY.

Mr. RICHES: My question relates to the establishment of the salt industry at Port Paterson, in the north of this State. I understand that development has taken place and agreement has been reached with the Leslie Company for the establishment of an industry at Port Augusta. Has the Premier any information about recent developments?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member is not correct in the statement he made about the composition of the company, which has an Australian-American composition. Half of the interests are held by the original lessee (the Hooker organization) and the other half are held by the Leslie Salt Company. Sir William Bishop, the chairman of the company, was nominated by the State Government at the request of the two companies concerned. So far as I know, the agreement has been completed. The Government has undertaken to establish, and money has been provided to establish, the berthing and loading facilities. That money will be repaid to the Government over a period of years out of the charges made for the loading and exporting of salt. The Australian company has from the Leslie Salt Company a contract for the export of 2,000,000 tons of salt, and I believe everything has been agreed and the whole of the agreement has been concluded. As far as I know, the works are going ahead now without further delay. The industry will be important to South Australia; it is intended to export about 400,000 tons of salt a year, so the honourable member will see that it will be

a major undertaking of considerable importance to his district. As far as I know, every detail has been agreed and the agreements have all been signed.

RAILWAY STANDARDIZATION.

Mr. CASEY: Some time ago I raised with the Premier a matter relating to the standardization of the gauge between Cockburn and Broken Hill. Under the 1948 agreement it was proposed to standardize this route and hand it over to the South Australian Government. From rumours circulating, I understand that the Commonwealth Government has decided to negotiate with the New South Wales Government, and that part of the line will be taken over by the New South Wales Government from the Silverton Tramway Company. Over the past few days the Commonwealth Minister for Transport (Mr. Opperman) has been in South Australia, and I understand that the Premier has had talks on railway standardization with him. Can the Premier indicate at this stage whether he knows of an agreement between the Commonwealth Government and the New South Wales Government for taking over this line between Cockburn and Broken Hill?

The Hon. SIR THOMAS PLAYFORD: I doubt very much whether an agreement of the type mentioned by the honourable member has actually taken place, because only a few days ago I received a letter from Mr. Heffron (Premier of New South Wales), in which he said that the New South Wales Government desired the South Australian Railways Commissioner to confer with the New South Wales Railways officers. I believe that that is the first approach that has been made in this matter by the New South Wales Government, and I do not believe that any agreement has yet been reached between the New South Wales Government and the Commonwealth Government. Also, I do not think that the Commonwealth Government has made any decision about the Silverton Tramway Company. I gathered from odd remarks made by the Commonwealth Minister yesterday when he was discussing the matter with me that his Government was still investigating the position. In this connection, some approaches have been made to me by the mining companies in Broken Hill, who would prefer that the South Australian Government control the line through to Broken Hill, or at least this section. I do not believe any agreement has yet been made with the New South Wales Government, because I do not believe the Commonwealth Government

has decided on its policy. However, the time factor makes a decision imminent and, as soon as I get any information, I will inform the honourable member of the position.

WHEAT PREMIUM PAYMENTS.

Mr. HALL: Prior to the last wheat harvest a system of wheat premium payments existed whereby millers paid a premium of several pence a bushel on certain wheats which passed their tests and which they used for local milling. As I understand that this system has been altered in regard to last season's harvest and ensuing harvests, will the Minister of Agriculture indicate the new system of payments and say when they have been or will be made to farmers? I understand they have not yet been made in my district. Does the wheat premium payment of several pence a bushel now apply to some hard wheats exported as well as to those used for local consumption? When and how will those payments be made?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will get the necessary information.

TENANCY AGREEMENTS.

Mr. CURREN: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to a question I asked on September 4 about tenancy agreements signed by occupiers of departmental houses?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: Yes; the amount referred to by the honourable member is in fact stamp duty, which is charged at the rate of 2s. 6d. for sums over £26 up to £50, 5s. for over £50 and up to £100, and 5s. for every £50 or part thereof for over £100. Stamp duty is payable under the Stamp Duties Act, and all amounts received from stamp duty are paid to the Commissioner of Stamps and are not retained by the Department of Lands. There is no power to grant a licence for a period in excess of 12 months, and licences are issued for a period not exceeding one year, in accordance with sections 36 and 43 of the Irrigation Act, 1930-1946.

CONCESSION FARES.

Mr. RYAN: Some time ago I raised with the Minister of Works the anomaly of children attending school being required to pay adult fares when travelling on Government transport. Can the Minister say whether the Government has yet considered this matter and arrived at an answer to the question?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: In the honourable member's earlier question he said that the Municipal Tramways Trust and the South Australian Railways were compelled, under their by-laws, to charge full fares for children

over 14 years, although the minimum school leaving age was 15 years. That is not quite correct. At present schoolchildren aged 14 and 15 years may secure rail passes the same as those under 14 years and those aged 14 to under 18 years may secure M.T.T. passes at the same fare as those under 14 years. Half the concessions are already available to scholars regularly travelling to and from school by public transport.

Mr. Ryan: I meant outside that.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: That is another matter. The honourable member's earlier question referred to the school leaving age, and I understood that he wanted information about school transport. Regarding further concessions for school transport other than transport to and from school, the authorities at present consider that it is not appropriate to make further concessions. The costs of transport authorities have risen this year mainly because of additional expenses caused by increases in wages and salaries, and the authorities consider that further concessions will not be made this year. I want to make the position clear regarding students travelling to and from school, as an increase in age from 14 to 15 years does not affect the availability of concession fares to them.

FRUIT FLY BLOCK.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: On August 13 I asked the Minister of Agriculture a question regarding the fruit fly block at Ceduna, to which on August 14 he gave me a considered reply. Last week I spent several days at Ceduna and made inquiries of the men employed on the fruit fly block. It is the opinion of those living in the Ceduna district that people are by-passing the Ceduna fruit fly block, and that it is useless where it is now situated. While the State is spending huge sums eradicating the fruit fly, it seems to me foolish that it is not able to prevent fruit entering at a place like Ceduna. It has been suggested to me that only two places are suitable for a fruit fly block, either at Penong or on this side of Ceduna. Will the Minister confer with his staff to see whether the site of the present fruit fly block at Ceduna can be altered?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will take the matter up with the Director of Agriculture.

WOOL LEVY.

Mr. HEASLIP: On September 4 I asked the Minister of Agriculture why New Zealand woolgrowers had been asked to increase the wool levy by 50 per cent while Australian woolgrowers were being requested to increase theirs

by almost 400 per cent. Has the Minister an answer?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: A report from the senior research officer on wool production in the Department of Agriculture states:

The New Zealand contribution to the £A16,250,000 International Wool Secretariat budget for promotion and research will be in the vicinity of £3,000,000 sterling per annum, equivalent to approximately £2 sterling per bale. The New Zealand Electoral College has agreed that the present levy of 7s. 6d. should be raised to 15s. per bale from the growers with 15s. per bale from the interest earned on reserves held by the New Zealand Wool Commission. The increase in the levy for New Zealand woolgrowers will take effect from October 1, 1964.

The Electoral College also requested that the New Zealand Wool Board investigate the best means of finding the further 10s. per bale necessary to meet the full amount required by the International Wool Secretariat. This raises the New Zealand levy contribution to the equivalent of £2 10s. per bale Australian currency. The Chairman of the New Zealand Wool Board, Mr. Acland, in his report to the Electoral College, said the board could not go beyond the figure of 15s. at the present time, because the Wool Commission is obliged under its Act to subsidize the levy pound-for-pound. Beyond 15s. sterling, the commission would have to draw on capital reserves. The board intended to seek an amendment of the Wool Commission Act, and it would then seek a further 10s. per bale, which the chairman believed would have to come from the wool-growers.

FRUIT CANNING.

Mr. LAUCKE: Following the collapse of a major fruit canning organization in this State—Foster Clark (S.A.) Limited—there is widespread concern within the fruitgrowing industry at the prospect of insufficient canning capacity to cater for next season's canning fruits. Can the Premier say whether action is being taken to help provide reasonable outlets for canning fruits in the coming season?

The Hon. SIR THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Government is most concerned at the position that could arise this year regarding fruit canning, not so much in the Upper Murray areas as in the local areas, because of the fact that Foster Clark is in the hands of a receiver and is no longer operating. Growers have had several meetings and I think that at the last meeting they decided to support a co-operative organization that would work in conjunction with the firm of Jon Products. I am not sure how far that proposal has gone. The Foster Clark factory has been on the

market and interests from another State have been negotiating for the purchase of the plant, but the result of those negotiations will not be known for another fortnight. The Government is most anxious to support either a well-established company or the introduction of a co-operative organization that could indicate reasonable chance of success in coping with the position. As honourable members know, the Government has already lost considerable sums in supporting fruit canning factories. However, if any good proposition comes along it will receive utmost sympathy from the Government.

ST. KILDA CHANNEL.

Mr. HALL: Recently the councillor for the St. Kilda area on the Salisbury District Council communicated with me and told me that much local effort had recently been put into lengthening and deepening the boat channel at St. Kilda in the direction of the open sea. Hundreds of pounds has been spent on the work, and it has been assisted by the local council. Can the Minister of Marine envisage any help being given to the local council or the local progress association in furthering this work with the object of providing a surer outlet for the many fishermen and boating enthusiasts who use St. Kilda for weekend recreation?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: This matter involves not only the Harbors Board but, I should think, the Tourist Bureau. I will have the question examined and let the honourable member have a reply in due course.

STANDING ORDERS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On August 20 I asked you, Mr. Speaker, a question about the revision of Standing Orders and in your reply you said:

I intend to call the Standing Orders Committee together regarding Standing Orders legislation.

Can you say, Sir, whether that committee has met and, if so, whether it has come to any conclusion?

The SPEAKER: The committee has not met yet because of the adjournment. As the honourable member realizes, I intended to call a meeting shortly after the Show adjournment. However, now that the House is again sitting and members of the committee are present I intend to proceed with the meeting as soon as possible.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MASTER BUTCHERS LIMITED.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. SHANNON: When speaking in the debate on the Food and Drugs Act regulations a few weeks ago I inadvertently referred to Master Butchers Limited as the Master Butchers Association. I desire to correct that. Apparently I have hurt certain people's feelings, and I would hate to hurt anybody's feelings. I must admit that it was because of my ignorance that I did not know that the body to which I referred was a limited company, as I now know it is. Secondly, I should like to make it clear that when I quoted the South Australian Farmers Co-operative Union Ltd. as having supported my approach to this problem I knew that that body was not interested in minced meat as such. I wish to make that clear in case honourable members are misled, because Master Butchers Limited apparently thinks my remarks could be misconstrued. I have nothing else to withdraw on the matter, and my attitude to it remains unaltered.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS.

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

Government Office Block, Victoria Square,
Adelaide,
Pata Water Supply.

Ordered that reports be printed.

CONDOLENCES.

The SPEAKER: I inform the House that I conveyed the resolution passed by this House on August 28, 1963, to Lady Duncan, widow of the late Hon. Sir Walter G. Duncan, former President of the Legislative Council, and in reply have received the following letter from Mr. John Duncan:

56 Park Terrace,
Parkside.

September 24, 1963.

The Hon. T. C. Stott, M.P.,
Speaker, House of Assembly,
Parliament House,
Adelaide.

Dear Mr. Stott,

Thank you very much for your letter of August 28, addressed to my mother, and containing a copy of a motion, which had been moved and carried in the House of Assembly that day, concerning the death of my late father. We deeply appreciate the action of the House, and the manner in which the resolution was carried. Thank you, too, for your

personal expression of sympathy. We also want to thank you, the members, and the officers of the House of Assembly, for the very beautiful flowers which you sent, and for which we are very grateful. You have all been so very kind.

Yours sincerely,
John Duncan.

I have to inform the House that I have conveyed the resolution passed by this House on September 3, 1963, to Mrs. Winifred Jenkins, widow of the late Mr. W. W. Jenkins, and have received the following reply:

11 Grantley Avenue,
Victor Harbour.

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

Dear Sirs,

My family and I wish to express sincere appreciation for your kindness and sympathy in our recent sad bereavement.

Yours faithfully,
Winifred Jenkins.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2).

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

In Committee of Supply.

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

That towards defraying the expenses of the establishments and public services of the State, for the year ending June 30, 1964, a further sum of £6,000,000 be granted: provided that no payments for any establishment or service shall be made out of the said sum in excess of the rates voted for similar establishments or services on the Estimates for the financial year ended June 30, 1963, except increases of salaries or wages fixed or prescribed by any return made under any Act relating to the Public Service or by any regulation or by any award, order or determination of any court or other body empowered to fix or prescribe wages or salaries.

Motion carried.

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

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It follows the usual form of Supply Bills and provides for the issue of a further £6,000,000 to enable the Public Service to function during the period in which the Estimates of Expenditure and the Appropriation Bill will be debated by Parliament. Clause 2 provides for the issue and application of £6,000,000.

Clause 3 provides for the payment of any increases in salaries or wages which may be authorized by any court or other body empowered to fix or prescribe salaries or wages.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I do not intend to delay this Bill, for I feel sure that you, Mr. Speaker, desire that it be passed. However, I remind the Treasurer that he is about two weeks too late. We were promised some months ago that this measure would be introduced on a certain date, and that has not happened. However, I shall have more to say about that later. In the meantime, I support the second reading.

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

THE BUDGET.

The Estimates—Grand Total, £103,306,000.

In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from September 3. Page 812.)

THE LEGISLATURE.

Legislative Council, £13,900.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I propose to commence my remarks concerning this Budget in a vastly different manner from that which I normally adopt. I will refer in a moment to the adjournment which took place on September 4, but first I take this opportunity of offering my congratulations to the member for Stirling on his election to Parliament to fill the vacancy that occurred on the death of the late Bill Jenkins, as he was known to us. In doing so, I remind the new member for Stirling that during my visits to his district recently I found that there were very grave suspicions in the minds of many electors concerning the Playford administration in that district and the very sad neglect of the people of that district by the Government. Accordingly, I expect the honourable member to take up some matters that concern the interests of the people of the district of Stirling. If there is any doubt in his mind as to what should be done, he can, on an approach to me, receive valuable information on this matter. If it is his desire to insist that these matters should be carried to a successful conclusion, he can certainly rely on my support to achieve this. On the other hand, if he would prefer that I introduce the matters for and on his behalf, and on behalf of the district generally, I ask only that he give me the necessary support, because the matters about which I am vitally concerned are in the interests of this State, and it cer-

tainly will be to the advantage of the member for Stirling to give serious thought to this particular matter.

I now refer to the adjournment on September 4; I refer to page 862 of *Hansard*, where the Treasurer referred to the votes and proceedings of the House of Assembly of September 22, 1960. I do not intend to quote details from this reference, but what I am vitally concerned about is that the Treasurer implied that this was an example of the Government, immediately on the death of a member, adjourning the House for the convenience of the Labor Party. He said that Government members were aware that we had to appoint a new Leader and that it would be grossly unfair to bring a new Leader into the House at short notice to debate the matters on the Notice Paper. What actually occurred, however, was that on Thursday, September 22, 1960, as soon as the Speaker had read prayers, the Treasurer moved under Standing Order 459, "that the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, October 4, at 2 p.m." This is a particular matter concerning the Standing Orders of the House of Assembly that should have been adopted on September 4 this year. If the Standing Orders are not to be carried out in accordance with the manner and dignity with which they are laid down for your guidance, Mr. Speaker, the sooner the Standing Orders Committee meets and provides Standing Orders that will suit the occasions the sooner members will know that the existing Standing Orders mean very little.

On this particular date (September 22, 1960) both sides paid their tribute to the late Leader, Mr. M. R. O'Halloran, but the reasons for the adjournment were not as stated by the Treasurer—namely, to give the Labor Party the opportunity to elect a successor. The Chief Secretary's Department had already arranged for a visit by Parliamentarians and other officers to the Leigh Creek coalfields. The visit, which commenced on Monday, September 26, concluded on Friday, September 30, and the House resumed sitting on October 4. The by-election in Frome, which resulted from the death of Mr. O'Halloran, was held on November 5: at no time did the House adjourn to enable members to take part in the campaign. Probably it is not necessary for me to remind the Committee that the Playford administration tried desperately to stretch the Electoral Act from Adelaide to Peterborough and back again. They succeeded in preventing the member for Frome, who was the endorsed

Labor candidate in that by-election, from taking part in the business of the House from the election date of November 5 until that session ended on November 17, 1960, when the House adjourned at 9.3 p.m.

On Tuesday, June 20, 1961, the House met at 12 noon pursuant to proclamation of the Speaker (Hon. B. H. Teusner), who presided. (He has since been demoted to Chairman of Committees.) Prayers were read, we proceeded to the Legislative Council, and subsequently returned to the House of Assembly, when the oath of allegiance was administered to the new member for Frome, Mr. Thomas Mannix Casey.

Mr. Ryan: That was seven or eight months.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: It was from November 5 until the following June before he was permitted in the House. What happened last Saturday, September 28? A by-election was held in the Stirling district and, although I do not know who insisted, the declaration of the poll took place yesterday at 2.30 p.m. I ask members to look at what the *Advertiser* was generous enough to say this morning! I hope the reporters in the gallery will be able to prevail on the editors of the *Advertiser* to give as much space to my remarks in tomorrow's issue. Let me give the exact facts. Mr. Stevens, who was endorsed by the Labor Party, was not given a chance to present himself at the declaration of the poll yesterday. A young married man with two children, he had arranged for one of his children to be in Adelaide while the other child was cared for by the mother and father. They left Bull Creek on Sunday morning, after milking.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: Bull-dust!

Mr. FRANK WALSH: That comes from the gentleman on the front bench sitting behind the dark glasses.

Mr. Lawn: The Minister for stockyard confetti!

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Let us get back to the realities, because the Minister was able to outstrip his Leader on September 4.

Mr. Ryan: He has been pulled into gear since.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: He does not appear to have been. Mr. Stevens, his wife and one child proceeded to Adelaide on Sunday morning and returned on Sunday evening. To the best of my knowledge, there are no telephone facilities in his locality unless the exchange is specially opened; it has no continuous service. If an attempt was made to ring him and the telephone was not answered, should he be held responsible? After milking on Monday morning he went out on his property and commenced

other work, but nobody from the Electoral Office or from the Returning Officer for the district left any message for him to be at the declaration of the poll at 2.30 p.m. yesterday. Let the *Advertiser* or anyone else publish that statement, which came from the defeated candidate. He was denied the right of at least paying a tribute to the Presiding Officer for the district of Stirling and, if I understand him correctly, I believe that he wished to go along to show his appreciation and courteously express his thanks for whatever was done for him in this by-election.

Once again, I find myself without the assistance of the Auditor-General's Report, and refer to the Treasurer's statement when he said:

I am very much indebted to my Treasury officers for the preparation of the vast amount of material that goes to make up the Estimates each year. Honourable members will realize from the standard of work they have seen, our Treasury officers are second to none in the Commonwealth, and I am sure all members will join me in expressing appreciation of the work being done by these officers.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I offer my congratulations to the senior officers of the Public Service who are attached to the Treasury, but knowing that the Treasury officials are responsible to the Treasurer, it is all the more necessary that I should have an advance copy of the Auditor-General's Report. It is the only opportunity that my colleagues and I have to investigate the contents of the Budget. In addition, and in contrast to the Treasurer, with the limited amount of staff made available to the office of the Leader of the Opposition, I find that both my staff and I work more than our fair share of hours to prepare the speech I am delivering this afternoon.

I quote from the Auditor-General's Report a copy of which I received a short time ago:

In certain departments I consider that there is insufficient control exercised to ensure that capital works are carried out at the least possible cost necessary to provide adequate facilities. The necessity for interest payments over many years requires that the cost of capital works should be kept at a minimum. Further comment on this will be made elsewhere in the report.

I have drawn the attention of the Government to this many times. I have had insufficient time to peruse the current report prior to this speech. I emphasize that I am not complaining of the quality of my staff, but I believe that as this report was almost ready to be delivered on the resumption after the Show adjournment, the Leader of the Opposition is entitled to receive an advance copy. If he

received a copy, he would be able to study the comparisons between the report and the Estimates presented to this House.

On page 3 of his Budget explanation, the Treasurer said:

The Revenue Budget presented in September, 1962, forecast a deficit of £603,000. The final results for the year were a surplus on Loan Account sufficient to eliminate the previous deficit and to give a balance of £405,000 together with a small surplus of £290,000 on Revenue Account, taking the cumulative surplus to £297,000.

As things turned out during 1962-63, with the buoyancy of trade and production, coupled with the ready availability of money for governmental and semi-governmental loans, the forecast deficit of £603,000 disappeared, and was replaced with a surplus of £290,000. Similar unexpected variations occurred in the previous financial year, because on page 3 of the Budget explanation, the Treasurer said:

During the early part of 1961-62 there was some risk of overstretching the Government's finances as many contractors concentrated on Government projects, and it appeared that the rate of payments might be more than could be sustained throughout the year. However, the final result of the year was a manageable deficit of £422,000 on Loan Account. At the same time a surplus of £507,000 was achieved on Revenue Account due almost entirely to an unexpected improvement in Railways Department finances.

Irrespective of whether the Government predictions have been correct or not, the unfortunate situation still remains that the unemployment position in this State in the last three years has not reacted favourably to the Treasurer's Budgets.

Whilst there has been an improvement recently, I believe there has to be a greater inducement offered to obtain apprentices in all trades. The most recent figures indicate that there is some improvement, but I believe there is still a great need to campaign to induce more youths, particularly those in secondary education, to give this matter very serious thought. Instead the important matter of employment appears to have been overlooked altogether, because the Budget merely informs members that Government expenditure is to be increased by approximately 7 per cent to £103,000,000, and that revenue receipts are to be increased in the same proportion. On page 4 of the Budget explanation we have been given the following vague reference:

The Government is considering the introduction of roads maintenance charges which would be paid to a special fund to finance maintenance of roads and therefore would not affect the Budget.

This is an important matter because road maintenance can become a heavy charge on Government finance, and road hauliers would have no desire to shirk their responsibilities of contributing towards road maintenance in an equitable manner. Regarding this subject, I request the Treasurer to have the courtesy of informing his own members, as well as members on this side of the Committee, by statements in Parliament, rather than our receiving the information secondhand via some radio station or on a newspaper hoarding in the street. It is an effrontery to democratic government for major items of Parliamentary business to be issued as publicity plugs instead of first being debated by the elected representatives of the people.

I understand, from a question asked by the member for Victoria (Mr. Harding), that he was seeking assistance to retain employment in this State. My understanding of the position is that the Highways Department is to call tenders for the supply of certain metal to Naracoorte. The last tender that was called for the same purpose was let to Mooree Quarries in Victoria, not only for the crushing of the metal but also for the delivery. I believe it would be reasonable to suggest that the owner-drivers of trucks in this State, particularly in the Naracoorte area, were deprived of some £8,000 whilst the metal itself was valued at £6,000. I believe that there is a good standard of metal available in South Australia. There may be a difference in the mileage, but it would be interesting to know why we have to provide employment for persons outside the State instead of utilizing our own labour force.

Where the Highways Department is concerned, if we are to be granted certain moneys from the Commonwealth as the result of petrol tax, I maintain that the money should be spent in this State instead of in other States, unless there is an alteration to the present proposals of the Government concerning these particular types of contract. I assure the member for Victoria that it is not my desire to intrude into his district's affairs, but I draw the Government's attention to this matter. The Minister of Roads, who represents the Southern Legislative Council district, should be acquainted with his own area, which has been generous to him in the past, and he should reciprocate by safeguarding the interests of the Naracoorte truck drivers.

On page 5 of his explanation the Treasurer states:

Mines Department expenditures were £80,000 less than estimated due to the fact that several drilling programmes were postponed and more work was done on a reimbursement basis.

In a developing country such as ours, the encouragement of mining and mineral exploration is vital and I can see no valid reason why the Government should have restricted its expenditure in this field. The estimated revenue receipts for 1963-64 are expected to exceed those for last year by £5,230,000. However, no mention has been made of the fact that some actual receipts for taxation were far in excess of the estimates for last year. For example, land tax was £57,000 and succession duties were £275,000 respectively, in excess of the estimates for last year. No major adjustment is envisaged to give substantial concessions in these lines to bring the imposts down to a reasonable figure. I know that the Government proposes some reductions of succession duties, for the Treasurer has stated:

The minimum values of succession were last adjusted in 1954, when the exemption level for widows and children under 21 years of age was raised from £2,800 to £3,500, and the exemption level for widowers, descendants and ancestors was raised from £500 to £1,500. The Government now considers it desirable to make adjustment for the changed levels of values, and to raise the exemption level for successions by widows and children under 21 years to £4,500 and for successions by widowers, descendants and ancestors to £2,000.

I am very pleased to see this, because I have had instances where a widow has come to me seeking advice on how she could raise money on her late husband's house in order to pay the succession duty incurred. In most cases the houses have been 30 to 40 years old or older. In all cases the State Government did not make any money available on the purchase of existing houses, excepting where special permission was granted for incoming tenants who were eventually to purchase the new house. Whilst the proposed amendments by the Government will assist to overcome some of the difficulties, there are still some anomalies that remain. I have in mind the case of a daughter who has cared for an aged parent for several years. She works in commerce or industry all day and performs domestic duties during the evening. In short, she has sacrificed herself in the interests of caring for an aged parent, but when that parent has died, substantial succession duties have been incurred and, in some cases, they have caused serious hardship.

In the Treasurer's reference to the proposed changes to the succession duty rates, there is

no prospect of daughters in this situation being granted any concession. The point with which I am vitally concerned is that there is a need to make further provision, because at present debts are being incurred upon properties through succession duties and it should be obligatory upon the State Bank to provide the necessary loan in these cases so that the people can pay their succession duties without having to go to other authorities to mortgage their properties. It should be the responsibility of an appropriate Government department to assist in these matters. Some amelioration should be afforded to those people I have mentioned. Regarding the liquor tax, the Treasurer said:

The Government has decided that the basis of charging liquor tax now operative in each of the other States is more equitable than the existing South Australian basis, and proposes to introduce the amending legislation necessary to relate liquor taxation to turnover in a defined previous period. However, the Government does not consider it appropriate to increase the impact of the tax fully up to the levels of the other States, but considers that a tax equivalent to 3 per cent of the turnover at wholesale values in the previous year would be reasonable. Such a tax would result in increased revenues of about £300,000 in a full year.

I would point out that the liquor tax collections last year totalled £197,000 (or, in round figures, £200,000), thus, in one year, the Government is proposing to increase the tax by more than 150 per cent, and it will be borne by only a section of the community. However the matter is viewed, I believe it will result in increased prices in that section of our community. In other words, it is a sectional tax. Our Government finances certainly must be in a very serious condition if the Government needs to increase any of its taxes in this way. I shall have more to say about this tax when the Treasurer brings down the legislation, because my information indicates that there will be some steep increases on the hotel trade; only some of these people will be able to meet this impost. The Government has collected comparable colossal increases in land tax receipts in recent years, but as yet it has not been prepared to rectify the anomalies and injustices that it caused. Regarding stamp duties, the Treasurer said:

For stamp duties I have estimated receipts for 1963-64 at £2,666,000, an increase of £218,000 above actual receipts for 1962-63.

In addition, much fuss was made about the number of transactions, but no mention was made of the loss of revenue relating to stamp duty on ordinary receipts. What about the

companies that have notified their customers that unless a receipt is demanded no receipt will be returned? There is a loss of 2d. stamp duty on every such receipt, and this has been brought about because of the postal charge of 5d. a letter to forward an invoice and to return a receipt. I would like to know what the Government estimates it is losing because of the non-issuance of receipts, and whether the Treasurer will raise the matter of second-class mail at the next Premiers' conference, because I believe the excessive increases in Commonwealth postal rates have adversely affected State stamp duty receipts.

The returns from the South-Eastern forests are continuing to improve, but the Government is conducting an undesirable practice of creaming off more and more to the general revenue of the State. During 1962-63, the contribution was £360,000, whereas in 1963-64 it is proposed to transfer £540,000 (an increase of 50 per cent). In view of the profitable return from our forests, we should at least be prepared to provide improved living conditions and adequate amenities to the employees in the South-East instead of trying to transfer a continually increasing amount into the general revenue funds of the State.

In regard to "Other Departmental Fees and Recoveries", the Treasurer expected an increase of £614,000, taking the total to £8,366,000. The main increases were expected to be in the Commonwealth education grants, which were expected to increase by £240,000. These grants, in the main, are for the University of Adelaide and the South Australian Institute of Technology. However, in the line "Other Departmental Fees and Recoveries" is contained the receipts from hospitals, and all we have been told on this account is that hospital receipts are expected to reach £2,869,000, an increase of £71,000 over actual receipts for 1962-63, due to increased numbers of patients and greater receipts from board of staff as new accommodation is occupied. This is the overall position, but there are several items within the hospitals receipts which show very substantial variations and should have been explained. For example, there is an expected decrease in patients' fees for the Royal Adelaide Hospital of £128,600—a reduction of 19 per cent; receipts under Commonwealth hospital benefits schemes for the Royal Adelaide Hospital, an expected increase of £93,400—an increase of 48 per cent; and receipts under the Commonwealth pharmaceutical benefits scheme for Queen Elizabeth Hospital, an expected increase

of £21,300—an increase of 40 per cent. As members can see, these three examples I have mentioned are all very substantial variations from the receipts of last year, and I think the Treasurer should have supplied us with the necessary explanations.

The Estimates of Expenditure placed before us showed expected expenditure from Special Acts, totalling £27,900,000, and £75,400,000 under the Appropriation Act. I understand that the Government guaranteed the accounts of Foster Clark (S.A.) Ltd. to the extent of £750,000, but that £300,000 to £350,000 in total is expected to be sufficient to meet the Government's indebtedness. Nevertheless, this still represents a substantial loss in the span of a few years, and naturally several doubts arise in one's mind. For instance, when Foster Clark entered into the business of taking over Brookers, who encouraged the inflationary valuation which undoubtedly favoured the Brooker organization? It would also appear that probably when the Foster Clark organization took over it dispensed with the services of the most competent people engaged in the organization. It is all right for members to ask what is to become of the fruit industry in this State. My information is that in some areas—and I need only mention Berri—more than enough fruit will be available this year to keep all canners supplied.

Under "Part II, Chief Secretary and Minister of Health", the salaries and contingencies for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital are estimated to cost £1,424,000 for the coming year. I am pleased that these funds are being made available for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, but I should have been more pleased had the Government investigated the present running of this hospital with the object of keeping the annual running costs fairly substantially below £70 a week for each occupied bed. This figure is nearly double that charged by some of our modern private hospitals, and it should be kept to a minimum, but I notice that the Government has adopted the opposite approach because it has made no reference to this matter. Nevertheless, it intends to recoup itself £625,000 of its expenditure by means of patients' fees, together with Commonwealth benefits. Already the Auditor-General has issued another warning concerning the all-important interest commitments. There are no means of following through. The Government gets a report from the Public Works Committee and in all probability it accepts the report. Tenders are called and the successful tenderer's price

is probably somewhere near the amount: it could be above it or below it. However, there is no way of knowing whether the report has been carried to its proper and logical conclusion: there are no ways or means of making a further investigation. The Auditor-General is concerned with the ever-increasing interest commitment. Who is going to take notice? It is time somebody took notice of what the Opposition is continually saying.

Under this same expenditure line, the Treasurer stated:

Under the appropriation for Hospitals Department is a provision of £1,593,000 for the mental health services. This is £200,000 or 14 per cent in excess of the actual expenditure for these services last year.

This is certainly a very brief statement because, according to the alteration in the expenditure through the various mental hospitals, substantial changes appear to be taking place. Apparently mental health headquarters and a psychiatric day hospital have been established, because last year the expenditure in this direction was practically negligible, whereas £10,074 and £6,300, respectively, are proposed expenditures in this direction during the coming year. In addition, we voted £13,000 for the Child Guidance Clinic last year, whereas only £11,000 was spent. Overall, for mental health services last year, Parliament voted £1,546,000, whereas the Government spent only £1,393,000. What happened to the £153,000 that was not spent, and why did not the Government spend this money on essential mental health services in accordance with the amounts authorized by Parliament?

There is no denying that improved conditions and additional staff are required in our mental hospitals. This lack has been pointed out to the Government on many occasions but, unfortunately, even with these unsatisfactory conditions still continuing, the Government is unwilling to spend the full amount authorized by Parliament on mental health services.

The concluding amounts under the "Miscellaneous" line included under "Chief Secretary" are also subject to criticism. I have said for years that it is no use the Government's placing items on the Estimates purely for propagandist purposes if it has no intention of spending the money, and this practice is most apparent under the "Miscellaneous" line of "Chief Secretary, Part II". For example, we authorized a grant to the Lyell McEwin Hospital of £100,000 but it was paid only £37,519. This year, £166,000 has been put on the Estimates for this line, but only time will tell just how much this

hospital will receive. Similarly, we authorized £17,971 as a grant to the South Australian Tuberculosis Association on account of Bedford Industries, but that association received only £3,545. I shall deal now with further extensions to hospitals. Although we authorized £36,000 for the Meningie Hospital and £8,000 for the Moonta Hospital, not one penny piece was spent, but I notice that the same amounts are on the Estimates again this year. For subsidies for institutions, we authorized £79,000 for the Kalyra Sanatorium, but only £64,494 was paid. The sum of £15,000 was authorized for the South Australian Spastic Paralysis Welfare Association, but nothing was paid. On these several "Miscellaneous" payments under the control of the Chief Secretary, the Government was able to retain £150,000 in its Treasury locker, and I am interested to know just what happened to this money during the last financial year. I assume the Treasurer has a complete answer to all these matters; at least, I hope he has.

The following is a list of hospitals which were placed on the Estimates for last year for special subsidies towards the cost of additions, alterations and equipment; it shows the actual expenditure as against that estimated by the Government.

Hospital.	Expenditure.	
	Estimated.	Actual.
	£	£
Bordertown (Tatiara)	1,000	Nil
Jamestown	24,300	18,864
Kangaroo Island	1,201	Nil
Kingston	1,491	Nil
Maitland	4,375	Nil
Millicent (Thyne)	50,000	42,911
Murray Bridge	23,695	Nil
Naracoorte	81,962	66,677
Penola	4,380	2,382
Renmark	20,206	Nil
	£212,610	£130,834

I hope there will be a degree of sanity in relation to the health of the people on Kangaroo Island, and I am concerned to know what the member for the district, who is the Minister of Agriculture, will have to say on these matters, because I think that others, apart from people on Kangaroo Island, are greatly interested in the hospital there. Probably the member for Murray will be able to say why nothing was spent on the Murray Bridge hospital.

Once again, the Government made a substantial saving as against the amount authorized for the health services of this State which, in this case, amounted to £82,000. Perhaps the

Treasurer would care to inform us what happened to this sum. If he cannot, probably he can get this information from the Chief Secretary, as we will need the information. The major omission with respect to health services is in the provision of infirmaries for the aged. The Government should provide for more infirmaries to cater for the aged, bearing in mind the Northfield wards that used to provide for this type of patient, and also the lower number of patients being cared for each year. The Government is generous in helping religious orders that care for the aged. For instance, it helps them provide furnishings and the Commonwealth Government gives a £2 for £1 subsidy on the erection of this type of accommodation, but we should make greater provision for geriatric patients in Government hospitals. Unless the organizations now caring for these people can qualify on all the requirements of the Commonwealth Government and can provide an operating theatre and a fully trained staff, a member of which has to be on duty continuously, the assistance is not granted. It would take a large sum to provide up-to-date equipment for these people, as many of them need special lifting gear and special care and attention. It should be incumbent on the Government to make more beds available, and I believe the Northfield ward is the place to do this as provision was made there years ago, but the number of beds has been reduced because the accommodation has been required for other purposes.

Another item about which I am concerned under "Chief Secretary—Miscellaneous", is the expenditure of £1,841 last year, plus an estimated amount of £964 for the current year, for the expenses of the overseas visit of the Treasurer, making £2,805 in all. I am not complaining about the sum spent, because I understand that the trip was in connection with the collapse of negotiations regarding the pulp mill for the South-East as well as an investigation into electricity supply.

On his return from his overseas trip, I questioned the Treasurer on July 23 regarding the negotiations with MacMillan Bloedel and Powell River Limited for the establishment of a pulp mill in the South-East at an estimated cost of £16,500,000, and also on the possibility of the use of nuclear power for electricity purposes. These matters are vital for the advancement of this State. Regarding the former, I understood from the Treasurer that the negotiations were in the final stages, and that it was only a matter of agreeing on

a schedule for price variations from time to time to meet the changing economic conditions. However, on September 6, a short statement appeared in the press that MacMillan Bloedel and Powell River Limited had withdrawn from participation in a proposed board and coarse paper mill in South Australia. Surely it is long overdue for this Parliament to be given the full information on the breakdown of the negotiations for this industry in the South-East. Was any financial inducement offered by the Treasurer in any of the negotiations for the establishment of the pulp mill; or, for that matter, were financial inducements offered to any other interested persons to establish industries in this State?

I consider that Parliament should be fully informed about the overseas trip of the Treasurer. For example, we should be told what negotiations were made, what is the potential for future investment, and just what did occur over this pulp mill for the South-East. As regards the possibilities of nuclear power in this State and in reply to my question on the same day, the Treasurer informed Parliament that on his trip to the United Kingdom and the United States of America he was accompanied by Mr. S. E. Huddleston, and that the authorities they interviewed in both countries comprised atomic authorities, leading manufacturers of power units, and electricity authorities. He also informed the House that he would be unable to reach any final conclusion on the subject for some time, and would not be able to express his views to the Electricity Trust until some supplementary studies that were being undertaken in the U.S.A. and Great Britain by atomic authorities were available to him. Seeing that Mr. Huddleston was remaining overseas until these studies were completed, he should be able to give the necessary information to the trust, but I believe that any information that the Treasurer intends to give to the trust should, in the first instance, at least in broad principle, be given to this Parliament, so that we may be able to glean some information as to the most likely site for the establishment of a nuclear power plant. We all know that certain sites appear to be under consideration but, as yet, the Treasurer has not had the courtesy to report officially to Parliament on any recommendations arising from his overseas visit. Of education, the Treasurer said:

In the field of education, there will be a further heavy increase in provision from the Budget.

I agree that the Government is spending colossal sums on education, but I have often pointed out that education costs per pupil are far outstripping ordinary cost of living increases, and the improvements in our educational system do not seem to be commensurate with the increased expenditure. As well as our ordinary primary and secondary education, there is the necessity for higher education to meet the more stringent requirements of industry, and in this regard the Treasurer said:

During the period of six years, 1958-1963, grants paid to the University of Adelaide and for degree teaching at the Institute of Technology would have totalled closely £16,000,000. Of this figure, the State will have provided £9,500,000 out of its own resources and will have passed on £6,500,000 provided by the Commonwealth.

The fact still remains that in spite of these substantial grants both from the State and Commonwealth Governments, the university has seen fit to increase its fees substantially this year. Earlier this year, I drew the attention of the Government to the savage increase in examination fees under the control of the Public Examinations Board, and they were eventually adjusted, but in the university calendar for this year, I notice that entrance fees for subjects at the university are also being increased substantially. In some cases, the increases range as high as 66½ per cent, and most are about 50 per cent. Throughout our education system there is clearly an urgent need to ascertain why the costs are so rapidly outstripping the actual results. I have drawn the Government's attention to these matters before, but apparently nothing has been done although the problems are becoming more acute, with the result that a thorough investigation and complete overhaul of our education system is still required.

Our continued advancement depends on an efficient system of education, and the longer the Government leaves these problems, the more chaotic they will become. In the meantime, Cabinet should refer back to the University Council the exorbitant increases in tuition and examination fees for university subjects to which I have referred. The Minister of Works gave the member for Port Adelaide a certain reply this afternoon, but it is not always the fares of students up to 15 or 16 years of age that are involved, nor for that matter, up to 18 years of age. Mr. Deputy Chairman, you would be amongst the first to admit that our standard of education must improve if industry in this country is to survive. Many full-time students at the university are 18 years

of age and over, and I am greatly concerned about their educational progress. More than one member of a family may be over the age of 18 years and at the university. Should such students be granted the right to travel for half fare on public transport, or would the Government prefer parents to assist students in purchasing old "bombs"—old and inferior motor cars—to travel to and from the university? We seek the best education for our students, but we should help the parents by providing full-time students with half fares on public transport. I do not want to seem personal, but I doubt whether the cost involved would equal the cost of the latest brochure issued by the Education Department.

Concerning water supplies, the Treasurer has said that 312,000 properties have a reticulated water supply and that capital expenditure exceeding £12,000,000 is estimated for the coming year. In this field, as in many others, the Government can boast that colossal sums are being spent; but there are two sides to heavy expenditure. The first is the pleasant side of the Government's being able to announce the commencement of some major project, but the other is sometimes the unpleasant side; that the expensive schemes of the Government have to be paid for somehow. One method the Government is using is to increase the cost of water by 3d. a thousand gallons, which it expects will return to the Engineering and Water Supply Department an extra £300,000 during the year. However, this has the appearance of the Government's attempting to chase its mounting interest commitment resulting from this public utility. I believe that the interest bill connected with this service for the coming year will exceed £3,000,000 and that it will continue to absorb about 60 per cent of the total earnings from water supplies. This is certainly a huge proportion to be absorbed in interest charges and it is brought about solely by the Government's grandiose schemes of the past now catching up with it.

Sewer services are closely related to water supplies. Much fuss has been made about excessive land subdivisions, but subdividers have been required to meet initially the whole cost of the water and sewer reticulation on an agreed reimbursement basis, and therefore there should not have been any particular problem. On the general question of subdivisions, two essential amenities are a reticulated water supply and a sewer service. My experience has been that when certain sewer extensions have been requested, the property

owners have been asked to provide an amount of £30 a year for a five-year period towards the cost of the extension. After having agreed to pay this amount, if some intermediate connections are made between the existing terminus of the sewer main and that of the newly connected house, no reduction is made in the payments. Let us compare this practice with what happens in the Electricity Trust. With the trust, if it is necessary for a consumer to pay for a certain number of poles, a refund or an adjustment is made if further connections are taken from the extended powerline. Apparently a comparable adjustment is not made in the Engineering and Water Supply Department. To be quite adamant in this matter, if the sewer mains are extended and pass vacant allotments on either side of that main, then full sewer charges should be made, and it would not be necessary to impose unjust penalties on those who have been forced to buy land and build beyond the limits of the existing sewer mains because other people and companies are holding land facing onto the mains purely for speculative purposes.

The people who have bought the land on which to erect a house should not have an unjust burden placed upon them by this Government. Other members have been faced with this problem. Frequently, when a sewer main is extended it passes vacant allotments. I recall an instance where a main passes four vacant allotments—two on each side of the street—yet the person who has been connected to the supply is required to pay about £16 extra a year for five years. He has no hope, under his agreement, of having that amount reduced. Is it not reasonable to expect that if a main passes four other properties the owners thereof should contribute equally to the cost? In other words, in this case the cost should be divided equally between the five properties. I do not deny the department the right to obtain revenue, but I am opposed to severe hardship being imposed on those people who are prepared to invest money in new houses.

In a dry State such as ours, there is no doubt that an adequate water supply is vital to our continued advancement, but I believe the people as a whole must be educated to the value of water. It is pleasant to have domestic gardens around Adelaide with an unlimited water supply, but we must realize that we have to pay for this benefit through the cost of getting the water from the Murray through the Mannum-Adelaide main. However, the present Government's method of assessment

and rating is having the effect of contributing towards the waste of water, because on the present rebate basis many houses around Adelaide are eligible to use 120,000 to 150,000 gallons before any excess charges are imposed. For an average domestic family, this is a colossal quantity of water to use. The question also arises of when industry is going to be asked to erect tanks and equipment so that it can re-use some of the water that is used for industrial purposes. I think there could be a better conservation of water in industry without imposing any severe hardship on it.

My colleagues and I are greatly concerned with many features of the Railways Department. Our railways system is important, yet employees are expected to work in conditions that should have gone out with long button-up boots. No improvement is being effected. It is no good continuing with antiquated accommodation for staff. If we are to get the best out of the railways system we should try to provide reasonable conditions for the employees. According to the press, Mr. Opperman, the Minister responsible for the Commonwealth Railways, is in Adelaide. In a recent issue of the *News* the Treasurer is depicted riding on a railway tricycle while Mr. Opperman is pushing a bicycle. I do not know who won, but Mr. Opperman is reported as stating that the Commonwealth rail service from Marree to Alice Springs would be improved and that he would call tenders for the new coaches required.

What opportunities will be given for the Islington railway workshops to build this rolling stock? Will a seven-year programme be necessary in order to provide reasonable rolling stock, as for the Port Pirie service? I know that fewer people are employed at Islington than was once the case. I have had plenty to say on this matter, and I do not wish to repeat it here today. However, I hope the Treasurer will find out and let me know what the charges are concerning contracts at Islington. Is it the case that a contract is made up to cost a certain amount and that a certain number of man hours is required for that work? I want to know whether or not 23s. an hour or thereabouts is added to a contract price after it is made up, because if we are to adopt these fantastic ideas of 23s. or 26s. an hour over and above the estimated cost, taking the man hours into account, I do not think we will ever succeed in getting contract work for the Islington workshops. In fact, I think we will reach the stage when all the work will be lost to us, and I do not want that to happen.

In view of the present demand for skilled labour, I doubt whether the Government expenditure will be in accordance with the Estimates presented to us, particularly where Government contracts are concerned. One method of overcoming the shortage of skilled labour is to have adequate immigration. I realize that in Great Britain, and probably in other countries, there is still a waiting list of migrants desiring to come to Australia. This is tied up with the question of shipping facilities. I do not know whether the Treasurer can inform me on this, but I understand that at one time a Labor Government provided a certain number of ships—a shipping line. The same type of Government that the Treasurer represents here is now in office in Canberra. Can the Treasurer prevail upon the Commonwealth Government to reconsider its ideas about shipping, instead of having to depend on all other countries to provide the shipping to bring out people who desire to settle in this country?

When I commenced speaking this afternoon I indicated that my approach to this matter would be a little different from my usual approach. In concluding my remarks, I now refer to a subject that I touched on earlier, namely, the adjournment of the House. When we speak of adjournments, I remind the Treasurer that he should be sure of his facts regarding the business of the House. The Treasurer said he agreed to adjourn the House on September 22, 1960, to help the Labor Party, but that is not true: it is far from true. I believe that it was a successful attempt to mislead members.

Since the adjournment took place on September 4, many things have occurred. Probably one of the most important of all is that the Royal Adelaide Show was a complete success, but at this stage I am more concerned with what took place on September 4 regarding the adjournment. From the outset, I point out that I am concerned about Standing Orders in this Parliament. With all due respect to the Speaker, I firmly believe that Standing Order 459, which was quoted by me, was a Standing Order that should have been upheld. Let me make this point on that matter: I frankly admit that once or twice when I have sought leave to suspend Standing Orders to enable me to move a second reading of a Bill on private members' day, the Government has agreed; but I believe there are countless occasions when we have granted permission to the Government without any opposition, and even on the very day of the adjournment permission was given to the

Minister of Agriculture to suspend Standing Orders to bring business before the House.

However, the Treasurer failed to abide by the Standing Orders of the House when he forced the motion for the adjournment through the House. In cases of urgency, any Standing or Sessional Order may be suspended on motion without notice, provided that such motion has the concurrence of an absolute majority of the whole number of the members of the House of Assembly. I know that the Treasurer claimed a point on Sessional Orders, but this point I deliberately make: the Treasurer gave no notice of his intention to move a motion for the adjournment. Consequently, as soon as the business of the day according to the Notice Paper was called upon, it was absolutely essential, under Standing Order 459, to have permission first to move the motion, but the Speaker failed in his obligation to carry out the Standing Orders. If Parliament is to proceed in its normal businesslike way, then Standing Orders must be adhered to. Had the Treasurer, as Leader of the Government, moved that the House adjourn at its rising prior to the business on the Notice Paper being called on, he would have been in order, but again, with the valuable assistance to the Government from the Speaker, he succeeded in breaking away from the Standing Orders. Whatever may come out of this debate, Standing Orders are laid down for guidance and they are provided for the conduct of the House of Assembly. I hope that a record of what I have said here this afternoon will be used for further reference, and, with the dignity that should prevail in Parliament, I hope that Standing Order 459 as printed will be used on other occasions on which this question may arise. The Treasurer was not in order in moving this, and I say the Speaker gave a wrong decision. I do not mind, Mr. Chairman, if you convey that to him.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I point out to the honourable Leader that that matter has been disposed of and resolved.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: There is only one difference between you and me this afternoon, Mr. Chairman: I agree that it was carried, but I do not agree that it was resolved. The interpretation placed on this matter did succeed, but I say there was a miscarriage of justice somewhere along the line concerning Standing Order 459. The Treasurer had not the right to move his motion, and I hope such a state of affairs will not occur again.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

CITY OF WHYALLA COMMISSION ACT
AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla) moved:

That the time for bringing up the report of the Select Committee be extended to Tuesday, October 8.

Motion carried.

TOWN PLANNING.

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

That in the opinion of this House the report of the Town Planning Committee should be an interim development plan and that provision should be made for the lodging and consideration of objections and the co-ordination of the work of local governing bodies to give effect to the plan as revised from time to time.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I gave notice of this motion in all good faith but I now wish to know, Mr. Speaker, whether, if I wait until after today to move it, I shall be too late in

view of the provisions requiring that action on the Town Planning Committee's development plan shall be taken within 28 sitting days of its being laid on the table of this House.

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition can allow this motion to lapse. He would be in order in giving a new notice of motion tomorrow and he would still be within the time limit.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I thank you for that information, Mr. Speaker, and accept it.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2).

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.59 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, October 2, at 2 p.m.